THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY

REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

D - Delia'ah

by James Strong & John McClintock

To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE
AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

AGES Software Rio, WI USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

D.

Daah

SEE GLEDE.

Dab’areh

a less correct mode of Anglicizing (Joshua 21:28) the name DABERATH *SEE DABERATH* (q.v.).

Dabaritta

SEE DABERATH.

Dab’basheth

(Heb. *Dabbe’sheth*, תשבּד; a camel’s hump, as in Isaiah 30:6, q. d. Camel-hump Hill; Sept. Δαβασθέ, Alex. Δαβασθαί, Vat. Βαιθάραβα; Vulg. *Debbaseth*), a place on the boundary-line of the tribe of Zebulon, between Maralah and Jokneam (Joshua 19:11; see Keil, *Comment.* in loc.); apparently the modern Jebata, which seems likewise to correspond to one of the places named Gabatha (Euseb. Γαβαά and Γαβαθά), located, by Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Gabathon) near Diocaesarea, in the plain of Legio (Robinson, *Researches*, 3, 201, whose map places it east of Uknufis, apparently by an error; see Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 1-10). It was again visited by Dr. Robinson (*Later Res.* p. 113), but is not described by him (comp. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 16:748). Knobel suggests (*Jos. Erklart*, p. 458) that the name in the *Onomasticon* may have arisen from a Hebrew epithet (תעב, i.e. *Gibeath*, q. d. the *hill* of the plain), a view which its isolation from the camel ridge seems to confirm (Ritter, 16:700), although the modern village seems to be upon a very slight, if any eminence.

Dab’erath

(Heb. *Daberath’*, תרבד [once, Joshua 19:12, with the art. *had-Daberath’*, תרבדה; once, 1 Chronicles 6:72, *Dobrath’*, תרבד], according to Furst a fem. form of רבדּ, *pasture*; Sept. in Joshua Δαβράθ

and Δαβραθά v. r. Δαβιρώθ, in Chron. Ἀμώς v. r. Δαβώρ; Vulg. *Dabereth*), a town in the tribe of Issachar (Joshua 21:28, where the A.V. has "*Dabareh*"), near the border of Zebulon (Joshua 19:12, where it is named next to Chisloth-tabor), and assigned to the Levites (1 Chronicles 6:72). It is probably the same with the village *Dabira* (Δαβειρά), mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v.) as lying near Matthew Tabor, in the region of Diocaesarea (Reland, *Paloest.* p. 737); and also the Dabaritta, repeatedly mentioned by Josephus (Δαβαρίττων κώμη, *War,* 2:21, 3; Δαβαριττηνοί, Life, 26; Δαβάριττα v. r. Δαράβιττα, Life, 62) as lying in the great plain on the confines of Galilee (Reland, *Paloest.* p. 737, too nicely objects that the border between Issachar and Zebulon would not be assigned to Galilee). In exact agreement with these notices there still exists, on the side of a ledge of rocks just at the base of Matthew Tabor, on the north-west, the village Deburieh, a small, poor, and filthy place, containing the bare walls of an old church, based upon massive foundations of a still older date. The situation, however, is beautiful, with the wooded heights of Tabor rising behind, and in front the plain of Esdraelon expanding like a sea of verdure (Robinson, *Res*. 3, 210; Maundrell, *Early Trav*. p. 479, Ritter, *Erdk*. 16:679; De Saulcy, *Narrative,* 1:75; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 166,167). *Tradition* (Van de Velde, 2:374) incorrectly makes this the scene of the miracle on the lunatic child performed by our Lord after his descent from the Mount of Transfiguration (Matthew 17:14).

Da'bria

one of the five swift scribes who recorded the visions of Esdras (2 Esdras 14:24; comp. 37, 42).

Dach Simon

a German Christian poet, born July 29, 1605, at Memel; became in 1633 sub-teacher of the cathedral school of Konigsberg, co-rector in 1636, professor of poetry in the University in 1639, and died April 16, 1659. He stands among the first poets of the so-called Konigsberg school. His productions were partly religious, partly social, and appeared under divers titles; they were collected and published by his widow. Some 150 of his religious pieces were published by H. Alberti, *Arien*, etc. (Konigsb. 1640-50), and afterwards incorporated in the Konigsberg Hymnbook of 1690. See Gebauer, *S. Dach u. seine Freunde als Kirchenliederdichter* (Tubing.

1828); Henneberger, *Jahrb. f. deutsche LiteraturGesch.* (Meiningen, 1854. Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, s.v.

Dacherius

SEE ACHERY, D.

D'Achery

SEE ACHERY, D.

Daco'bi

(Δακουβί v. r. Δακούβ, Vulg. *Accuba*), one of the heads of the families of "porters" that returned from Babylon (1 Esdras 5:28); the same with AKKUB *SEE AKKUB* (q.v. No. 2) of the Hebrews text (Ezra 2:42).

Da Costa Isaac

(a descendant of Uriel Acosta, q.v.), was born Jan. 14, 1798, at Amsterdam, where he also pursued his studies until 1817, when he went to Layden to devote his time to the study of law and belles-lettres. In 1822, after the death of his father, he abandoned Judaism and embraced Christianity, and became one of the most active opponents of the new rationalistic opinions. A circle of religiously-inclined persons gathered about him, and to these he expounded the Bible until after the Revolution of 1830, when he visited different cities of Holland and delivered a series of lectures. In 1839 he became a member of the Netherlands Institute, and renewed his efforts as a poet, while he still carried on a controversy with theologians of other schools and against all ecclesiastical innovations. He died April 28, 1860. Besides numerous poems and works in general literature, he wrote, *Israel en de Volken* (1849); *Over de eenheid en overeenstimming de evangelien* (1840, 2 vols.*); Over de waarheid en wardij van het Oude Testament* (1843); Paulus (1846); *Beschoulw'ng over het evangelie van Lukas* (1856); *De apostel Johannes en zijne schriften*. — Pierer, *Universal-Lexikon*, 19:831.

Daddae'us

(Λοδδαῖος v. r. Λολδαῖος, Vulg. *Loddoeus*), the "captain of the treasury" among the exiles at Babylon (1 Esdras 8:46; in the preceding verse Anglicized *Saddoeus*); evidently a corruption (through the blending

with the preceding particle ו [ו] of the IDDO *SEE IDDO* (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra 8:17).

Daemon

in Greek δαίμων, and its derivative δαιμόνιον, both rendered "devil" in the English version of the New Test.; in the original, however, they are carefully distinguished from the term διάβολος. *SEE DEVIL*. These two words, δαίμων and δαιμόνιον, are used as synonymous both by profane and sacred writers. The entmologies which the Greek authors themselves assign to them all point to some supposed characteristic of those *intelligent beings* to whom the words are applied. For example, Plato, in his *Cratylus* (i. 398, ed. Serran.), derives the word from δαήμων, "knowing" (of which, indeed, the form δαίμων is found in Archil. [B.C. 650]), in allusion to the superior intelligence and consequent efficiency ascribed to dsemons; Eusebius (*Praep. Evang*. 4:5) from δειμαίνω, "to be terrified;" others, as Proclus (*in Hesiod*.), from δαίω, "to distribute," because daemons were supposed to assign the lots or destinies of mankind (in which case it would be similar to Μοῖρα). The subject is greatly encumbered with superstition.

I. By heathen writers the terms in question are employed with considerable latitude. In Homer, where the gods are but supernatural men, δαίμιον is used interchangeably with θεός (1l. 17:98, 99; comp. 104); hence any particular divinity, as Venus (11. in); afterwards in Hesiod (*Op.* 121), when the idea of the gods had become more exalted and less familiar, the δαίμονες, are spoken of as intermediate beings *("minores diis et majores hominibus*," Liv. 8:20; Adam, *Rom. Antiq.* p. 287), the messengers of the gods to men. This latter usage of the word evidently prevailed afterwards as the correct one, although in poetry, and even in the vague language of philosophy, τὸ δαιμόνιον was sometimes used as equivalent to τὸ θεῖον for any superhuman nature. Aristotle applies δαιμόνιον to the Divinity, Providence (*Rhetor*. 2:23). But Plato (*Symp*. p. 202, 203) fixes it distinctly in the more limited sense. Among them were numbered the spirits of good men, "made perfect" after death (Plato, *Crat*. p. 398, quotation from Hesiod). It was also believed that they became tutelary deities of individuals (to the purest form of which belief Socrates evidently referred in the doctrine of his (δαιμόνιον); and hence δαίμων was frequently used in the sense of the "fate" or "destiny" of a man (as in the tragedians

constantly), thus recurring, it would seem, directly to its original derivation.

1. Daemons, in the theology of the Gentiles, are middle beings between gods and mortals. This is the judgment of Plato, which will be considered decisive: "*Every* daemon is a middle being between God and mortal." He thus explains what he means by a middle being: "God is not approached immediately by man, but all the commerce and intercourse between gods and men are performed by the mediation of daemons." He enters into further particulars: "Daemons are reporters and carriers from men to the gods, and again from the gods to men, of the supplications and prayers of the one, and of the injunctions and rewards of devotion from the other" (Plato, *Sympos*. 3, 202, 203, ed. Serran.). "And this," says the learned Mede, "was the *eocumenical* philosophy of the apostles' times, and of the times long before them."

2. Daemons were of two kinds; the one were the souls of good men, which upon their departure from the body were called heroes, were afterwards raised to the dignity of daemons, and subsequently to that of gods (Plutarch, *De Defect. Orac*.). Plato (*Cratylus, ut sup*.) says, 'The poets speak excellently who affirm that when good men die they attain great honor and dignity, and become' daemns." It is also admitted that lamblichus, Hierocles, and Simplicius use the words angels and daemons indiscriminately. Philo (*De Gigantibus*) says that souls, daemons, and angels are only different names that imply one and the same substance; and he affirms (*De Somn*.) that Moses calls those angels whom the philosophers call daemons. It was also believed that the souls of bad men became evil daemons (Chalcid. *in Platon. Tim*. c. 135, p. 330). Accordingly δαιμόνιος often occurs in ancient authors as a term of reproach. The other kind of daemons were of more noble origin than the human race, having never inhabited human bodies (Plato, *Tim*. p. 41, 42, 69, 71, 75; Apuleius, *De Deo Socratis*, p. 690).

3. The heathens held that some daemons were malignant by nature, and not merely so when provoked and offended. Plutarch says, "It is a very ancient opinion that there are certain wicked and malignant daemons, who envy good men, and endeavor to hinder them in the pursuit of virtue, lest they should be partakers of greater happiness than they enjoy" (Plut. *Dion*. 1:958, Paris, 1624). On this passage bishop Newton remarks, "This was the opinion of all the later philosophers, and Plutarch undeniably affirms it

of the very ancient ones" (*Dissert. on the Proph.*, Lond. 1826, p. 476). Pythagoras held that certain daemons sent diseases to men and cattle (Diog. Laert. *Vit. Pythag*. p. 514, ed. Amstel.). Zaleucus, in his preface to his Laws (*apud Stoboeum*, Serm. 42), supposes that an evil daemon might be present with a witness to influence him to injustice.

II. *By Hellenistic writers*. — In the Septuagint the words δαίμων and δαιμόνιον, though not found very frequently, are yet employed to render different Hebrew words; generally in reference to the idols of heathen worship, as in Psalm 95:3, for µylyl}a, the "empty," the "vanities" (rendered χειροποίητοι, etc., in Leviticus 19:4; 26:1); in Deuteronomy 32:17, for µydiv,e "lords" (comp. 1 Corinthians 8:5); in Isaiah 65:11, for dGi, *Gad*, the goddess of Fortune: sometimes in the sense of avenging or evil spirits, as in Psalm 91:6, for b f q, "pestilence," i.e. evidently "the destroyer;" also in Isaiah 13:21; 34:14, for r y [ic; "hairy," and µyYixi, "dwellers in the desert," in the same sense in which the A.V. renders "satyrs." *SEE SPECTRE*. In the book of Tobit (3, 8) we meet with "an evil doemon" (πονηρὸν δαιμόνιον). *SEE ASMODEAUS*.

In Josephus we find the word "daemons" used always of evil spirits; in 7:6, 3, he says expressly, Daemons are no other than the spirits of the wicked, that enter into men and kill them, unless they can obtain some help against them;" and he speaks of their exorcism by fumigation (as in Tobit 8:2, 3). See also *Ant.* vi, c. 8, 2; viii, c. 2, 5. Writing as he did with a constant view to the Gentiles, it is not likely that he would use the word in the other sense, as applied to heathen divinities.

By Philo the word appears to be used in a more general sense, as equivalent to "angels," and referring to both good and evil. *SEE GIANT*.

III. *The New-Testament writers* always use the word in a bad sense when they speak as from themselves. In the Gospels generally, in James 3:19, and in Revelation 16:14, the daemons are spoken of as spiritual beings at enmity with God, and having power to afflict man not only with disease, but, as is marked by the frequent epithet "unclean," with spiritual pollution also. In Acts 19:12,13, etc., they are exactly defined as "evil spirits" (τὰ πνεύματα τὰ πονηρά). They "believe" the power of God "and tremble" (James 2:19); they recognize our Lord as the Son of God (Matthew 8:29; Luke 4:41), and acknowledge the power of his name, used in exorcism, in

the place of the name of Jehovah, by his appointed messengers (Acts 19:15); and look forward in terror to the judgment to come (Matthew 8:29). The description is precisely that of a nature akin to the angelic, *SEE ANGEL*, in knowledge and powers, but with the emphatic addition of the idea of positive and active wickedness. Nothing is said either to support or to contradict the common Jewish belief, that in their ranks might be numbered the spirits of the wicked dead. In support of it are often quoted the fact that the daemoniacs sometimes haunted the tombs of the dead (Matthew 8:28), and the supposed reference of the epithet ἀκάθαρτα, "unclean," to the ceremonial uncleanness of a dead body. In 1 Corinthians 10:20, 21; 1 Timothy 4:1; and Revelation 9:20, the word δαιμόνια a is used of the objects of Gentile worship, and in the first passage it is opposed to the word Θε (with a reference to Deuteronomy 32:17). So also is it used by the Athenians in Acts 17:18. The same identification of the heathen deities with the evil spirits is found in the description of the damsel having "a spirit of divination" (πνεῦμα πύθωνα, or πύθωνος) at Philippi, and the exorcism of her as a daemoniac by Paul (Acts 16:16); and it is to be noticed that in 1 Corinthians 10:19, 20, the apostle is arguing with those who declared an idol to be a pure nullity, and while he accepts the truth that it is so, he yet declares that all which is offered to it is offered to a "daemon." *SEE PYTHONESS*. Indeed, it has been contended that evidence is found in the Old Test. to show that demons who had once been souls of men were the objects of immediate worship among the heathens (Deuteronomy 26:14; Psalm 106:28; Isaiah 8:19), and it is in contradistinction to these that Jehovah is so frequently called "the living God" (Deuteronomy 5:6, etc. etc.; see Farmer's *Essay on the Daemonacs*, passim). More particularly,

1. As to their *nature*, daemons are πνεύματα, or *spirits* (comp. Matthew 8:16; 10:1; 12:43-45; Mark 9:20; Luke 10:20, etc.). Hence there is ascribed to them intelligence and will (Mark 1:24; Luke 4:34; James 2:19; 3:14), as well as great power (Matthew 8:28-32; Mark 9:26; Ephesians 6:12). Whether they are to be reckoned as belonging to the class, and as fallen from the original condition of the angels, does not clearly appear from any statement of Scripture. As the messengers and agents of Satan (q.v.), they may be either the one or the other; but the probability seems to be that they belong to the same class as himself (see Doddridge, *Family Expositor*, 1:33, London, 1799; Campbell, *Prelim. Dissert*. p. 190). He is called the Prince of the Daemons; the daemons whom our Lord cast out

are collectively called Satan (Matthew 12:24-29; Luke 13:16); and the phrase "unclean spirits," which is applied to them (Matthew 10:1; Mark 3:11; 6:7, etc.), is applied also to fallen angels (Revelation 16:13; 18:2), and even in the singular to Satan himself (Mark 3:30; comp. 22). These considerations, we think, render it probable that the δαιμόνια of the N.T. belong to the number of those angels "who kept not their first estate;" and we conclude probably (though attempts have been made to deny the inference) that they must be the same as "the angels of the devil" (Matthew 25:41; Rev. 12:7, 9), "the principalities and powers" against whom we "wrestle" (Ephesians 6:12, etc.).

2. As to *character*, daemons are described as evil, unclean (πονηρά, ἀκάθαρτα) (Matthew 12:45; 10:1, etc.), as belonging to the kingdom of darkness, and used by Satan for his wicked designs (Matthew 9:34; 25:41; Ephesians 6:12).

3. As to their *abode*, they are represented as "reserved in everlasting chains under darkness unto the judgment of the great day" (Jude 1:6; comp. 2 Peter 2:4). They are said also to be in the abyss (Luke 8:31; comp. Revelation 9:1-11). *SEE ABYSS*. Such descriptions, however, can be understood as intimating nothing more than their being in a state of punishment, and under control; for the activity which is ascribed to them is incompatible with the idea of their being in a state of confinement; and, besides, such passages as Ephesians 2:2; 6:12, would lead to the conclusion that a sphere of extended physical freedom is assigned to these fallen spirits.

IV. The fathers frequently refer to daemons in their writings. By some they are represented as angels who, originally created holy, fell into rebellion and sin (Joan. Damasc. *Expos. Fidei*, 2:4), while others represent them as the fruit of the intercourse of angels with women (Justin M. *Apol.* 2:5), and others that they are the souls of the giants whom the daughters of men bore to devils (*Pseudo-Clementin*. 8:18). They also teach that they are ἀσώματα, yet not in such a sense as to be absolutely impassable, but as σκίᾷ ὄντα (Clem. Alex. p. 791; comp. Chrysosom, *Hom*. 125; Theodoret, in *Jes*. 13). They all describe them as evil, as deceiving and destroying men, as being the object of worship to the heathen, and as employed by God to punish the wicked (Origen, *Cont. Cels.v.* 234; viii, p. 399, etc.). See the passages collected in Suicer, *Thes.* s.v. δαίμων, and in Usteri, *Paulin. Lehrbegrigfe* (*Ant*. 3, p. 421 sq., 5th ed.); comp. also on the whole subject

Winzer, *De Daemonologia in N.T. libris* (Viteb. et Lips. 1812-22); Lindinger, *De Hebroeor. arte med. de Doemone* (Wittenb. 1774); Pisanski, *Beleucktung der sogenannt. biblisch. Damonologie* (Danz. 1778); Schmid, *De lapsu doemonum* (Wittenberg, 1775). *SEE DAEMONIAC*.

Daemoniac

(δαιμονιζόμενος, rendered "possessed with a devil;" also δαίμονα ἔχων), a term (in the Gr.) frequently used in the New Test., and applied to persons suffering under the possession of a daemon or evil spirit, *SEE DAEMON*, such possession generally showing itself visibly in bodily disease or mental derangement. The word δαίμονᾶν is used in a nearly equivalent sense in classical Greek (as in *AEsch. Choeph*. p. 566; *Sept. c. Theb*. p. 1001; Eurip. *Phoen*. p. 888, etc.), except that as the idea of spirits distinctly evil and rebellious, hardly existed, such possession was referred to the will of the gods or to the vague prevalence of an Ἄτη, or fury. Neither word is employed in this sense by the Sept., but in our Lord's time (as is seen, for example, constantly in Josephus) the belief in the possession of men by daemons, who were either the souls of wicked men after death or evil angels, was thoroughly established among all the Jews, with the exception of the Sadducees alone. Daemonized persons, in the N.T., are those who were spoken of as having a daemon or daemons occupying them, suspending the faculties of their minds, and governing the members of their bodies, so that what was said and done by the daemoniacs was ascribed to the indwelling daemon. Plato (*apud Clem. Alex. Strom.* 1:405, Oxon.) affirms that "daemoniacs do not use their own dialect or tongue, but that of the daemons who have entered into them." Lucian says "the patient is silent; the daemon returns the answer to the question asked." Apollonius thus addresses a youth supposed to be possessed: "I am treated contumeliously by the daemon, and not by thee" (comp. Matthew 8:28 and 31; Mark 5:2; 9:12; Luke 8:27, 32). With regard to the frequent mention of daemoniacs in Scripture, three main opinions have been started.

1. That of Strauss and the mythical school, which makes the whole account merely symbolic, without basis of fact. The possession of the devils is, according to this idea, only a lively symbol of the prevalence of evil in the world, the casting out of the devils by our Lord a corresponding symbol of his conquest over that evil power by his doctrine and his life. This notion stands or falls with the mythical theory as a whole: with regard to this special form of it, it is sufficient to remark the plain, simple, and prosaic

relation of the facts as facts, which, whatever might be conceived as possible in highly poetic and avowedly figurative passages, would make their assertion here not a symbol or a figure, but a lie. It would be as reasonable to expect a myth or symbolic fable from Tacitus or Thucydides in their accounts of contemporary history.

2. The second theory is, that our Lord and the evangelists, in referring to daemoniacal possession, spoke only in accommodation to the general belief of the Jews, without any assertion as to its truth or its falsity. It is concluded that, since the symptoms of the affliction were frequently those of bodily disease (as dumbness, Matthew 9:32; blindness, Matthew 12:22; epilepsy, Mark 9:17-27), or those seen in cases of ordinary insanity (as in Matthew 8:28; Mark 5:1-5); since, also, the phrase “to have a devil” is constantly used in connection with, and as apparently equivalent to, “to be mad” (see John 7:20; 8:48’; 10:20, and perhaps Matthew 11:18 Luke 7:33); and since, lastly, cases of daemoniacal possession are not known to occur in our own days, therefore we must suppose that our Lord spoke, and the evangelists wrote, in accordance with the belief of the time, and with a view to be clearly understood, especially by the sufferers themselves, but that the daemoniacs were merely persons suffering under unusual diseases of body and mind.

With regard to this theory also, it must be remarked that it does not accord either with the general principles or with the particular language of Scripture. Accommodation is possible when, in things indifferent, language is used which, although scientifically or etymologically inaccurate, yet conveys a true impression, or when, in things not indifferent, a declaration of truth (1 Corinthians 3:1, 2), or a moral law (Matthew 19:8), is given, true or right as far as it goes, but imperfect, because of the imperfect progress of its recipients. But certainly here the matter was not indifferent. The age was one of little faith and great superstition; its characteristic the acknowledgment of God as a distant lawgiver, not an inspirer of men’s hearts. This superstition in things of far less moment was denounced by our Lord; can it be supposed that he would sanction, and the evangelists be permitted to record for ever, an idea in itself false, which has constantly been the very stronghold of superstition? Nor was the language used such as can be paralleled with mere conventional expression. There is no harm in our “speaking of certain forms of madness as lunacy, not thereby implying that we believe the moon to have or to have had any influence upon them; . . . but if we began to describe the cure of such as the moon’s ceasing to

afflict them, or if a physician were solemnly to address the moon, bidding it abstain from injuring his patient, there would be here a passing over to quite a different region, . . . there would be that gulf between our thoughts and words in which the essence of a lie consists. Now Christ does everywhere speak such language as this" (Trench, *On Miracles*, p. 153, where the whole question is most ably treated). Nor is there, in the whole of the N.T., the least indication that any "economy" of teaching was employed on account of the "hardness" of the Jews' "hearts." Possession and its cure are recorded plainly and simply; daemoniacs are frequently distinguished from those afflicted with bodily sickness (see Mark 1:32; 16:17, 18; Luke 6:17,18); even, it would seem, from the epileptic (σεληνιαζόμενοι, Matthew 4:24); the same outward signs are sometimes referred to possession, sometimes merely to disease (comp. Matthew 4:24, with 17:15; Matthew 12:22, with Mark 7:32, etc.); the daemons are represented as speaking in their own persons with superhuman knowledge, and acknowledging our Lord to be, not, as the Jews generally called him, son of David, but Son of God (Matthew 8:29; Mark 1:24; 5:7; Luke 4:41, etc.). All these things speak of a personal power of evil, and, if in any case they refer to what we might call mere disease, they at any rate tell us of something in it more than a morbid state of bodily organs or self-caused derangement of mind. Nor does our Lord speak of daemons as personal spirits of evil to the multitude alone, but in his secret conversations with his disciples, declaring the means and conditions by which power over them could be exercised (Matthew 17:21). Twice also he distinctly connects daemoniacal possession with the power of the evil one; once in Luke 10:18, to the seventy disciples, where he speaks of his power and theirs over daemoniacs as a "fall of Satan," and again in Matthew 12:25-30, when he was accused of casting out daemons through Beelzebub, and, instead of giving any hint that the possessed were not really under any direct and personal power of evil, he uses an argument, as to the division of Satan against himself, which, if possession be unreal, becomes inconclusive and almost insincere. Lastly, the single fact recorded of the entrance of the daemons at Gadara (Mark 5:10-14) into the herd of swine, and the effect which that entrance caused, is sufficient to overthrow the notion that our Lord and the evangelists do not assert or imply any objective reality of possession. In the face of this mass of evidence, it seems difficult to conceive how the theory can be reconciled with anything like truth of Scripture.

But, besides this, it must be added that, to say of a case that it is one of disease or insanity, gives no real explanation of it at all; it merely refers it to a class of cases which we know to exist, but gives no answer to the further question, how did the disease or insanity arise? Even in disease, whenever the mind acts upon the body (as e.g. in nervous disorders, epilepsy, etc.), the mere derangement of the physical organs is not the whole cause of the evil; there is a deeper one lying in the mind. Insanity may indeed arise, in some cases, from the physical injury or derangement of those bodily organs through which the mind exercises its powers, but far oftener it appears to be due to metaphysical causes, acting upon and disordering the mind itself. In all cases where the evil lies not in the body, but in the mind, to call it "only disease or insanity" is merely to state the fact of the disorder, and give up all explanation of its cause. It is an assumption, therefore, which requires proof, that, amid the many inexplicable phenomena of mental and physical disease in our own days, there are none in which one gifted with "discernment of spirits" might see signs of what the Scripture calls "possession."

The truth is, that here, as in many other instances, the Bible, without contradicting ordinary experience, yet advances to a region where human science cannot follow. As generally it connects the existence of mental and bodily suffering in the world with the introduction of moral corruption by the Fall, and refers the power of moral evil to a spiritual and personal source, so also it asserts the existence of inferior spirits of evil, and it refers certain cases of bodily and mental disease to the influence which they are permitted to exercise directly over the soul and indirectly over the body. Inexplicable to us this influence certainly is, as all action of spirit on spirit is found to be; but no one can pronounce *a priori* whether it be impossible or improbable, and no one has a right to eviscerate the strong expressions of Scripture in order to reduce its declarations to a level with our own ignorance. *SEE CONDESCENSION*.

3. We are led, therefore, to the ordinary and literal: interpretation of these passages, that there are evil spirits, *SEE DAEMON*, subjects of the Evil One, who, in the days of the Lord himself and his apostles especially, were permitted by God to exercise a direct influence over the souls and bodies of certain men. This influence is clearly distinguished from the ordinary power of corruption and temptation wielded by Satan through the permission of God. Its relation to it, indeed, appears to be exactly that of a miracle to God's ordinary Providence, or of special prophetic inspiration to

the ordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit. Both (that is) are actuated by the same general principles, and tend to the same general object; but the former is a special and direct manifestation of that which is worked out in the latter by a long course of indirect action. The distinguishing feature of possession is the complete or incomplete loss of the sufferer's reason or power of will; his actions, his words, and almost his thoughts are mastered by the evil spirit (Mark 1:24; 5:7; Acts 19:15), till his personality seems to be destroyed, or, if not destroyed, so overborne as to produce the consciousness of a twofold will within him, like that sometimes felt in a dream. In the ordinary temptations and assaults of Satan, the will itself yields consciously, and by yielding gradually assumes, without losing its apparent freedom of action, the characteristics of the Satanic nature. It is solicited, urged, and persuaded against the strivings of grace, but not overborne.

Such possession, however, is only the special and, as it were, miraculous form of the "law of sin in the members," the power of Satan over the heart itself, recognized by Paul as an indwelling and struggling power (Romans 7:21-24). Nor can it be doubted that it was rendered possible in the first instance by the consent of the sufferer to temptation and to sin. That it would be most probable in those who yielded to *sensual* temptations may easily be conjectured from general observation of the tyranny of a habit of sensual indulgence. The cases of the habitually lustful, the opium-eater, and the drunkard (especially when struggling in the last extremity of *delirium tremens*) bear, as has often been noticed, many marks very similar to those of the scriptural possession. There is in them physical disease, but there is often something more. It is also to be noticed that the state of possession, although so awful in its wretched sense of daemoniacal tyranny, yet, from the very fact of that consciousness, might be less hopeless and more capable of instant cure than the deliberate hardness of willful sin. The spirit might still retain marks of its original purity, although through the flesh and the demoniac power acting by the flesh it was enslaved. Here, also, the observation of the suddenness and completeness of conversion seen in cases of sensualism, compared with the greater difficulty in cases of more refined and spiritual sin, tends to confirm the record of Scripture.

It was but natural that the power of evil should show itself, in more open and direct hostility than ever, in the age of our Lord and his apostles, when its time was short. It was natural also that it should take the special form of possession in an age of such unprecedented and brutal sensuality as that

which preceded his coming, and continued till the leaven of Christianity was felt. Nor was it less natural that it should have died away gradually before the great direct, and still greater indirect influence of Christ's kingdom. Accordingly we find early fathers (as Just. Mart. *Dial. c. Tryph.* p. 311 B.; Tertullian, *Apol.* 23, 37, 43) alluding to its existence as a common thing, mentioning the attempts of Jewish exorcism in the name of Jehovah as occasionally successful (see Matthew 12:27; Acts 19:13), but especially dwelling on the power of Christian exorcism to cast it out from the country as a test of the truth of the Gospel, and as one well-known benefit which it already conferred on the empire. By degrees the mention is less and less frequent, till the very idea is lost or perverted. *SEE EXORCIST*.

Such is a brief sketch of the scriptural notices of possession. That round the Jewish notion of it there grew up, in that noted age of superstition, many foolish and evil practices, and much superstition as to fumigations, etc. (comp. Tob. 8:1-3; Joseph. *Ant.* 8:2, 5), of the "vagabond exorcists" (see Acts 19:13), is obvious and would be inevitable. It is clear that Scripture, does not in the least sanction or even condescend to notice such things; but it is certain that in the Old Testament (see Leviticus 19:31; 1 Samuel 28:7, etc.; 2 Kings 21:6; 23:24, etc.), as well as in the New, it recognizes possession as a real and direct power of evil spirits upon the heart. *SEE POSSESSED* (*with a devil*).

Dagan

SEE CORN; *SEE AGRICULTURE*.

Dagger

(b r ,j , *che'reb*, usually "sword"), any sharp instrument, especially a military weapon (Judges 3:16, 21, 22). *SEE SWORD*.

Daggett Herman,

a Congregational minister, was born at Walpole, Mass., Sept. 11, 1766, and graduated at Brown University, 1788. He entered the ministry Oct. 1789, and after preaching a year in Southhold, L. I., was ordained pastor in Southampton, April 12.1792. In 1796 he removed to West Hampton. In 1801 he was ordained pastor over the churches of Fire Place and Middle Island, which he resigned in 1807. In 1818 he became principal of the For.

Miss. School at Cornwall. This position he resigned in 1824, and died May 19,1832. — Sprague, *Annals*, 2:291.

Daggett Naphtali, D.D.,

a Congregational minister, was born at Attleborough, Mass., Sept. 8, 1727; graduated at Yale 1748, and was ordained pastor in Smithtown, L. I., 1751. He was elected Prof. of Divinity in Yale College, 1756, and remained there until his death, Nov. 25, 1780. He occupied the presidential chair of the college *pro tempore* from 1766 until 1777. When the British landed at West Haven, 1779, his patriotic ardor led him to take up arms, and he was very rudely treated by the enemy. His death was hastened by his sufferings. He published a few sermons. —Sprague, *Annals*, 1:479.

Dagobert

SEE DAIMBERT.

Da'gon

Picture for Da'gon 1

(Heb. *Dagon'*, ˆ/gD;Sept. and Josephus, Δαγών), the national god of the Philistines. Some have derived the name from ˆgD; *grain* (Sanchoniathon, *Fragm. ed. Orelli*, p. 26, 32; Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1:381; Beyer, *ad* Seld. p. 285); but the derivation from gD; a *fish*, with the diminutive (i.e. endearing) termination on (Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 320), is not only more in accordance with the principles of Hebrew derivation (Ewald, *Heb. Gram.* § 312, 341), but is most decisively established by the terms employed in 1 Samuel 5:4. It is there said that Dagon fell to the earth before the ark, that his head and the palms of his hands were broken off, and that "*only Dagon was left of him*." If Dagon is derived from gD; *fish*, and if the idol, as there is every reason to believe, had the body of a fish with the head and hands of a man, it is easy to understand why a *part* of the statue is there called *Dagon* in contradistinction to the head and hands, but not otherwise. That such was the figure of the idol is asserted by Kimchi, and is admitted by most modern scholars. It is also supported by the analogies of other fish deities among the Syro-Arabians (see Herod. 2:72; AElian, *Anim.* 10:46; 12:2; Xenoph. *Anab.* 1:4, 9; Strabo, 17:812; Diod. Sic. 2:4; Cicero, *Nat. Deor.* 3, 15; comp. Miunter, *Rel. d. Karth.* p. 102; Movers, *Phoniz.* p. 491 sq.; Creuzer, *Symbol.* 2:78 sq.). Besides the ATERGATIS (q.v.) of the Syrians

(which was the female counterpart of Dagon), the Babylonians had a tradition, according to Berosus (*Berosi Quae supersunt*, ed. Richter, p. 48, 54), that at the very beginning of their history an extraordinary being, called Oannes, having the entire body of a fish, but the head, hands, feet, and voice of a man, emerged from the Erythraean Sea, appeared in Babylonia, and taught the rude inhabitants the use of letters, arts, religion, law, and agriculture; that, after long intervals between, other similar beings appeared and communicated the same precious lore in detail, and that the last of these was called Odakon (Ὠδάκων). Selden is persuaded that this Odakon is the Philistine god Dagon (*De Diis Syris*, p. 265), a conclusion in which Niebuhr coincides (*Gesch. Assurs*, p. 477), but from which Rawlinson dissents (Herod. 1:482). The resemblance between Dagon and Atergatis (q. d. ryDia and gD; great fish) or Derketo (which is but an abbreviation of the last name) is so great in other respects that Selden accounts for the only important difference between them — that of sex — by referring to the androgynous nature of many heathen gods. It is certain, however, that the Hebrew text, the Sept., and Philo Byblius (in Euseb. *Praep. Ev.* 1:10) make Dagon masculine (ὁ Δαγών). The fish-like form was a natural emblem of fruitfulness, and as such was likely to be adopted by seafaring tribes in the representation of their gods. (See Gotze, *Dissert. de* ἰχθυολατρείᾳ, Lips. 1723.)

Picture for Da’gon 2

The most famous temples of Dagon were at Gaza (Judges 16:21-30) and Ashdod (1 Samuel 5:5, 6; 1 Chronicles 10:10). The former was employed as a theater (see Faber, Archdol. 1:444, 436), and was once overthrown by Samson (comp. Judges 16). The latter temple was destroyed by Jonathan in the Maccabaean wars (1 Maccabees 10:84; 11:4; Josephus, *Ant.* 13:4, 5). There would also seem to have been a third in the vicinity of Jericho, which was demolished by Ptolemy (Joseph. *War*, 1:2, 3); and the site of which Schwarz claims (*Palest.* p. 163) to have discovered in a stream still bearing the name of *Duga*, or fish-river: it is but a relic of the ancient *Doch*, or DOCUS *SEE DOCUS* (q.v.). Traces of the worship of Dagon likewise appear in the names Caphar-Dagon (near Jamnia), and Beth-Dagon in Judah (Joshua 15:41), and Asher (Joshua 19:27). *SEE BETH-DAGON*.

Picture for Da’gon 3

Besides the female figure of Atergates, there have lately been discovered among the Assyrian ruins (Botta, pl. 32-35) figures of a male fish-god, not only of the forms given above (Layard, *Nineveh.* 2:353), but occasionally with a human form and feet, the fish only covering the back like a cloak (Layard, *Babylon*, p. 301). Colonel Rawlinson has also deciphered the name dagon on the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.). See Roser, *De Dagone*, in Ugolini, *Thesaur.* 23, Sharpe in Bonomi’s *Nineveh.* 3d ed. p.169.

Dagon’s House

(1 Samuel 5:5), or *the* HOUSE (1 Samuel 5:2) or TEMPLE OF DAGON (1 Chronicles 10:10), ˆ/gDÁ tyBe i.e. Beth-Dagon, as it is elsewhere rendered (Joshua 15:41; 19:27; so Βηθδαγών, Maccabees 10:83), or the sanctuary of Dagon, the god of the Philistines, mentioned in Judges 16:23, and other places. See this etymology defended against the older one (which Furst retains, *Heb. Lex*. p. 286) in Gesenius, *Monument. Phan*. p. 387, and *Thesaur.* p. 204. In the first two (and possibly also the third) of the above passages, the temple of Dagon, situated in or near Ashdod (as stated under the foregoing article DAGON), is evidently intended; the other collocations of these words, *SEE BETH-* require a fuller elucidation than could well be given in the article *BETH-DAGON* (q.v.).

1. BETH-DAGON, in Joshua 15:41, was one of the second group of “sixteen cities with their villages,” which the sacred writer places in *the lowlands* (hlpv) of the tribe of Judah, apparently on the actual plain which stretches westward towards the Philistine coast from “the hill country” so often mentioned. This does not (as in Reland, *Paloestina*, p. 636) designate a *Gederoth-bethdagon*, as the name Gederoth occurs *alone* in 2 Chronicles 28:18, with the same description as it has in this place, as one of the cities of the lowlands of Judah. Gesenius and Fürst identify this Bethdagon with the Caphar-dagon, which in the time of Eusebius was a very large village (κώμη μεγίστη, inter Jamniam et Diospolin) in the neighborhood of Joppa; but modern research has shown that this latter place, of which still remain some traces in *Beit-Dejan*, a village between Yafa and Ludd, is considerably above the northern boundary of Judah, Our Bethdagon, indeed, no longer exists by the same name (Van de Velde’s *Map of Palestine and Memoir*; p. 294). The same must be said of

2. BETH-DAGON, mentioned in Joshua 19:27, as one of the *border* cities of the tribe of Asher. Though, however, no modern landmark points out the site of this north Beth-dagon, it is not difficult to discover, from the precise topographical statement of the sacred writer, that this city was situated at the point where the boundary-line of the tribe, after crossing the ridge south of the promontory of Carmel towards the east, intersects the stream of the Kishon, on the confines of Zebulon. It is remarkable that, as there is a modern *Beit-Dejan* in the south which yet cannot be identified with, but is far to the north-west of, the southern Beth-dagon, so there is still, in the central district of the Holy Land, a second *Beit-Dejan*, which is equally far distant from our northern Beth-dagon, only in the opposite direction of southeast. In the fertile and beautiful plain of Salim, a little to the east of Nabulus (Shechem), Dr. Robinson descried at the east end of it, on some low hills, a village-called *Beit-Deja* (*Bibl. Researches*, 3, 102; *Later Researches*, p. 298). This *Beit-Dejan*, Robinson thinks, has no counterpart in the Beth-dagons of the Bible. The French traveler, De Saulcy, is not of this opinion, but identifies the village near Nabulus with the Beth-dagon of Chronicles 10:10; because "this village is only one day's march from Jilboun, the locality in the mountain to the north-east of Jenin, which was unquestionably the scene of Saul's disaster" (*Dead Sea*, 1:101). If his conjecture be right, we must indicate this as the

3. BETH-DAGON of 1 Chronicles 10:10 (Sept. οἶκος Δαγών), in the western half-tribe of Manasseh (some distance from Mount Gilboa), where the Philistines after their victory, placed Saul's head in the temple of their god-his body and those of his sons having been carried (the same distance north-east) to Bethshan, whence the Jabesh-Gileadites afterwards rescued them. It no doubt aids this view that we are not otherwise informed where the temple was in which they deposited their ghastly trophy; moreover, the phrase (in ver. 9) bybis;8pA/r aB; denoting *a circuit of the adjacent country*, which had been evacuated by Israel, and was then occupied by the enemy (ver. 7), very well suits the relative positions of this *Beit-Dejan* and Bethshan, equally distant from the fatal field, and in different directions.

4. With regard to the Beth-dagon of 1 Maccabees 10:83, Gesenius (*Thes.* p. 194) expresses a doubt whether this passage means only Dagon's temple at Azotus, or a Beth-dagon, a town so called in the neighborhood. In that case we might regard this as a city in the vicinity of Azotus (or Ashdod), answering probably to Dr. Robinson's western *Beit-Dejan*, and Eusebius's Caphardagon, already mentioned. It will be observed that in the 84th verse

Beth-dagon occurs as a proper name, as it also does in the original, Βηθδαγών, whereas, in the next verse, the temple of the Philistine god is described by the appellative τὸ ἱερὸν Δαγών. On the whole, however, there does not appear to be sufficient reason for the distinction.

Dailey David,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Gloucester County, N. J., March 1, 1792, was converted in 1805, entered the itinerancy in 1812, became superannuated in 1855, and died May 4, 1856. For more than, forty years he was a useful minister and presiding elder, and was especially" proficient in the theology of the plan of salvation." He filled many important stations with uniform and excellent success. He was one of the editors of the revised hymn-book of the Methodist Episcopal Church now in use. — *Minutes of Conferences*, 6:219.

Daillé Jean,

minister of the French Reformed Church, and one of the most learned theologians of his age. He was born at Chatellerault Jan. 6, 1594; became tutor in the family of Duplessis-Mornay (q.v.) in 1612, and was ordained in 1623. Most of the remainder of his life was spent as minister of Charenton. He died April 15, 1670. In theology Daille belonged to the moderate school of Saumur (q.v.). "His discourses are characterized by a heart-stirring eloquence, and it has been remarked of him that he had all the eloquence of Saurin without any approach to his turgid and bombastic style. The work by which Daille is best known is his treatise De usu Patrum, a work designed to check or moderate the excessive reverence which is felt in many quarters for the writers of ecclesiastical antiquity. It rendered an important service to the Protestant cause in his own country and times, and may still be consulted with great advantage." It was published in 1632; in Latin in 1636 (Genev. 4to); and a translation into English in 1651, under the title of *A Treatise concerning the right Use of the Fathers in the Decision of Controversies that are at this Day in Religion* (new ed. by Jekyll, Lond. 1841, 12mo; Amer. ed. Phila. 1842, 12mo). We have translations also —of his *Exposition of the Philippians*, by Sherman (Lond. 1841, imp. 8vo); *Exposition of Colossians*, by Sherman (Lond. 1841, imp. 8vo). Among his other writings *are De Cultibus Latinorum* (Genev. 1671, 4to); *De Ponis et Satisfactionibus humanis* (Amst. 4to); *De la Creance des Peres sur le fait des Images* (8vo); *De*

Corfirmatione et ext. unctione (Genev. 1659, 4to); *De Auriculari Confessione* (Genev. 1661, 4to); *De Pseudepigraphis Apostolicis* (1658, 8vo); and 20 volumes of sermons. — See Haag, *La France Protestante*, 4:181; Rich, *Biog. Dictionary*, s.v.; *Life of Daille*, prefixed to his *Right Use of the Fathers*; Chase, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 4:5 sq.; Bayle, *Dictionary*, s.v.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Generale*, 12:790.

D'Ailly

SEE AILLY.

Daily

occurs in the *Engl*. version of our Lord's Prayer as the rendering of ἐπιούσιος (Matthew 6:11; Luke 11:3), which literally means *for subsistence*, i.e. *needful*, as it probably should have been translated. The same Greek word occurs nowhere else, although several Hebrew and Greek words are thus translated in other passages. Conant, however (*Revised Version of Matthew*, N. Y. 1860, p. 30), maintains the correctness of the Auth. Vers., as does also Schaff (in Lange's *Matthew*, p. 121). But this involves a palpable tautology. *SEE DAY*. Treatises on the phrase "daily bread" have been written in Latin by Kirchmaier (*Viteb*. 1711), Kortholt (*Kil*. 1677), Stolberg (*Viteb*. 1688), Pfeiffer (*Regiom*. 1689), Zorn (*Opusc*. 1:465-503). *SEE LORDS PRAYER*.

Daily Offering

or SACRIFICE (Atlï/[dymiT;hi, *the continual offering*; Josephus ὁλοκαύτωμα ἐνδελ χισμοῦ, ἐνδελεχισμός, *War*, 7:2, 1), (in Daniel 8:12 sq.; 11:31; 12:11) and the Talmud (simply dymiT;hi, "the continual," *sacrificium juge*), was a burnt-offering of two year-old lambs, which were daily immolated in the name of the whole Israelitish people (ἐκ τοῦ δημοσίου ἀναλώματος, Joseph. *Ant. 3*, 10, 1) upon the great altar; the first lamb early (as soon as it became light, Mishna, *Tamid*, 3, 2; no reliance is to be placed upon Zorn's treatise *De certis tempp. in jugi sacrifcio ap. Ebr. offerendo*, in the *Miscell*. Lips. Nov. 2:1 sq.), the other (br,[, tjnImi, "the evening oblation," Daniel 9:21) at evening (more definitely "^yBeµyiBr][;h; between the two evenings, *SEE PASSOVER*; according to *Pesach*, v. 1, the eve-offering was sacrificed as a rule between the eighth-and-a-half and the ninth-and-a-half hour [2.5 to 3.5 o'clock

P.M.], but on Sabbath-eve and Passover-eve [14th Nisan] one hour earlier; Josephus, *Ant.* 14:4, 3, designates "about the ninth hour" as the time; comp., however, Jonathan's *Targum*, Genesis 49:27. This was the usual termination of a fast [q.v.], Daniel 9:21; Acts 3:1; 10:3, 30), each with one tenth of an ephah of fine wheaten flour as a meat offering, and a quarter of a hin of wine as a drink offering (Exodus 29:38-42; Numbers 28:3-8; Ezra 3:5). It was not superseded by the Sabbath or festival offerings (Numbers 28:9 sq., 15 sq.; not even by those of the Passover, *Pesach*, v. 1). The regulations concerning the preparation of the priests for this annual religious service, the allotment of the several operations, and the ritual of the sacrifice itself, were eventually prescribed in the tract *Tamid* (Mishna, v. 10), which Iken has illustrated with erudite explanation (Brem. 1736; and in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 19); comp. also Loscan, *De Sacrificio Quotid.* (Lips. 1718). In the (last) Temple there was a lamb-apartment in the north-west corner for the special purpose of this offering (*Tamid*, 3, 3). *SEE SACRIFICE*.

Daily Service

or PRAYERS. In the ancient Church, wherever it was practicable, daily service was established, at which every clergyman was compelled to attend, under pain of suspension or deprivation, whether it was his duty to officiate or not. This subject is determined by several councils, by the first council of Toledo, and by that of Agde: the law of Justinian punishes the neglect of this duty with degradation, because of the scandal it gives to the laity. In some churches a daily celebration of the Lord's Supper seems to have been recommended, and to some extent practiced. There are found testimonies on this subject in Tertullian, Cyprian, and Irenaeus; the last of whom says; "It is the will of our Lord that we should make our offering at his altar frequently, and without intermission." But there was no fixed and express rule as to the time of celebration. The rubric of the Church of England declares that all "priests and deacons are to say daily the morning and evening prayer, either privately or openly, not being let by sickness or some other urgent cause. And the curate that ministereth in every parish church or chapel, being at home, and not being otherwise reasonably hindered, shall say the same in the parish church or chapel where he ministereth, and shall cause a bell to be tolled thereunto a convenient time before he begin, that the people may come to hear God's word and to pray with him." But this rule is now a dead letter. — *Prayer-book*, Preface;

Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. vi, chap. 3, § 5, 6; Procter, *On Common Prayer*, p. 195-197.

Daimbert Or Dagobert

the first Latin patriarch of Jerusalem. While he was bishop of Pisa, pope Urban II conferred upon him the sovereignty of Corsica for an annual tribute of fifty lives, and appointed him papal legate in the East. In Nov. 1095, Daimbert was present at the Council of Clermont when Urban II preached the first crusade, and he joined the crusade at the head of troops from Pisa and Genoa. When Daimbert arrived in Palestine, Godfrey of Bouillon was already master of Jerusalem. At a general meeting of the Christian chiefs, held on Christmas. 1099, Daimbert was elected patriarch of Jerusalem, in the place of one Arnulphus who was deposed. Godfrey had to leave to Daimbert the sovereignty of Jaffa, and of that quarter of Jerusalem in which the Church of the Resurrection was situated. On the death of Godfrey, Daimbert aspired to the throne of Jerusalem, but finally had to yield to Baldwin, and to crown the new king. Falling out with Baldwin, he was expelled by the latter, and Arnulphus returned to the patriarchate. Daimbert went to Italy, and prevailed upon pope Pascal II to decide in his favor. He intended to return to Jerusalem and to enforce the papal decision, but died on his way at Palermo, in 1107. —Hoefer, *Biographie Generale*, 12:792.

Dai’san

(Δαισάν v. r. Δεσάν, Vulg. *Desanon*), the head of one of the families of temple-servants that returned from Babylon (1 Esdras v: 31); evidently a corruption (r being mistaken for d) for the REZIN *SEE REZIN* (q.v.) of the Hebrew texts (Ezra 2:48; Nehemiah 7:50).

Daiyah

SEE VULTURE.

Dalai’ah

(1 Chronicles 3:24), the same name elsewhere more correctly Anglicized DELAIAH *SEE DELAIAH* (q.v.).

Dalberg Karl Theodor,

baron of Dalberg, was born Feb. 8, 1744, at Hernsheim, near Worms; he studied at Gottingen and Heidelberg; became, while yet very young, prebendary of Mayence, and canon of Worms and Wurzburg. In 1772, as governor of Erfurt, he gave a great impulse to agriculture, commerce, and industry. In 1787 he became coadjutor of the elector of Mayence and the bishop of Worms; was made bishop of Constance in 1788, and soon after archbishop of Tarsus. The last elector of Mayence died in 1802, and as, by the treaty of Luneville, the electorate of Mayence on the one side of the Rhine had been abolished and on the other secularized, Dalberg became arch-chancellor, which position he held with great credit; but by suppressing the convents he incurred the hatred of the clergy, and by sympathy for France that of Germany. In 1804 he was present at the coronation of the emperor at Paris. When the confederacy of the Rhine was formed he had to resign his office, but, in exchange, was made prince-primate of the confederacy, and was Napoleon's adviser in spiritual and ecclesiastical matters. He afterwards became grandduke of Frankfort, and appointed Eugene Beauharnais as his successor. In 1813 he renounced his title, went first to Constance, where he protected the vicar general Wessenberg from the enmity of the pope, and afterwards returned to Regensburg, where he lived in retirement on a pension of 100,000 florins, and died Feb. 10, 1817. His principal works are, *Betrachtungen i. d. Universum* (Frankf. 1777; 6th ed. 1819); *Verhaltniss zwischen Moral end Staftskunst* (Frankf. 1786); *Grundsaitze d. Esthetik* (Erf. 791*); Von d. Bewusstsein als allgem. Grunde d. Weltweisheit* (Erf. 1793); *Betrachtungen ueber d. Charakter Karls d. Gr*. (Erfurt, 1806); *Perikles* (Rome, 1811). See Kramer, *Geddichtniss-schrift auf K. von Dalberg* (Gotha, 1817). —Hoefer, *Nouv. Biographie Generale*, 12:802.

Dale, The King's

(Ë l Ḳhiqm,[evalley of the king), the name of a valley apparently near the Dead Sea, where Melchizedek met Abraham (Genesis 14:17); otherwise called the *Valley of Shaveh* (q.v.), but identified by some with another of the same name (the modern Valley of Jehoshaphat, or, rather, its southern part, opening into the plot used for the king's garden, about the well of Job and the pool of Siloam), in which Absalom reared his family monument (2 Samuel 18:18). *SEE ABSALOMS TOMB*.

Dale Or Dalen, Antonius Van,

was born Nov. 8,1638, in Haarlem. He was brought up to business against his will. At the age of thirty he applied himself to the .study of the ancient languages, and at the same time to that of medicine. He became a practising physician, and attained distinction in his profession. His faithful and disinterested attention to his poor patients secured him high praise. He also exercised for a time his preaching gift among the Mennonites; but his sermons were overloaded with learned citations, and hence were hardly acceptable to the people. His European reputation rests, however, on the learned works which he wrote against what he regarded as superstition. In 1683 he published *De oraculis Efhnicorum dissertationes duce, quorum prioar de ipsorum duratione ac defectu, posterior de eorundf in auctoribus* (Amst. 8vo). In this work he combated the opinion that demoniac influence was exerted in connection with the oracles of the ancients, and that sorcery is to be ascribed to Satan. The work. produced a great sensation. Fontenelle made free use of it in the composition of his *Histoire des Oracles* (Paris, 1707, 12mo). He wrote several other works in Latin, and one in his native tongue, on the same subject, discrediting belief in Satanic agency, especially when applied to the interpretation of Scripture. He also published a *Dissert. super Aristea de LXX interpretibus*, with a history of ceremonies of baptism among the Jews, and among the various Christian communions (Amst. 1704, 4to). He died Nov. 28,1708, deeply lamented. I. Clericus, T. Janssonius, and Prof. Morus were among his friends.

Daleites

followers of David Dale, pastor of an Independent congregation at Glasgow. Since the death of Mr. Dale they have formed a connection with the Inghamites (q.v.).

Dalmanu’tha

(Δαλμανουθά, deriv. unknown, unless [as suggested by Lightfoot,’ *Hor. Hebr.* p. 555; comp. Simonis *Onom.* p. 51] for the *Zalmon*, ˆwmlx, a town mentioned in the Talmud as lying near Tiberias), a place mentioned only in Mark 8:10, where we read that Jesus, after feeding the multitude in the Decapolis, east of the Sea of Galilee, took a boat and “came into the regions (εἰς τὰ μέρη) of Dalmanutha;” while the parallel passage

(Matthew 15:39) states that he “came into the borders of Magdala.” From this we may conclude that Dalmanutha was a town on the west side of the lake near Magdala. The latter stood close upon the shore, at the southern end of the little plain of Gennesaret, at the present Mejdel. *SEE MAGDALA*. Immediately south of it a precipitous hill juts out into the sea. Beyond this, about a mile from Magdala, a narrow glen breaks down from the west. At its mouth are some cultivated fields and gardens, amid which, just by the beach, are several copious fountains, surrounded by heavy ancient walls and the ruins of a village. The place is called *‘Ain el-Barideh*, “the cold fountain” (Robinson, *Res*. 3, 27), and has, with great probability, been thought to be the site of Dalmanutha (Porter, in Smith and Kitto, s.v.; Tristram, *Land of Israel*, p. 429). *SEE CAPERNAUM*. Thomson thinks it may be the present ruined site called Dalhamia, on the river south of the lake, although he admits this seems too far from Magdala (*Land and Book*, 2:60). Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 189) finds it in the “cave of Telimnan” (ˆamylt), mentioned in the Talmud, situated probably in the cliffs above Mejdel (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 334), which, he learns, was also called *Talmanuta*.

Dalma’tia

(Δαλματία, deriv. unknown), a mountainous country on the eastern shore of the Adriatic Sea (Pliny, 3, 28; Strabo, 7:315), between the rivers Titius and Drinus, and the Bebian and Scordian hills, south of Laburnia (Pliny, 3, 26), which, together with it, formed, after the expedition of Tiberius, A.D. 9, the Roman province of Illyricum, for which, indeed, it was often spoken of synonymously (Conybeare and Howson’s *St. Paul*, 2:126). Its principal towns were Salona, Epidaurus, Lissus, etc. (Ptolemy, 2:17, 4). It derived its name from the Dalmatae, a barbarous but valiant race, supposed to be of Thracian origin, and who were very skillful in navigating the sea along their coasts, and extremely bold in their piracies. The capital, Dalminium, was taken and destroyed by the Romans, B.C. 157; the country, however, was not completely subdued till the time of Augustus. The modern name of the country is the same as the ancient. Education and morality are here at a lower ebb than in any other part of the Austrian empire (see the *Penny Cyclopoedia*, s.v.; Smith’s *Dict. of Class. Geog.* s.v., and the travelers there referred to). *SEE ILLYRICUM*.

During Paul’s second imprisonment at Rome, Titus left him to visit Dalmatia (2 Timothy 4:10), but for what purpose is not stated, unless we

may conjecture that it was to regulate the affairs of the Church in that region (Cellarii *Notit.* 1:614 sq.), in the vicinity of which Paul had formerly preached (Romans 15:19). *SEE TITUS*.

At present Dalmatia is a crown-land of the Austrian emperor, the emperor bearing among his other titles that of king of Dalmatia. According to the last census of 1887, the population amounted to 476,101, mostly Slavi. Of these, 396,836 were Roman Catholics, under the archbishop of Zara and five bishops (Sebenico, Spalato, Lesina, Ragusa, and Cattaro); 138 United. Greeks (in three congregations, belonging to the diocese of Kreuz, in Croatia; 78,744 members of the orthodox (non-United) Greek Church, under one bishop, who formerly resided at Sebenico, and since 1842 at Zara; 43 Lutherans; 34 Reformed; and 283 Israelites. The Roman Catholics have 297 parishes, 122 chaplaincies, and 69 monasteries; the orthodox Greeks, 92 parishes, 9 chaplaincies, and 11 monasteries. — *Allgemeine Real-Encyklop. 3*, 73.

Dalmatic

the characteristic dress of the deacon in the administration of the Eucharist, so called from being first woven in Dalmatia, or first used by the Dalmatian clergy (Durandus, *Rat*. 3, 1). It is a robe reaching down to the knees, and open at each side for a distance varying at different periods. It is not marked at the back with a cross like the chasuble, but in the Latin Church with two narrow stripes, the remains of the *angusti clavi* worn on the old Roman dress. In the Greek Church it is called colobium, and is covered with a multitude of small crosses. The dalmatic is seen, in some old brasses, worn over the alb and the stole, the fringed extremities of Which reach just below it. It was adopted at a later period by the higher clergy. The chasuble (q.v.) was sometimes worn over the dalmatic. Its symbolical meaning is thus explained by the ritualists: “The deacon’s robe of white with purple stripes, with the right sleeve plain and very full, but the left fringed or tasselled, is the image of bountifulness towards the poor. It is the robe given to deacons and sub-deacons, because they were chosen by the apostles to serve the tables; and a deacon should have a dalmatic with broader sleeves than a sub-deacon, because he should have a larger generosity, while a bishop should have one with sleeves much broader and wider than the deacon’s, because of the same reason in an ascending ratio. A dalmatic signifies an immaculate life as well as hospitality, and it has two stripes before and behind to show that a bishop should exercise his charity

to all, both in prosperity and adversity. The transverse line, which forms a cross behind, is, of course, in allusion to the cross which the great Bishop of our souls bore when on his way to Calvary." — Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 6, ch. 4, § 20; Rock, *Hierurgia*, 2:647; Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s.v.; Palmer, *Orig. Liturgicae*, 2:314.

Dal'phon

(Heb. *Dalphon'*, ˆ/p l Þj prob. Persian; Sept. Δελφών v. r. καὶ ἀδελφῶν; Vulg. *Delphon*), the second of the ten sons of Haman; killed by the Jews on the 13th of Adar (Esther 9:7), B.C. 473.

Dam

(µae *mother*), the female parent of young birds (Deuteronomy 22:6, 7), or lambs (Exodus 22:30; Leviticus 22:27). With the Mosaic regulations of merciful treatment toward these creatures spoken of in these passages, compare the similar ordinance respecting boiling a kid in its own mother's milk (Exodus 23:19), and the treatise of Heumann, *De legis paradoxe* (Gott. 1748, and in his Syllog. *Diss.* 2; 282 sq.). *SEE BEAST*.

Damages

whether to person or property, according to the Mosaic statutes. *SEE FINE*.

1. Injury to limb, in the case of a free Israelite, entailed an equal infliction (*jus talionis*) upon the same part of the body of the aggressor (Exodus 21:23-25; Leviticus 24:19 sq.; Deuteronomy 19:21; comp. Matthew 5:38); in the case of a slave it effected his freedom (Exodus, 21:26 sq.; — comp. Philo, *Opp.* 2:332). Pecuniary satisfaction, however, in the former case, was a well-established custom (Josephus, *Ant.* 4:8, 35), so that retaliation was probably resorted to only in cases of intentional or malicious injury (comp. Exodus 22:22 sq.; see Michaelis, *Mos. Recht*, v. 55 sq.). Greek legislation also (Diod. Sic. 12:17; Diog. Laert. 1:57), as well as the law of the Roman Twelve Tables (see Gell. 20:1; comp. Heinecc. *Antiq. Jur. Rom.* 4:18, 8, and Opusc. min. p. 213 sq.; on the Germanic usages, see Strodtmann, *Deutche Alterth Umer*, p. 45), sanctioned this natural and simple judicial observance of "like for like" (comp. Dougtaei *Analect.* 1:92, 11; Danz, in Menschen's *N. Test. Talm.* p. 488 sq.). Among the Israelites, however, it does not seem to have often been enforced (comp. Lightfoot,

Hor. Hebr. p. 282), and corporal injuries, at least under the monarchy, were almost always compromised by a sum of money (so generally among the Turks; see Hammer, *Osman. Reich*, 1:146 sq.). The Talmudical interpretation growing out of this enactment may be seen in *Baba Kamma*, 8:1. *SEE RETALIATION*.

2. Wounding a free person in an affray (where both parties might be presumed to be pretty nearly equally to blame, the injury, however, must have been inflicted with a stone or the fist, t/rgb; comp. Philo, 2:317, τῇ χειρί; not with a proper weapon, Josephus, *Ant.* 4:8, 33; also in a suddenly outbreaking quarrel between them that gave no evidence of long-meditated harm), which rendered the individual unfit for work, required compensation for the loss through sickness and the expense of cure (Exodus 21:18 sq.; ver. 19 prescribes that this mulct should cease when the wounded person became able to go about again); should he die afterwards no further penalty was to be exacted (Philo, *Opp.* 2:317; comp. *Baba Kamma*, 8:1). More severe exaction followed when in a fray a pregnant woman was so injured as to suffer abortion, for then the law of life for life prevailed in full (Exodus 21:22; according to Josephus, however, *Ant.* 4:8, 33, and Philo, *Opp.* 2:317, pecuniary reparation was allowed in such cases likewise). *SEE PUNISHMENT*.

3. Damage to one's property by cattle (Exodus 22:5), or accidental spread of fire in the field (ver. 6), called for full remuneration of the loss (as also among the Romans; see Walter, *Gesch. d. rom. Rechts*, p. 812), and was to be paid for in kind, although a commutation in money certainly might obtain (Philo, *Opp.* 2:339). For fuller details, see the Talmudic treatise *Baba Kamma*, 4:1. When a hired animal or article was injured no special restitution was required (Exodus 22:15). It was otherwise, however, with property placed in trust. *SEE DEPOSIT*. On the jurisdiction of all cases, *SEE ELDER*.

Dam'aris

(Δάμαρις) an Athenian woman converted to Christianity by Paul's preaching (Acts 17:34), A.D. 48. Chrysostom (*de Sacerdotio*, 4:7) and others held her to have been the wife of Dionysius the Areopagite, but apparently for no other reason than that she is mentioned together with him in this passage. Grotius and Hemsterhuis think the name should be Damalis, Δάμαλις (signifying *heifer*), which is frequently found as a

woman’s name; but the permutation of λ and ρ was not uncommon both in pronunciation and writing (Lobeck on Phrynichus, p. 652).

Damascene’

(Δαμασκηνός), an inhabitant (2 Corinthians 11:32) of the city of Damascus (q.v.).

Damascenus Joannes.

SEE JOHN OF DAMASCUS.

Damas’cus

(Heb. *Damme’sek*, qc,MDi[sometimes *Darme’sek*, qc,m]rDi, by resolution of the Dagesh, 1 Chronicles 18:5, 6; once *Dumme’sek*, qc,MWD, probably by erroneous transcription for the last, 2 Kings 16:10], signifying activity [Gesenius, *Thes*. p. 345 sq.], from its commerce; Arab, *Dtimeshk*; Gr. Δαμασκός), one of the most ancient, and at all times one of the most important of Oriental cities. It is called by the natives *Es-Sham*, and is capital of an important pashalic of this latter name, and indeed is the chief or capital city of Syria. It was sometimes spoken of by the ancients as an Arabian city, but in reality it belongs to Syria (Coele-Syria, Strabo 16:756; Ptolemy, v. 15, 22). In 2 Samuel 8:5, 6, “the Syrians of Damascus” are spoken of, and the words “Syria of Damascus” are found in Isaiah 7:8. It is expressly said, “the head of Syria is Damascus;” also, Isaiah 17:3, “the kingdom” is to cease “from Damascus;” so that this’ place was obviously the metropolis of a Syrian empire. It gave name (Syria Damascena, Plin. *Hist*. *Natural*. v. 13) to a district of Syria, which, in 1 Chronicles 19:6, is distinguished as “Syria-Maachah” in the A.V:. The city is even mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions (q.v.). There has never been any doubt of its identity.

Picture for Damascus 1

1. *Situation*. —Damascus occupies the most beautiful site in Syria, or perhaps in all Western Asia. At the eastern base of Anti-Libanus lies a vast plain, having an elevation of about 2200 feet above the level of the sea. It is bounded on the south by the river Awaj, with its branches, which separates it from Ituraea. On the east a little group of conical hills divides it from the great Arabian desert. Its form is triangular, and its area about 500

square miles. Only about one half of this is now inhabited, or indeed habitable; but in richness and beauty this half is unsurpassed. It owes all its advantages to its rivers (2 Kings 5:12). The plain is about 400 stadia from the Mediteranean, and from six to eight days' journey from Jerusalem. Its celebrity is of early date. Strabo (xvi, p. 756) speaks of it in eulogistic terms. In a religious point of view, also, its repute was great. Julian (*Ep*. 24) terms it "the great and sacred Damascus, surpassing every city both in the beauty of its temples and the magnitude of its shrines, as well as the timeliness of its seasons, the limpidness of its fountains, the volume of its waters, and the richness of its soil." The Abana (q.v.), now called Barada, rising high up on the western flank of Anti-Libanus, forces its way through the chain, running for some time among the mountains, till suddenly it bursts through a narrow cleft upon the open country east of the hills, and diffuses fertility far and wide. "From the edge of the mountain-range," says a modern traveler, "you look down on the plain of Damascus. It is here seen in its widest and fullest perfection, with the visible explanation of the whole secret of its great and enduring charm, that which it must have had when it was the solitary seat of civilization in Syria, and which it will have as long as the world lasts. The river is visible at the bottom, with its green banks, rushing through the cleft; it bursts forth, and as if in a moment scatters over the plain, through a circle of thirty miles, the same verdure which had hitherto been confined to its single channel... Far and wide in front extends the level plain, its horizon bare, its lines of surrounding hills bare, all bare far away on the road to Palmyra and Bagdad. In the midst of this plain lies at your feet the vast lake or island of deep verdure, walnuts and apricots waving above, corn and grass below; and in the midst of this mass of foliage rises, striking out its white arms of streets hither and thither, and its white minarets above the trees which embosom them, the city of Damascus. On the right towers the snowy height of Hermon, overlooking the whole scene. Close behind are the sterile limestone mountains — so that you stand literally between the living and the dead" (Stanley, *Palestine*, p. 402). Another writer mentions among the produce of the plain in question "walnuts, pomegranates, figs, plums, apricots, citrons, pears, and apples" (Addison's *Dam. and Palmyra*, 2:92). Olivetrees are also a principal feature of the scene. Besides the main stream of the Barada, which runs directly through the town, supplying its public cisterns, baths, and fountains, a number of branches are given off to the right and to the left, which irrigate the meadows and corn-fields; turning what would otherwise be a desert into a garden. These various streams,

although greatly weakened in volume, flow on towards the east for about twenty miles, when they pour their waters into two small and shallow lakes, which lie upon the verge of the desert. Two other streams, the Wady Helbon upon the north, and the Awaj upon the south, which flows direct from Hermon, increase the fertility of the Damascene plain, and contend for' the honor of representing the "Pharpar" (q.v.) of Scripture. The city stands on the banks of the main stream, about two miles distant from, and 500 feet below the pass through which it emerges into the plain. The modern Oriental architecture does not bear close inspection, but when seen from a distance it is singularly imposing. Tapering minarets and swelling domes, tipped with golden crescents, rise up in every direction from the confused mass of white terraced roofs, while in some places their tops gleam like diamonds amid the deep green foliage. In the center of the city stands the great mosque, and near it the massive towers of the castle.

2. *History.* —According to Josephus (*Ant.* 1:6) Damascus was founded by Uz, the son of Aram, and grandson of Shem. It is first mentioned in Scripture in connection with Abraham, whose steward was a native of the place (Genesis 15:2). We may gather from the name of this person, as well as from the statement of Josephus, which connects the city with the Arammeans, that it was a Shemitic settlement. According to a tradition preserved in the native writer Nicolaus, Abraham staid for some time at Damascus after leaving Charran and before entering the promised land, and during his stay was king of the place. "Abraham's name was," he. says, "even in his own day, familiar in the mouths of the Damascenes, and a village was shown where he dwelt, which was called after him" (*Fragm.* 30). This last circumstance would seem, however, to conflict with the notion of Abraham having been king, since in that case he would have dwelt in the capital. In the village of Buzeh, three miles north of the city, is a highly venerated shrine, called for the last eight centuries "the house of Abraham." (On these fables, see Julian, *Epist*. 24, p. 392; *Cellarii Notitice*, 2:442 sq.; Mannert, VI, 1:407 sq.; Justin, 36:2; Isidorus, *Origg.* 15:1; D'Herbelot, *Biblioth.* Or. 1:70.) *SEE ABRAHAM*.

Nothing more is known of Damascus until the time of David, when "the Syrians of Damascus came to succor Hadadezer, king of Zobah," with whom David was at war (2 Samuel 8:5; 1 Chronicles 18:5). On' this occasion David "slew of the Syrians 22,000 men," and in consequence of this victory became completely master of the whole territory, which he garrisoned with Israelites. "David put garrisons in Syria of Damascus; and

the Syrians became servants to David, and brought gifts" (2 Samuel 8:6). Nicolaiis of Damascus said that the name of the king who reigned at this time was Hadad; and he ascribes to him a dominion not only over Damascus, but "over all Syria except Phoenicia" (*Fragm.* 31). He noticed his *attack* upon David, and related that many battles were fought between them, the last, wherein he suffered defeat, being "'*upon the Euphrates*." According to this writer, Hadad the first was succeeded by a son, who took the same name, as did his descendants for ten generations. But this is irreconcilable with Scripture (see Miller, *Origo regni Damasc*. Lips. 1714; also in Ikenii *Thesaur.* 1:721 sq.). It appears that in the reign of Solomon a certain Rezon, who had been a subject of Hadadezer, king of Zobah, and had escaped when David conquered Zobah, made himself master of Damascus, and established his own rule there (1 Kings 11:23-5). He was "an adversary to Israel all the days of Solomon... and he abhorred Israel, and reigned over Syria" (Joseph. *Ant.* 8:7, 6). Afterwards the family of Hadad appears to have recovered the throne, and a Benhadad, who is probably Hadad III of Nicolaus, a grandson of the antagonist of David, is found in league with Baasha, king of Israel, against Asa (1 Kings 15:19; 2 Chronicles 16:3), and afterwards in league with Asa against Baasha (1 Kings 15:20). He made a successful invasion of the Israelitish territory in the reign of that king; and in the reign of Omnri he not only captured a number of Israelitish cities, which he added to his own dominions, but even seems to have exercised a species of lordship over Samaria itself, in which he acquired the right of "making himself streets" (1 Kings 20:34; comp. Nic. D. *Fragm.* 31, *ad fin*.). He was succeeded by his son, Hadad IV (the Benhadad II of Scripture, and the Ben-idri of the Assyrian inscriptions), who came at the head of thirty-two subject kings against Ahab, and laid siege to Samaria (1 Kings 20:1). The attack was unsuccessful, and was followed by wars, in which victory declared itself unmistakably on the side of the Israelites; and at last Benhadad was taken prisoner, and forced to submit to a treaty whereby he gave up all that his father had gained, and submitted in his turn to the suzerainty of Ahab (1 Kings 20:13-34). The terms of the treaty were perhaps not observed. At any rate, three years afterwards war broke out afresh, through the claim of Ahab to the city of Ramoth-Gilead (1 Kings 22:1-4). The defeat and death of Ahab at that place (ib. 15-37) seems to have enabled the Syrians of Damascus to resume the offensive. Their bands ravaged the lands of Israel during the reign of Jehoram; and they even undertook at this time a second siege of Samaria, which was frustrated miraculously (2 Kings 6:24; 7:6-7). After this, we do

not hear of any more attempts against the Israelitish capital. The cuneiform inscriptions show that towards the close of his reign Benhadad was exposed to the assaults of a great conqueror, who was bent on extending the dominion of Assyria over Syria and Palestine. Three several attacks appear to have been made by this prince upon Benhadad, who, though he had the support of the Phoenicians, the Hittites, and the Hamathites, was unable to offer any effectual opposition to the Assyrian arms. His troops were worsted in several engagements, and in one of them he lost as many as 20,000 men. It may have been these circumstances which encouraged Hazael, the servant of Benhadad, to murder him and seize the throne, which Elisha had declared would certainly one day be his (2 Kings viii. 15). He may have thought that the Syrians would willingly acquiesce in the removal of a ruler tinder whom they had suffered so many disasters. The change of rulers was not at first productive of any advantage to the Syrians. Shortly after the accession of Hazael (about B.C. 884), he was in his turn attacked by the Assyrians, who defeated him with great loss amid the fastnesses of Anti-Libanus. However, in his other wars he was more fortunate. He repulsed an attack on Ramoth-Gilead, made by Ahaziah, king of Judah, and Jehoram, king of Israel, in conjunction (2 Kings 8:28-9); ravaged the whole Israelitish territory east of Jordan (2 Kings 10:32-3), besieged and took Gath (2 Kings 12:17; compare Amos 6:2); threatened Jerusalem, which only escaped by paying a heavy ransom (2 Kings 12:18); and established a species of suzerainty over Israel, which he maintained to the day of his death, and handed down to Benhadad, his son (2 Kings 13:3-7, and 22). This prince, in the earlier part of his reign, had the same good fortune as his father. Like him, he “oppressed Israel,” and added various cities of the Israelites to his own dominion (2 Kings 13:25); but at last a deliverer appeared (ver. 5), and Joash, the son of Jehoahaz, ‘beat Hazael thrice, and recovered the cities of Israel” (ver. 25). In the next reign still further advantages were gained by the Israelites. Jeroboam II (B.C. cir. 836) is said to have “recovered Damascus” (2 Kings 14:28), and though this may not mean that he captured the city, it at least implies that he obtained a certain influence over it. The mention of this circumstance is followed by a long pause, during which we hear nothing of the Syrians, and must therefore conclude that their relations with the Israelites continued peaceable. *SEE BENHADAD*. When they reappear, nearly a century later (B.C. cir. 742), it is as allies of Israel against Judah (2 Kings 15:37). We may suspect that the chief cause of the union now established between two powers which had been so long hostile was the necessity of combining to

resist the Assyrians, who at the time were steadily pursuing a policy of encroachment in this quarter. Scripture mentions the invasions of Pul (2 Kings 15:19; 1 Chronicles 5:26), and Tiglath-Pileser (2 Kings 15:29; 1 Chronicles 5:26); and there is reason to believe that almost every Assyrian monarch of the period made war in this direction. It seems to have been during a pause in the struggle that Rezin, king of Damascus, and Pekah, king of Israel, resolved conjointly to attack Jerusalem, intending to depose Ahaz and set up as king a creature of their own (Isaiah 7:1-6; 2 Kings 16:5). Ahaz may have already been suspected of a friendly feeling towards Assyria, or the object may simply have been to consolidate a power capable of effectually opposing the arms of that country. In either case the attempt signally failed, and only brought about more rapidly the evil against which the two kings wished to guard. Jerusalem successfully maintained itself against the combined attack; but Elath, which had formerly been built by Azariah, king of Judah, in territory regarded as Syrian (2 Kings 14:22), having been taken and retained by Rezin (2 Kings 16:6), Ahaz was induced to throw himself into the arms of Tiglath-Pileser, to ask aid from him, and to accept voluntarily the position of an Assyrian feudatory (2 Kings 16:7-8). The aid sought was given, with the important result that Rezin was slain, the kingdom of Damascus brought to an end, and the city itself destroyed, the inhabitants being carried captive into Assyria (ib. ver. 9; comp. Isaiah 7:8, and Amos 1:5). Among the sculptures lately discovered on the site of Nineveh are thought to be delineations of this siege and capture of Damascus. Rawlinson even reads the name of the city on an obelisk connected with them (Bonomi, *Nineveh.* p. 234 sq.). Assyrian remains have lately been discovered in a mound near Damascus (*Journal of Sacred Literature*, October. 1854, p. 218; January, 1855, p. 469). *SEE ASSYRIA.*

Picture for Damascus 2

It was long before Damascus recovered from this serious blow. As Isaiah and Amos had prophesied in the day of her prosperity that Damascus should be “taken away from being a city and be a ruinous heap” (Isaiah 17:1), that “a fire should be sent into the house of Hazael which should devour the palaces of Benhadad” (Amos 1:4), so Jeremiah, writing about B.C. 600, declares “Damascus *is waxed feeble* and turneth herself to flee, and fear hath seized on her; anguish and sorrows have taken. her as a woman in travail. How is the city of praise *not left*, the city of my joy!” (Jeremiah 49:24-5). Damascus remained a province of Assyria until the

capture of Nineveh by the Medes (B.C. 625), when it submitted to the conquerors. Its Wealth and commercial prosperity appear to have declined for a considerable period, probably on account of the ravages of Tiglath-Pileser, and the captivity of the most influential and enterprising of its people. The city was afterwards held in succession by the Egyptians, Babylonians, and Persians. We have no particulars of its history for a period of three centuries. Under the rule of the Persians it was the capital of the province of Syria, and the residence of the satrap. We do not know at what time Damascus was rebuilt, but Strabo says that it was the most famous place in Syria during the Persian period (xvi. 2, § 19). When Darius, the last king of Persia, made his great effort to repress the rising power, and bar the progress of Alexander of Macedon, it was in this city he deposited his family and treasures (Arrian, *Exp*. Al. 2:11). The fate of Damascus, with that of all Western Asia, was decided by the battle of Issus, in which the Persian army was almost annihilated. Damascus now became the capital of a province which Alexander gave to his general Laomedon (Plut. *Vit. Alexandri*). During the long wars which raged between the Seleucide and the Ptolemies, Damascus had no separate history: it sometimes fell to the one, and sometimes to the other. Antioch was founded, and became their favorite residence, and the capital of the Seleucidae; but when the Syrian kingdom was divided in B.C. 126, Damascus was made the second capital. Its territory embraced Coele-Syria, Phoenicia, and the country east of the Jordan, and it was afterwards governed in succession by four princes of the family of Seleucus. Damascus and Antioch thus became the seats of rival factions, and aspirants after complete sovereignty (Joseph. *Ant.* 13:13, 4, and 15, 1). The last of these princes, Antiochus Dionysus, was killed in battle against Aretas, king of Arabia, and the Damascenes forthwith elected Aretas his successor (Josephus, *Ant.* 13:15,1), B.C. 84. In the year B.C. 64, the Romans, under Pompey, invaded and captured Syria, constituted it a province of the empire, and made Damascus the seat of government (ib. 14:2, 3, and 4, 5; Mos. Choren. 1:14; Appian, *Bell. Mithrid*. p. 224). From Josephus (*War*, 1:2; 25:2; 20:2; comp. Acts 9:2) it appears that its population contained great numbers of Jews.

Picture for Damascus 3

For twenty years Damascus continued to be the residence of the Roman procurators. The city prospered under their firm and equitable rule, and even after their removal to Antioch did not decline. Strabo, who flourished

at this period, describes it as one of the most magnificent cities of the East. Nicolaus, the famous historian and philosopher, the friend of Herod the Great and Augustus, was now one of its citizens (Strabo, *Geogr.* xvi; Josephus, *Ant.* 16:10, 8). But the strong arm of Rome was not sufficient to quell the fiery spirit of the Syrians. The whole country was rent into factions, and embroiled by the unceasing rivalries and wars of petty princes. About the year A.D. 37, a family quarrel led to a war between Aretas, king of Arabia, and Herod Antipas. The Roman governor, Vitellius, was instructed to interfere in favor of the latter; but when he was ready to attack Aretas, who had already driven back Herod, news arrived of the death of the emperor Tiberius. The government of Syria was thus thrown into confusion, and Vitellius returned to Antioch (Joseph. *Ant.* 18:5, 1-3). It appears that now Aretas, taking advantage of the state of affairs, followed up his successes, advanced upon Damascus, and seized the city. It was during his brief rule (or some earlier one) that Paul visited Damascus on his return from Arabia (Galatians 1:16, 17). *SEE ARETAS*. His zeal as a missionary, and the energy with which he opposed every form of idolatry, had probably attracted the notice and excited the enmity of Aretas; and consequently, when informed by the Jews that the apostle had returned to the city, he was anxious to secure him, and gave orders to the governor to watch the gates day and night for that purpose (Acts 9:24; 2 Corinthians 11:32. See Neander, *Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, 1:106). The Romans adorned Damascus with many splendid buildings, the ruins of which still exist. Some of them were probably designed by Apollodorus, a native of the city, and one of the most celebrated architects of his age, to whose genius we are indebted for one of the most beautiful monuments of ancient Rome, the Column of Trajan (Dion Cass. lxix). A little later it was reckoned to Decapolis (Plin. *Hist. Nat.* v. 16), after which it became a part of the province known as Phcenicia-Libanesia (Hierocl. *Synecd*. p. 717).

Christianity was planted in Damascus by Paul himself (Acts 9:20 sq.; Galatians 1:12), and obtained a firm footing in the apostolic age. It spread so rapidly among the population that in the time of Constantine the great temple, one of the noblest buildings in Syria, was converted into a cathedral church and dedicated to John the Baptist. When the first general council assembled at Nice, Magnus, the metropolitan of Damascus, was present with seven of his suffragans. But the Roman empire was now waxing feeble, and the religion which, by its establishment as a national

institute, ought to have infused the germ of a new life into the declining state, was itself losing its purity and its power. Damascus felt, like other places, the demoralizing tendencies of a corrupt faith. In the beginning of the 7th century a new and terrible power appeared upon the stage of the world's history, destined, in the hands of an all-wise though mysterious Providence, to overthrow a degenerate empire and chastise an erring Church. In A.D. 634 Damascus opened its gates to the Mohammedans, and thirty years later the first caliph of the Omeiades transferred the seat of his government to that city. It now became for a brief period the capital of a-vast empire, including Syria, Mesopotamia, Persia, Northern Africa, and Spain (Elmacin, *Hist. Sarac.* xiii). In A.D. 750 the Omeiades were supplanted by the dynasty of Abbas, and the court was removed to Bagdad. A stormy period of four centuries now passed over the old city without leaving a single incident worthy of special note. An attack of the Crusaders (A.D. 1148), under the three chiefs, Baldwin, Conrad, and Louis VII, might have claimed a place here had it not been so disgraceful to the Christian arms. It is enough to say that the cross never displaced the crescent on the battlements of Damascus. The reigns of Nureddin and his more distinguished successor Saladin form bright epochs-in the city's history. Two centuries later came Timur, who literally swept Damascus with "the besom Of destruction." Arab writers sometimes call him elWahsh, "the wild beast," and he fully earned that name. Never had Damascus so fearfully experienced the horrors of conquest. Its wealth, its famed manufactures, and its well-filled libraries, were all dissipated in a single day. It soon regained its opulence. A century later it fell into the hands of the Turks, and, with the exception of the brief rule of Ibrahim Pasha, it has ever since remained nominally subject to the sultan.

The Mohammedan population of Damascus have long been known as the greatest fanatics in the East. The steady advance of the Christian community in wealth and influence during the last thirty years has tended to excite their bitter enmity. In July, 1860, taking advantage of the war between the Druses and Maronites, and encouraged also by the Turkish authorities, they suddenly rose against the poor defenseless Christians, massacred about 6000 of them in cold blood, and left their whole quarter in ashes! Such is the last act in the long history of Damascus. (There is a work by Pieritz on the Persecution of the Jews at Damascus, Lond. 1840.) Damascus is still the largest city in Asiatic Turkey. It contained in 1859 a population of about 150,000. Of these, 6000 were Jews and 15,000

Christians. The Christian community has since been almost exterminated by the above massacre of the greater portion of the males. The pasha ranks with the first officers of the empire, and the city is the head-quarters of the Syrian army.

3. *Commerce.* —Damascus has always been a great center for trade. The difficulties and dangers of the mountain passes to the west of Anti-Libanus made the line of traffic between Egypt and Upper Syria follow the circuitous route by Damascus rather than the direct one through Coele-Syria, while the trade of Tyre with Assyria and the East generally passed naturally through Damascus on its way to Palmyra and the Euphrates. Ezekiel, speaking of Tyre, says, “Damascus was thy merchant in the multitude of the wares of thy making, for the multitude of all riches; in the wine of Helbon and white wool.” It would appear from this that Damascus took manufactured goods from the Phoenicians, and supplied them in exchange with wool and wine. The former would be produced in abundance in Coele-Syria and the valleys of the Anti-Libanus range, while the latter seems to have been grown in the vicinity of HELBON, a village still famous for the produce of its vines, ten or twelve miles from Damascus to the north-west (*Geograph. Jour*. 26:44). But the passage-trade of Damascus has probably been at all times more important than its direct commerce. Its merchants must have profited largely by the caravans which continually passed through it on their way to distant countries. It is uncertain whether in early times it had any important manufactures of its own. According to some expositors, the passage in Amos 3:12, which we translate “in Damascus on a couch” (cr,[,qc¡mdþ₩), means really “on the damask couch,” which would indicate that the Syrian city had become famous for a textile fabric as early as the eighth century B.C. There is no doubt that such a fabric gave rise to our own word, which has its counterpart in Arabic as well as in most of the languages of modern Europe; but it is questionable whether either this, or the peculiar method of working in steel, which has impressed itself in a similar way upon the speech of the world, was invented by the Damascenes before the Mohammedan era. In ancient times they were probably rather a consuming than a producing people, as the passage in Ezekiel clearly indicates. It afterwards became famous for its sword-blades and cutlery; but its best workmen were carried off by Timur to Ispahan. Its chief manufactures are, at present, silks, coarse woolen stuffs, cottons, gold and silver ornaments, and arms. The bazaars are stocked with the products of nearly all nations

— Indian muslins, Manchester prints, Persian carpets, Lyons' silks, Birmingham cutlery, Cashmere shawls, Mocha coffee, and Dutch sugar.

4. *Topography, Antiquities, etc*, — The old city, the nucleus of Damascus, stands on the south bank of the river, and is surrounded by a tottering wall, the foundations of which are Roman, and the superstructure a patchwork of all succeeding ages. It is of an irregular oval form. Its greatest diameter is marked by the "*street called Straight*," which intersects it from east to west, and is about a mile long. This street was anciently divided into three avenues by Corinthian colonnades, and at each end were triple Roman gateways, still in a great measure entire. In the old city were the Christian and Jewish quarters, and the principal buildings and bazaars. On the north, west, and south are extensive suburbs. The internal aspect of the city is not prepossessing, and great is the disappointment of the stranger when he leaves the delicious environs and enters the gates. Without, nature smiles joyously, the orchards seem to blush at their own beauty, and the breeze is laden with perfumes. Within, all is different. The works of man show sad signs of neglect and decay. The houses are rudely built; the lanes are paved with big rough stones, and partially roofed with ragged mats and withered branches; long-bearded, fanatical-visaged men squat in rows on dirty stalls, telling their beads, and mingling, with muttered prayers to Allah and his prophet, curses deep and terrible on all infidels. The bazaars are among the best in the East. *SEE BAZAAR*. They are narrow covered lanes, with long ranges of open stalls on each side; in these their owners sit as stiff and statue-like as if they had been placed there for show. *SEE MERCHANT*. Each trade has its own quarter. Every group in the bazaars would form a lively picture. All the costumes of Asia are there, strangely grouped with panniered donkeys, gayly-caparisoned mules, and dreamy-looking camels. The principal khans or caravansaries are spacious buildings. They are now used as stores and shops for the principal merchants. The great khan, Assad Pasha, is among the finest in Turkey. A noble Saracenic portal opens on a large quadrangle, ornamented with a marble fountain, and covered by a series of domes supported on square pillars. Many of the mosques are fine specimens of Saracenic architecture. Their deeply-moulded gateways are very beautiful, and the interlaced stone-work around doors and windows is unique. They are mostly built of alternate layers of white and black stone, with string courses of marble arranged in chaste patterns. But they are all badly kept, and many of them are now ruinous.

The *private houses* of Damascus share, with the plain, the admiration of all visitors. No contrast could be greater than that between the outside and inside. The rough mud-walls and mean doors give poor promise of taste or beauty within. The entrance is always through a narrow winding passage-sometimes even a stable-yard-to the "outer court," where the master has his reception-room, and to which alone male visitors are admitted. Another winding passage leads to the haren (q.v.), which is the principal part of the house. Here is a spacious court, with tesselated pavement, a marble basin in the center, jets d'eau around it, orange, lemon, and citron trees, flowering shrubs. jessamines and vines trained over trellis-work for shade. The rooms all open on this court, intercowrmunication between room and room being almost unknown. On the south side is an open alcove, with marble floor and cushioned dais. The decorations of some of the rooms is gorgeous. The wails of the older houses are wainscoted, carved, and gilt, and the ceilings are covered with arabesque ornaments. In the new houses painting and marble fretwork are taking the place of arabesque and wainscoting.

The principal building of Damascus is the *Great Mosque*, the domes and minarets of which are everywhere conspicuous. It occupies one side of a large quadrangular court, flagged with marble, arranged in patterns, and ornamented with some beautiful fountains. Within the mosque are double ranges of Corinthian columns supporting the roof, in the style of the old basilicas. The walls were once covered with Mosaic, representing the holy places of Islam; but this is nearly all gone. In the center is a spacious dome. The building was anciently a temple, with a large cloistered court, like the Temple of the Sun at Palmyra. In the time of Constantine it was made a church and dedicated to John the Baptist, whose head was said to be deposited in a silver casket in one of the crypts. In the 7th century the Moslems took possession of it, and it has since remained the most venerated of their mosques. It is a singular fact, however, that though it has now been for twelve centuries in possession of the enemies of our faith, though during the whole of that period no Christian has ever been permitted to enter its precincts, yet over its principal door is an inscription embodying one of the grandest and most cheering of Christian truths (Psalm 145:13).

The *Castle* is a large quadrangular structure, with high walls and massive flanking towers. It is now a mere shell, the whole interior being a heap of

ruins. The foundations are at least as old as the Roman age. It stands at the north-west angle of the ancient wall.

The *traditionary sacred places* of Damascus are the following: A "long, wide thoroughfare" — leading direct from one of the gates to the castle or palace of the pasha — is "called by the guides 'Straight'" (Acts 9:11); but the natives know it among themselves as "the Street of Bazaars" (Stanley, p. 404). The house of Judas is shown, but it is not in the street "Straight" (Pococke, 2:119). That of Ananias is also pointed out. The scene of the conversion is confidently said to be "an open green spot, surrounded by trees," and used as the Christian burial-ground; but this spot is on the eastern side of the city, whereas Paul must have approached from the south or west. Again it appears to be certain that "four distinct spots have been pointed out at different times" (Stanley, p. 403) as the place where the "great light suddenly shined from heaven" (Acts 9:3). The point of the walls at which St. Paul was let down by a basket (Acts 9:25; 2 Corinthians 11:33) is also shown; and it. is a fact that houses are still constructed in Damascus in like manner overhanging the wall. In the vicinity of Damascus certain places are shown traditionally connected with the prophet Elisha; but these local legends are necessarily even more doubtful than those which have reference to the comparatively recent age of the apostles. There are even spots pointed out as the scene of events in the life of Abraham (Stanley, p. 404).

The climate of Damascus is healthful except during July, August, and September, when fevers and opthalmia are prevalent, engendered by filth and unwholesome food. The thermometer ranges from 80° to 87° Fahr. during the summer, and seldom falls below 45° in winter. There is usually a little snow each year. The rain begins about the middle of October, and continues at intervals till May. The rest of the year is dry and cloudless.

A full description of Damascus, with notices, plans, and drawings, is given in Porter's *Five Years in Damascus* (Lond. 1855, 2 vols. 8vo); and in the JOUR. SAC. LIT. July, 1853, p. 245 sq.; Oct. 1853, p. 45 sq.; see also Addison's *Damascus and Palmyra* (ii. 92-196); Walch, *Antiquitates Damasc. illustrate* (Jen. 1757 [a copious treatise, giving all facts known in his day]; also in his *Acta Apostol*. 2:31 sq.); Kelly, *Syria* (chap. xv), and travelers in Palestine generally. See SYRIA.

Damascus John Of.

SEE JOHN OF DAMASCUS.

Damaskios

one of the last eclectic philosophers, was a native of Damascus, studied in Alexandria and Athens, and taught the Neo-Platonic philosophy in the latter city. In consequence of the persecution of paganism by the emperor Justinian, Damaskios, in 529, emigrated to Persia, where he was well received by Khosroes, who, at the treaty of peace in 533, obtained for him permission to return and freedom of his religious belief. He is the author of a number of works, the most important of which is entitled Περὶ ἀρχῶν (edited by J. Kopp, Frankfort, 1826). On his life and opinions, see Kopp, preface to the above work, and Jules Simon in *Dictionnaire des Sciences Philosophiques*. — Hoefer, *Biog. Generale*, 12:842.

Damasus I

pope, born in Spain (others say in Rome) A.D. 306, succeeded Liberius as bishop of Rome A.D. 366. He was opposed by Ursicinus, who claimed the election, and in their disgraceful strifes many people were murdered. -He was a man of vigorous intellect, and extended the power of the see of Rome very greatly. The emperor Gratian conferred upon him, in 378, the right to pass judgment upon those clergymen of the other party who had been expelled from Rome, and, at the request of a Roman synod held in the same year, instructed the secular authorities to give to him the necessary support. Damasus was a vigorous opponent of Arianism; a synod held by him in 368 condemned the two Illyrian bishops Ursacius and Valens, and another, held in 370, passed sentence against Auxentius of Milan. He also exerted himself for putting an end to the Antioch schism, and took part in the OEcumenical Council of Constantinople of 381. One of his best acts was to make Jerome his secretary, and to aid him in his version of the Bible. He died in 384, and after his death was soon enrolled in the catalogue of saints, being commemorated on Dec. 11. See Damasi *Opera*, edited by Merenda (Rome, 1754, fol.; Paris, 1840, 8vo); Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* bk. ii, cent. iv, pt. ii, ch. ii, note 40; Milman, *Hist. of Latin Christianity*, 1:108 sq.; *Christian Remembrancer*, Oct. 1854, 283 sq.

Damasus II

pope, originally Poppo, a native of Bavaria. He was bishop of Brixen when he was elected pope in 1048, upon the recommendation of the emperor Henry 3, on the day of the abdication of Benedict X, and died twenty-three days after his election, 1048.

Damian (Damianus Or Damiani), Peter,

an eminent cardinal and reformer in the Roman Church, born at Ravenna about 1007. His parents appear to have taken much pains with his education, for he early excelled as much in piety as he did in learning. When he had completed his studies, he entered the monastery of the "Holy Cross" at Avellana, in Umbria. So high was his reputation that pope Stephen X created him cardinal bishop of Ostiao In A.D. 1061 he resigned all his preferments, which at the first even had been forced upon him, being unable to live with such a dissolute, debauched, and unholy crew as the clergy of those parts and times were. In the year 1069 he was sent as legate to prevent the emperor Henry from being divorced from his wife Bertha. His last public employment was in A.D. 1072, when he was commissioned to dissolve the excommunication under which his natal city Ravenna had lain for several years. He died of a fever at Faenza, on February 23, 1072, aged 66 years. His acts and his writings, which are numerous, tended much to the enlargement and consolidation of the papal power; yet he does not seem to haave been at all a party man, but to have proceeded in a direct and honest course, which led him, on the whole, to the support of that dominion which then prevailed. Not one of his least merits with the Romish Church would be that he was the first who required his monks to recite the Office of the Virgin; but that Church should also recollect that he strongly deprecates the use of temporal weapons for the increase of spiritual power. Altogether Damian was among the foremost men of his age, both morally and intellectually. His works were collected by Cajetan (Rome, 1606-1615, 3 vols. fol.), and have been several times reprinted; the best edition is that of Bassani (1783,4 vols. fol.). His life is given in the first volume of his works; also in *Vita P. Damiani*. by Laderchi (Rome, 1702, 4to); and in the *Acta Sanctorum*, Feb. 3, 406 sq. See Dupin, *Eccl. History*, vol. 9, ch. 8, Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.*, bk. 3, c. 1, pt. 2, chap. 2, n. 67; Bayle, *Dictionary*, s.v.; Clarke, *Succ. of Sacred Literature*, 2:608; Schrdckh, *Kirchen*geschichte, 22:523 sq.; Lea, *Sacerdotal Celibacy* (1867), chap. 12.

Damianists Or Damianites

The followers of Damianus of Alexandria (q.v.) were so called.

Damianus

Monophysite patriarch of Alexandria (t 601), expressed himself on the doctrine of the Trinity in a sense similar to that of Sabellius. He maintained that the divinity (θεύτης) of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost is an essential characteristic (ὕπαρξις) divided among the three, so that they are God only in their unity, not each one in himself (καθ ἑαυτόν), and that in this unity they constitute the one divine essence (μίαν οὐσίαν καὶ φύσιν). His followers were called Damianites, after him, or Angelists, from Angelium, the place where they held their assemblies in Alexandria; their adversaries were called Tetradists (Τετραδίται), as, going still further than the Tritheists, they acknowledged four gods, namely, the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost, and the higher Being, which, in his nature (φύσει) and in himself (καθ ἑαυτόν), is God. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklopadie*, 3, 263; Mosheim, *Ch. History*, bk. ii, ch. vi, pt. i, § 4; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, § 96.

Damianus St.

SEE COSMAS.

Damin

SEE ADAMI.

Dammim

SEE EPHES-DAMMIM.

Damnation

condemnation. This word is used to denote the final loss of the soul, but it is not always to be understood in this sense in the sacred Scripture. Thus it is said in Romans 13:2, “They that resist shall receive to themselves damnation,” i.e. condemnation, “from the rulers, who are not a terror to good works, but to the evil.” Again, in 1 Corinthians 11:29, “He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself,” i.e. condemnation; exposes himself to severe temporal judgments from God, and to the judgment and censure of the wise and good. Again,

Romans 14:23, “He that doubteth is damned if he eat,” i.e. is condemned both by his own conscience and the word of God, because he is far from being satisfied that he is right in so doing.

Dan

Picture for Dan

(Heb. id. ˆD; a judge; Sept. Δάν), the name of a man and his tribe and of two towns. *SEE MAHANEH-DAN*; *SEE DAN-JAAN*.

1. (Josephus translates Θεόκριτος, *Ant.* 1:19, 8.) The fifth son of Jacob, and the first of Bilhah, Rachel’s maid (Genesis 30:6), born B.C. 1916. . The origin of the name is there given in the exclamation of Rachel — “‘God hath judged me (yNnD; *danan’ni*)... and given me a son,’ therefore she called his name Dan,” i.e. “judge.” ‘In the blessing of Jacob (Genesis 49:16) this play on the name is repeated — “Dan shall judge (ˆydy; *yadin’*) his people.” Dan was own brother to Naphtali; and, as the son of Rachel’s maid, in a closer relation with Rachel’s sons, Joseph and Benjamin, than with the other members of the family. It may be noticed that there is a close affinity between his name and that of DINAH, the only daughter of Jacob. *SEE JACOB*.

TRIBE OF DAN. — Only one son is attributed to this patriarch (Genesis 46:23); but it may be observed that “Hushim” is a plural form, as if the name, not of an individual, but of a family; and it is remarkable whether as indicating that some of the descendants of Dan are omitted in these lists, or from other causesthat when the people were numbered in the wilderness of Sinai, this was, with the exception of Judah, the most numerous of all the tribes, containing 62,700 men able to serve. The position of Dan during the march through the desert was on the north side of the tabernacle (Numbers 2:25). Here, with his brother Naphtali, and Asher, the son of Zilpah, before him, was his station, the hindmost of the long procession (Numbers 2:31; 10:25). The names of the “captain” (aycn) of the tribe at this time, and of the “ruler” (the Hebrew word is the same as before), who was one of the spies (13:12), are preserved. So also is the name of one who played a prominent part at that time, “Aholiab, the son of Ahisamach, of the tribe of Dan,” associated with Bezaleel in the design and construction of the fittings of the tabernacle (Exodus 31:6, etc.). The numbers of this tribe were not subject to the violent fluctuations which increased or diminished

some of its brethren (comp. the figures given in Numbers 1 and 26), and it arrived at the threshold of the Promised Land, and passed the ordeal of the rites of Baal-peor (Numbers 25) with an increase of 1700 on the earlier census. The remaining notices of the tribe before the passage of the Jordan are unimportant. It furnished a "prince" (nasi, as before) to the apportionment of the land; and it was appointed to stand on Mount Ebal, still in company with Naphtali (but opposite to the other related tribes), at the ceremony of blessing and cursing (Deuteronomy 27:13).

After this nothing is heard of Dan till the specification of the inheritance allotted to him (Joshua 19:48). He was the last of the tribes to receive his portion, and that portion, according to the record of Joshua — strange as it appears in the face of the numbers just quoted-was the smallest of the twelve. But, notwithstanding its smallness, it had eminent natural advantages. On the north and east it was completely embraced by its two brother tribes Ephraim and Benejamin, while on the south-east and south it joined Judah, and was thus surrounded by the three most powerful states of the whole confederacy. Of the towns enumerated as forming "the 'border' of its inheritance," the most easterly which can now be identified are Ajalon, Zorah (Zareah), and Ir-Shemesh (or Beth-shemesh, q.v.). These places are on the slopes of the lower ranges of hills by which the highlands of Benjamin and Judah descend to the broad maritime plain, that plain which on the south bore the distinctive name of "the Shefelah," and more to the north, of "Sharon." From Japho — afterwards Joppa, and now Yafa — on the north, to Ekron and, Gathrimmon on the south-a length of at least fourteen miles that noble tract, one of the most fertile in the whole of Palestine, was allotted to this tribe. By Josephus (*Ant.* v. 1, 22, and 3, 1) this is extended to Ashdod on the south, and Dor, at the foot of Carmel, on the north, so as to embrace the whole, or nearly the whole, of the great plain, including Jamnia and Gath. (This discrepancy may be accounted for by supposing that the Danites at some period may have overrun the country thus far, when the Philistines were humbled by the powerful Ephraimites and the still more powerful David.) But this rich district, the corn-field and the garden of the whole south of Palestine, which was the richest prize of Phoenician conquest many centuries later, and which, even in the now degenerate state of the country, is enormously productive, was too valuable to be given up without a struggle by its original possessors. The Amorites accordingly "forced the children of Dan into the mountain, for they would not suffer them to come down into the valley" (Judges

1:34) — forced them up from the corn-fields of the plain, with their deep black soil, to the villages whose ruins still crown the hills that skirt the lowland. True, the help of the great tribe so closely connected with Dan was not wanting at this juncture, and "the hand of the children of Joseph," i.e. Ephraim, "prevailed against the Amorites" for the time. But the same' thing soon occurred again, and in the glimpse with which we are afterwards favored into the interior of the tribe, in the history of its great hero, the Philistines have taken the place of the Amorites, and with the same result. Although Samson "comes down" to the "vineyards of Timnath" and the valley of Sorek, yet it is from Mahaneh-Dan — the fortified camp of Dan, between Zorah and Eshtaol, behind: Kirjathjearim — that he descends, and it is to that natural fastness, the residence of his father, that he "goes up" again after his encounters, and that he is at last borne to his family sepulchre , the burying-place of Manoah (Judges 14:1, 5,19; 13:25; 16:4; — comp. 18:12; 16:31). It appears from that history that there was an under-current of private and social intercourse between the Philistines and the Danites, notwithstanding the public enmity between Israel and the former (Judges 13-16).

These considerations enable us to understand how it happened that long after the partition of the land "all the inheritance of the Danites had not fallen to them among the tribes of Israel" (Judges 18:1). They perhaps furnish a reason for the absence of Dan from the great gathering of the tribes against Sisera (Judges 5:17). They also explain the warlike and independent character of the tribe betokened in the name of their head-quarters, as just quoted — Mahaneh-Dan, "the camp, or host, of Dan" — in the fact specially insisted on and reiterated (Judges 18:11, 16, 17) of the complete equipment of their 600 warriors "appointed with weapons of war," and the lawless freebooting style of their behavior to Micah. There is something very characteristic in the whole of that most fresh and interesting story preserved to us in Judges 18 — a narrative without a parallel for the vivid glance it affords into the manners of that distant time-characteristic of boldness and sagacity, with a vein of grim sardonic humor, but undeformed by any unnecessary bloodshed.

In the "security" and "quiet" (Judges 18:7, 10) of their rich northern possession the Danites enjoyed the leisure and repose which had been denied them in their original seat. But of the fate of the city to which they gave "the name of their father" (Joshua 19:47), we know scarcely anything. The strong religious feeling which made the Danites so anxious to ask

counsel of God from Micah's Levite at the commencement of their expedition (Judges 18:5), and afterwards take him away with them to be "a priest unto a tribe and a family in Israel," may have pointed out their settlement to the notice of Jeroboam as a fit place for his northern sanctuary. But beyond the exceedingly obscure notice in Judges 18:30, we have no information on this subject. From 2 Chronicles 2:14, it would appear that the Danites had not kept their purity of lineage, but had intermarried with the Phoenicians of the country. (See an elaboration of this in Blunt, *Coincidences*, pt. 2, ch. 4.)

In the time of David Dan still kept its place among the tribes (1 Chronicles 12:35). Asher is omitted, but the "prince of the tribe of Dan" is mentioned in the list of 1 Chronicles 27:22. But from this time forward the name as applied to the tribe vanishes; it is kept alive only by the northern city.' In the genealogies of 1 Chronicles 2 to 12 Dan is omitted entirely, which is remarkable When the great fame of Samson and the warlike character of the tribe are considered, and can only be accounted for by supposing that its genealogies had perished. It is perhaps allowable to suppose that little care would be taken to preserve the records of a tribe which had left its original seat near the head-quarters of the nation, and given its name to a distant city notorious only as the seat of a rival and a forbidden worship. Lastly, Dan is omitted from the list of those who were sealed by the angel in the vision of John (Revelation 7:5-8). — Smith, *Dict. of Bible*, s.v. Perhaps the portion of the tribe which remained south was in time amalgamated with the tribe of Judah (as appears in the cities enumerated after the exile, Nehemiah 11:35), while the northern section united with the northern confederacy, and shared in its dispersion.

The following is a list of all the places in the tribe of Dan mentioned in Scripture, with their probable identification:

Ajalon. Town. Yalo.
Allon. do. *SEE ELON*.
Arimathaea. do. Ramleh?
Ataroth-Joab. do. Deir-Ayub?
Ba'aiath. do. Deir Balut.
Bene-barak. do. Buraka.
Beth-car. Hill. . Beit Far?
Beth-shemesh. Town. Ain Shems.
Charashim. Valley. Wady Mazeirah]?

Ekron. Town. A kir.
Elon. do. [Beit Susin]?
Eltekeh. do. [El-Maans reh]?
Eshtaol. do. Yeshua?
Gath-rimmon. do. [Rafat.]
Gibbethon. do. [Saidonl?
Gimzo. do. Jimzu.
Gittaim. do. *SEE ARIMATHIA*.
Hadid. do. El-Haditheh.
Heres. Mountain. *SEE JEATAM*.
Ir-shemesh. Town. *SEE BETH-SHEMESE*.
Jabniel, or Jabneh. do. Yebna.
Japho. do. Yafa.
Jearim. Mountain. [Hills W. of Wady Ghurab].
Jehud. Town. El-Yehumdieh.
Jethlah. do. [Ruins N. of Latrum]?
Joppa. do. *SEE JAPHO*.
Lod, or Lydda. do. Ludd.
Mahaneh-dan. Plain. W. of Kirjath-jearim?
Makaz. District. E. of Ekron?
Me-jarkon. Town. [Danniyal]?
Neballat. do. Beit Nebala.
Ono. do. Kefr-Auna.
Rakkon. do. [Kheibehl?
Seir [or Seirath?]. Mountain. Saris.
Shaalbin. Town. [Beit Sira]?
Sharon. Plain. Vicinity of.Ludd.
Shicron. Town. [Beit Shit]?
Timnah, or Timnath. do. Tibneh.
Zorah, or Zoreah. do. Sura.

The mention of this tribe in the “blessings” of Jacob and Moses must not be overlooked, but it is difficult to extract any satisfactory meaning from them. According to Jewish tradition, Jacob’s blessing on Dan is a prophetic allusion to Samson, the great “judge” of the tribe; and the ejaculation with which it closes was that actually uttered by Samson when brought into the temple at Gaza. (See the Targum Ps. Jonathan on Genesis 49:16, 17; and the quotations in Kalisch’s *Genesis* ad loc.) Modern critics likewise see an allusion to Samson in the terms of the blessings which they presume on

that account to have been written after the days of the Judges (Ewald, *Gesch.* 1:92). Jerome's observations (*Qu. in Gen*.) on this passage are very interesting. Herder's interpretation as given by Stanley (*Palestine*, p. 388) is as follows: "It is doubtful whether the delineation of Dan in Jacob's blessing relates to the original settlement on the western outskirts of Judah, or to the northern outpost. Herder's explanation will apply almost equally to both. 'Dan,' the judge, 'shall judge his people;' he the son of the concubine no less than the sons of Leah; he the frontier tribe no less than those in the places of honor shall be 'as one of the tribes of Israel.' 'Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an adder in the path,' that is, of the invading enemy by the north or by the west, 'that biteth the heels of the horse,' the indigenous serpent biting the foreign horse unknown to Israelite warfare, 'so that his rider shall fall backwards.' And his war-cry as from the frontier fortresses shall be, 'For Thy salvation, O Lord, I have waited!' In the blessing of Moses the southern Dan is lost sight of. The northern Dan alone appears, with the same characteristics, though under a different image; 'a lion's whelp' in the far north, as Judah in the far south: 'he shall leap from Bashan' — from the slopes of Hermon, where. he is couched watching for his prey."

2. (Josephus τὸ Δάνιον,) The city so familiar as the most northern landmark of Palestine in the common expression "from Dan even to Beersheba." The name of the place was originally LAISH or LESHEM (Joshua 19:47). Its inhabitants lived "after the manner of the Zidonians," i.e. engaged in commerce, and without defense. But it is nowhere said that they were Phoenicians, though this may perhaps be inferred from the parentage of Huram — his mother "of the daughters of Dan," his father "a man of Tyre" (2 Chronicles 2:14). They seem to have derived their security from the absence of any adverse powers in their neighborhood, and from confidence in the protection of Sidon, which was, however, too far off to render aid in the case of such a sudden assault as that by which they were overpowered. This distance of Sidon was carefully noted by the Danite spies as a circumstance favorable to the enterprise; and it does not appear that Sidon ever made any effort to dispossess the intruders. Living thus "quiet and secure," they fell an easy prey to the active and practiced freebooters of the Danites. These conferred upon their new acquisition the name of their own tribe, "after the name of their father who was born unto Israel" (Judges 18:29; Joshua 19:47), and Laish became Daniel The graven image which the wandering Danites had stolen from Micah they set up in

their new home, and a line of priests was established, which, though belonging to the tribe of Levi and even descended from Moses, was not of the family of Aaron, and therefore not belonging to the regular priesthood. To the form of this image and the nature of the idolatry we have no clew, nor to the special relation which existed between it and the calf-worship afterwards instituted there by Jeroboam (1 Kings 12:29, 30). It only appears that Jeroboam took advantage of the confirmed idolatry of the Danites (Judges 18:30), erected a temple in their city, and set up there one of his golden calves for the benefit of those to whom a pilgrimage to Jerusalem would not have been politic, and a pilgrimage to Bethel might have been irksome (1 Kings 12:28). The latter worship is alluded to in Amos 8:14 in a passage which possibly preserves a formula of invocation or adjuration in use among the worshippers; but the passage is very obscure. The worship of the calf may be traced to this day in the secret rites of the Nosairian Druse saints of the vicinity (Newbold, *Jour. As. Soc*. 16:27). After the establishment of the Danites at Dan it became the acknowledged extremity of the country, and the formula "from Dan even to Beersheba" is frequent throughout the historical books (Judges 20:1; 1 Samuel 3:20; 2 Samuel 3:10; 17:11; 24:2, 15; 1 Kings 4:25). In the later records the form is reversed, and becomes "from Beersheba even to Dan" (1 Chronicles 21:2; 2 Chronicles 30:5). It is occasionally employed alone in a somewhat similar meaning; thus, in Jeremiah 8:16, "The snorting of his horses was heard from Dan; the whole land trembled at the sound of the neighing of his strong ones" (also 4:15). Dan was, with other northern cities, laid waste by Benhadad (1 Kings 15:20; 2 Chronicles 16:4), and this is the last mention of the place.

Various considerations would incline us to the suspicion that Dan was a holy place of note from a far earlier date than its conquest by the Danites. These are:

(1.) The extreme reluctance of the Orientals — apparent in numerous cases in the Bible — to initiate a sanctuary, or to adopt for worship any place which had not enjoyed a reputation for holiness from pre-historic times.

(2.) The correspondence of Dan with Beersheba in connection with the life of Abraham — the origin of Beersheba also being, as has been noticed, enveloped in some diversity of statement.

(3.) More particularly its incidental mention in the very clear and circumstantial narrative of Genesis 14:14, as if well known even at that

very early period. Its mention in Deuteronomy 34:1, is also before the events related in Judges xviii, though still many centuries later than the time of Abraham. But the subject is very difficult, and we can hardly hope to arrive at more than conjecture upon it. With regard to Genesis 14:14, three explanations suggest themselves.

a. That another place of the same name is intended. (See Kalisch, *ad loc*. for an ingenious suggestion of Dan-jaan). Against this may be put the belief of Josephus (comp. *Ant.* 1:10, 1, with v. 3, 1) and of Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Laisa, comp. with *Quaest. Hebr. in Genesim*, 14:14), who both unhesitatingly identify the Dan near Paneas with the Dan of Abraham.

b. That it is a prophetic anticipation by the sacred historian of a name which was not to exist till centuries later, just as Samson has been held to be alluded to in the blessing of Dan by Jacob. *c*. That the passage originally contained an older name, as Laish; and that, when that was superseded by Dan, the new name was inserted in the MSS. This last is Ewald's (*Gesch.* 1:73), and of the three is the most feasible, especially when we consider the characteristic, genuine air of the story in Judges, which fixes the origin of the name so circumstantially. Josephus (*Ant.* v. 3, 1) speaks positively of the situation of Laish as "not far from Mount Libanus and the springs of the lesser Jordan, near (κατά) the great plain of the city of Sidon" (compare also *Ant.* 8:8, 4); and this, as just said, he identifies with the Dan in Genesis 14:14 (*Ant.* 1:10, 1). In consonance with this are the notices of Jerome, who derives the word "Jordan" from the names of its two sources. In Deuteronomy 34:1, also, we find the phrase "all the land of Gilead unto Dan" employed by Moses some fifty years before the conquest of Leshem. The locality of the town is specified with some minuteness. It was "far from Zidon," and "in the valley (qm,[; *Emek*) that is by (l) Beth-rehob;" but as this latter place has not been identified with certainty, the position of Dan must be ascertained by other means. Josephus says that it stood at the "lesser" fountain of the Jordan . . . in the plain of Sidon, a day's journey from that city, and that the plain around it was of extraordinary fertility (*Ant.* 1:10, 1; v. 3, 1; 8:8, 4; *War*, 4:1, 1). Eusebius and Jerome are still more explicit — "A village, *four miles distant from Paneas*, on the road leading to Tyre; it was the boundary of Judaea (ὅριον τῆς Ἰουδαίας), and at it the Jordan took its rise." Jerome adds, "De quo et Jordanis flumen erumpens a loco sortitus est nomen. *Jor* quippe ῥεῖθρον, id est, fluvium sive rivum Hebraei vocant" (*Onomast.* s.v. Dan). Some writers, both ancient and modern, have confounded Dan with Paneas or Caesarea

Philippi (Philostorgius, History, 7:3*; Theodoret in Genes*.; Sanson, *Geog. Sac*. s.v.; Alford on Matthew 16:13). This error appears to have arisen chiefly from indefinite remarks of Jerome in his commentary on Ezekiel 48:18: "Dan . . . ubi hodie Paneas, quae quondam Caesarea Philippi vocabatur;" and on Amos viii, "Dan in terminis terrae Judaicae, *ubi nunc Paneas est*." It is plain from Jerome's words in the Onomasticon that he knew the true site of Dan, and therefore these notices must be understood as meaning that Caesarea Philippi was in his days the principal town in the locality where Dan was situated, and that both were upon the border of Palestine. The Jerusalem Targum calls it "Dan of Caesarea," intimating its vicinity to the latter (on Genesis 14:14; see Reland, *Paloest*. p. 919-21). In perfect agreement with this is the position of Tell el-Kadi, a mound from the foot of which gushes out "one of the largest fountains in the world," the main source of the Jordan (Robinson, *Later Res*. 3, 390-393). The tell itself, rising from the plain by somewhat steep terraces, has its long, level top strewed with ruins, and is very probably the site of the town and citadel of Daniel. The spring is called el-Leddan, possibly a corruption of Dan (Robinson, 3, 392), and the stream from the spring Nahr ed-Dhan (Wilson, 2:173), while the name, Tell el-Kadi, "the Judge's mound," agrees in signification with the ancient name. Those who have visited it give the exact agreement of the spot with — the requirements of the story in Judges 18 — '"a good land and a large, where there is no want of anything that is on the earth" (Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:320). Tell el-Kady is cup-shaped, resembling an extinct crater, and is covered with a dense jungle of thorns, thistles, and rank weeds. Its circumference is about half a mile, and its greatest elevation above the plain eighty feet. There are some traces of old foundations, and heaps of large stones on the top and sides of the southern part of the rim, where perhaps the citadel or a temple may have stood. There are also ruins in the plain a short distance north of the tell. There are doubtless other remains, but they are now covered with grass - and jungle. At the western base of the tell is the great fountain, and there is a smaller one within the cup, shaded by noble oak-trees (Porter, *Damascus*, 1:303). About a quarter of an hour north, Burckhardt noticed ruins of ancient habitations and the hill which overhangs the fountains appears to have been built upon, though nothing is now visible (Burckhardt, *Syria*, p. 42; Robinson, *Researches*, 3, 351-358).

3. "Dan also" stands in the A.V. as the rendering of ˆdw] (*Vedan*, lit. *and Dan*; Sept. translates undistinguishably), an Arabian city mentioned in

Ezekiel 27:19 as a place from which cloths, wrought iron, cassia, and other spices were brought to Tyre. By it is probably meant the city and mart of *Aden*, in connection with which Edrisi enumerates these very wares: "The town of Aden is small, but celebrated for its seaport, from which vessels sail bound for India, China, and neighboring countries, returning with cargoes of iron, Damascus sword-blades... cardamom, cinnamon . . myrobolan... and various kinds of rich figured and velvet stuffs" (i. 51). (See M'Culloch's *Gazetteer*, s.v. Aden). *SEE VEDAN*.

Dana, Daniel

D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Ipswich, Mass., July 24,1771, and was educated at Dartmouth College, where he graduated in 1788. For several years he was employed as a tutor. In 1793 he was licensed "as a qualified candidate preacher of the Gospel of Christ." In 1794 he was ordained pastor of the Presbyterian church in Newburyport, and after a successful ministry of twenty-six years was transferred to Hanover, New Hampshire, as president of Dartmouth College. He soon withdrew from that position as uncongenial with his feelings, and settled in Londonderry as pastor of the church, where he remained four years and a half. In 1826 he became pastor of the Second Presbyterian church at Newburyport, which position he resigned in 1845, in the seventy-fifth year of his age. Dr. Dana was regarded as "one of the most able, devoted, and useful ministers of the period in which he lived." He died August 26, 1859. He edited Gibbon's *Memoirs of Pious Women* (1802), and Flavel's *Works*, and published numerous tracts and sermons. — Wilson, *Presbyterian Almanac*, 1861, p. 84; *Princeton Review*, Jan. 1867; Sprague, *Life of Daniel Dana, D.D.* (Boston, 1866).

Dana

James, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in Cambridge 1735, graduated at Harvard 1753, and in 1758 was installed pastor at Wallingford, Conn. He became pastor of the First Church, New Haven, 1789; was dismissed July 30, 1805; and died Aug. 18, 1812. He was made D.D. by the University of Edinburgh, 1768. Dr. Dana published "*An Examination of Edwards on the Will*" (anon. 1770*); "An Examination of the Same, continued*" (1773); and a number of occasional sermons. In his writings in reply to Edwards, he held "that men themselves are the only efficient causes of their own volitions; nor do they always determine

according to the greatest apparent good; the affections do not follow the judgment; men sin against light, with the wiser choice, the greater good full in their view. Through the impetuosity of their passions, they determine against the greatest apparent good. This is the case with every sinner who resolves to delay repentance to a future time. Self-determination is the characteristic of every moral agent. The absence of liberty he deemed inconsistent with moral agency; and by liberty he meant, not merely liberty in regard to the external action, but liberty of volition; an exemption from all circumstances and causes having a controlling influence over the will-a self-determining power of man, as a real agent, in respect to his own volitions. On the whole, he regarded the scheme of Edwards as acquitting the creature of blame, and impeaching the truth and justice of the Creator." — Sprague, *Annals*, 1:565.

Danaba

(Δάναβα), a small town placed by Ptolemy (v. 15, 24) in Palmyrene, a subdivision of his Coele-Syria; also mentioned under the name Danabe in the war between the emperor Julian and the Persians (Zozim. *Hist.* 3, 27, 7). It does not appear to correspond to any of the three places of a similar name mentioned by Eusebius (Δαναβά, Δαννέα) and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. Damnaba), lying in the region of Moabitis. It- was the seat of a bishopric (*Notit. Eccles.*), and has lately been identified by Porter (*Damascus*, 1:346) — from an Arabic MS. written in the 7th century by Macarius — with Saidnaya, now a large village at the foot of Anti-Lebanon, with a convent and extensive ruins (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 306).

Danseus, Or Daneau Lambert,

an eminent French Protestant divine, was born at Orleans, 1530. He first studied law, afterwards theology, and became minister at Geneva, and subsequently at Leyden; finally at Orthez, in Navarre, where he died in 1595. He was the first writer who treated Christian ethics separately from theology (*Ethices Christiance lib.* 3, Genev. 1577). He was a strong Calvinist, as shown in his Loci Communes. He edited portions of Augustine, and wrote largely in controversy. We have in English his *Commentary on the Minor Prophets*, translated by Stockwood (Lond. 1594, 4to). See Haag, *La France Protestante*, 4:192; *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1850, p. 22.

Dance

This act is usually denoted in Hebrews by some form of lWj, *chul*, which literally signifies to twist (and is often applied to writhing under pain, as of birth, or trembling under fear), and hence probably refers to the whirling motions of the Oriental sacred dances (Judges 21:21, 23; Psalm 30:11; 149:3; 150:4; Jeremiah 31:4, 13; Lamentations 5:15; Exodus 15:20; 32:19; Judges 11:34; 1 Samuel 18:6; 21:21; 29:5; Song of Solomon 6:13). A similar idea of moving in a circle is radically contained in the word ggj; *chagag'*, translated "dancing" in 1 Samuel 30:16. Another term thus rendered (Ecclesiastes 3:4, Job 21:11; Isaiah 13:21; 1 Chronicles 15:29) is dqir; *rakad'*, which simply means to skip or leap for joy, as it is elsewhere rendered, and is nearly equivalent to a fourth term thus translated (2 Samuel 6:14, 16), rrK; *karat'*, which means to jump or spring. In the New Test. the terms translated "dance" are χορός (radically expressive of the same idea of circular motion), applied to a festive occasion in connection with music (Luke 15:25), and ὀρχέομαι, literally to leap up and down, but conventionally used in later times to denote a regular dance according to rule, either in concert (Matthew 11:17; Luke 7:32) or by a single person, especially in the elaborate pantomime dance of Roman times (Matthew 14:6; Mark 6:22). (See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Antiq.* s.v. Saltatio, Pantomimus.)

As emotions of joy and sorrow universally express themselves in movements and gestures of the body, efforts have been made among all nations, but especially among those of the South and East, in proportion as they seem to be more demonstrative, to reduce to measure and to strengthen by unison the more pleasurable — those of joy. The dance is spoken of in holy Scripture universally as symbolical of some rejoicing, and is often coupled for the sake of contrast with mourning, as in Ecclesiastes 3:4, "a time to mourn and a time to dance" (comp.Psalm 30:11; Matthew 11:17). Children dance spontaneously (Job 21:11; Matthew 11:17; Luke 7:32).

Picture for Dance 1

1. At a very early period, dancing was enlisted into the service of religion among the heathen; the dance, enlivened by vocal and instrumental music, was a usual accompaniment in all the processions and festivals of the gods (Strabo, 10); and, indeed, so indispensable was this species of violent

merriment, that no ceremonial was considered duly accomplished-no triumph rightly celebrated, without the aid of dancing. The Hebrews, in common with other nations, had their sacred dances, which were performed on their solemn anniversaries, and other occasions of commemorating some special token of the divine goodness and favor, as means of drawing forth, in the liveliest manner, their expressions of joy and thanksgiving. The performers were usually a band of females, who, in cases of public rejoicing, volunteered their services (Exodus 15:20; 1 Samuel 18:6), and who, in the case of religious observances, composed the regular chorus of the temple (Psalm 149:3; 150:4), although there are not wanting instances of men also joining in the dance on these seasons of religious festivity. Thus David deemed it no way derogatory to his royal dignity to dance on the auspicious occasion of the ark being brought up to Jerusalem (2 Samuel 6:14, 16). The word used to describe his attitude is significant of violent efforts of leaping (z[Al kB] rKe]km, rKe]km] zZpm); and, from the apparent impropriety and indecency of a man advanced in life, above all a king, exhibiting such freaks, with no other covering than a linen ephod, many learned men have declared themselves at a loss to account for so strange a spectacle. It was, unquestionably, done as an act of religious homage; and when it is remembered that the ancient Asiatics were accustomed, in many of their religious festivals, to throw off their garments even to perfect nudity, as a symbol sometimes of penitence, sometimes of joy, and that this, together with many other observances that bear the stamp of a remote antiquity, was adopted by Mohammed, who has enjoined the pilgrims of Mecca to encompass the Kaaba clothed only with the *ihram*, we may perhaps consider the linen ephod, which David put on when he threw off his garments and danced before the ark, to be symbolic of the same objects as the *ihram* of the Mohammedans (see Foster's *Mohammedanism Unveiled*). The conduct of David was imitated by the later Jews, and the dance was incorporated among their favorite usages as an appropriate close of the joyous occasion of the feast of Tabernacles. "The members of the Sanhedrim, the rulers of the synagogues, doctors of schools, and all who were eminent for rank or piety, accompanied the sacred music with their voices, and leaped and danced with torches in their hands for a great part of the night, while the women and common people looked on." This strange and riotous kind of festivity was kept up till exhaustion and sleep dismissed them to their homes (Buxtorf, *De Synag. Jud*. cap. 21).

The character of the ancient dance was very different from that of ours, as appears from the conduct of Miriam, who “took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dances.” Precisely similar is the Oriental dance of the present day, which, accompanied of course with music, is led by the principal person of the company, the rest imitating the steps. The evolutions, as well as the songs, are extemporaneous — not confined to a fixed rule, but varied at the pleasure of the leading dancer; and yet they are generally executed with so much grace, and the time so well kept with the simple notes of the music, that the group of attendants show wonderful address and propriety in following the variations of the leader’s feet. The missionary Wolff describes a festival of some Eastern Christians, where one eminent individual, who led the song as well as the dance, conducted through the streets of the city a numerous band of people, who leaped and danced in imitation of the gestures used by him. When the late deputation of the Church of Scotland were on their way through Palestine, their young Arab guides, to relieve the tedium of the journey, sometimes “commenced a native song and dance; one of them, advancing a little before the rest, began the song, dancing forward as he repeated the words; when the rest, following him in regular order, joined in the chorus, keeping time by a simultaneous clapping of hands. They sang several Arabian songs, responding to one another, dancing and clapping their hands.” In their “dancing dervishes” the Turks seem to have adopted into their system the enthusiastic raptures, at once martial and sacred, which (e.g. in the Roman *Salii*) seem indigenous in many Southern and Eastern races from the earliest times.

In the earlier period dancing is found combined with some song or *refrain* (Exodus 15:20; 32:18, 19; 1 Samuel 21:11); and with the ãTo or tambourine (A. V. “timbrel”), more especially in those impulsive outbursts of popular feeling which cannot find sufficient vent in voice or in gesture singly. Nor is there any more strongly popular element traceable in the religion of the ancient Jews than the opportunity so given to a prophet or prophetess to kindle enthusiasm for Jehovah on momentous crises of national joy, and thus root the theocracy in their deepest feelings, more especially in those of the women, themselves most easily stirred, and most capable of exciting others. The dance was regarded even by the Romans as the worship of the body, and thus had a place among sacred things (Servius ad Virg. *Bucol*. v. 73). A similar sentiment is conveyed in Psalm 35:10: “All my bones shall say, Lord, who is like unto thee?” So the;tongue” is the

best member among many, the “glory” (Psalm 57:8) of the whole frame of flesh, every part of which is to have a share in the praises of God. Similarly among the Greeks is ascribed by Athenaeus to Socrates a fragment in praise of dancing (Athen. 14:627; comp. Arrian, *Alex*. 4:11). Plato certainly (*Leg*. 7:6) reckons dancing (ὄρχησις) as part of gymnastics (γυμναστική). So far was the feeling of the purest period of antiquity from attaching the notion of effeminacy to dancing, that the ideas of this and of warlike exercise are mutually interwoven, and their terms almost correspond as synonyms (Homer, II. 16:617; comp. Creuzer, *Symb*. 2:367; 4:474; and see especially Lucian, *De Salt*., passim). Women, however, among the Hebrews made the dance their especial means of expressing their feelings; and when their husbands or friends returned from a battle on behalf of life and home, they felt that they too ought to have some share in the event, and found that share in the dance of triumph welcoming them back. The “eating, and drinking, and dancing” of the Amalekites is recorded, as is the people’s “rising up to play” (qjɸj including a revelling dance), with a tacit censure; the one seems to mark the lower civilization of the Amalekites, the other the looseness of conduct into which idolatry led the Israelites (Exodus 32:0; 1 Corinthians 10:7; 1 Samuel 30:16). So, among the Bedouins, native dances of men are mentioned (Lynch, *Dead Sea*, p. 295), and are probably an ancient custom. The Hebrews, however, save in such moments of temptation, seem to have left dancing to the women. But, more especially, on such occasions of triumph, any woman, whose nearness of kin to the champion of the moment gave her a public character among her own sex. seems to have felt that it was her part to lead such a demonstration of triumph or of welcome; so Miriam (Exodus 15:20), and so Jephthah’s daughter (Judges 11:34), and similarly there no doubt was, though none is mentioned, a chorus and dance of women led by Deborah, as the song of the men by Barak (comp. Judges 5:1 with Exodus 15:1, 20). Similarly, too, Judith (15:12, 13) leads her own song and dance of triumph over Holofernes. There was no such leader of the choir mentioned in the case of David and Saul. Hence, whereas Miriam “answered” the entire chorus in Exodus 15:21, the women in the latter case “answered one another as they played” (1 Samuel 18:7), that “answer” embodying the sentiment of the occasion, and forming the burden of the song. The “coming out” of the women to do this (Judges 11:34; 1 Samuel 18:6; comp. “Went out,” Exodus 15:20) is also a feature worthy of note, and implies the object of meeting, attending upon, and conducting home. So Jephthah’s daughter met her father, the “women of all the cities” came

to meet and celebrate Saul and David, and their host, but Miriam in the same way "goes out" before "Jehovah" the "man of war," whose presence seems implied. This marks the peculiarity of David's conduct when, on the return of the ark of God from its long sojourn among strangers and borderers, he (2 Samuel 6:5-22) was himself *choregus*; and here, too, the women, with their timbrels (see especially ver. 5, 19, 20, 22), took an important share. This fact brings out more markedly the feelings of Saul's daughter Michal, keeping aloof from the occasion, and "looking through a window" at the scene. She should, in accordance with the examples of Miriam, etc., have herself led the female choir, and so come out to meet the ark and her lord. She stays with the "household" (ver. 20), and "comes out to meet" him with reproaches, perhaps feeling that his zeal was a rebuke to her apathy. It was before "the handmaids," i.e. in leading that choir which she should have led, that he had "uncovered" himself; an unkingly exposure as she thought it, which the dance rendered necessary — the wearing merely the ephod or linen tunic. The occasion was meant to be popularly viewed in connection with David's subjugation of various enemies and accession to the throne of Israel (see 1 Chronicles 12:23-13:8); he accordingly thinks only of the honor of God who had so advanced him, and in that forgets self (comp. Müller, *De Davide ante Arc*. Ugolini, 32). From the mention of "damsels," "timbrels," and "dances" (Psalm 68:25; 149:3; 150:4) as elements of religious worship, it may perhaps be inferred that David's feeling led him to incorporate in its rites that popular mode of festive celebration. This does not seem to have survived him, for as Saalschitz remarks (*Archaol*. *der Hebr*. 1:299), in the mention of religious revivals under Hezekiah and Josiah, no notice of them occurs; and this, although the "words," the "writing," and the "commandment of David" on such subjects are distinctly alluded to (2 Chronicles 29:30; 35:4, 15). It is possible that the banishing of this popular element, which found its vent no doubt in the idolatrous rites of Baal and Astarte (as it certainly did in those of the golden calf, Exodus 32:19), made those efforts take a less firm hold on the people than they might have done, and that David's more comprehensive scheme might have retained some ties of feeling which were thus lost. On the other hand was doubtless the peril of the loose morality which commonly attended festive dances at heathen shrines. Certainly in later Judaism the dance was included among some religious festivities, e.g. the feast of tabernacles (Mishna, *Succah*, v. 3, 4), where, however, the performers were men. This was probably a mere following the example of David in the letter. Also in the earlier period of

the Judges the dances of the virgins in Shiloh (Judges 21:19-23) were certainly part of a religious festivity. It seems also from this last instance clear, and from the others probable, that such dances were performed by maidens apart from men, which gives an additional point to the reproach of Michal. What the fashion or figure of the dance was is a doubtful question, nor is it likely to have lacked such variety as would adapt it to the various occasions of its use. The terms employed, however, all point to dancing in a ring. In modern Oriental dances a woman leads off the dance, the others then follow her with exact imitation of her artistic and graceful attitudes. A parallelism of movement is also incident to it (Saalschiitz, *ib*. p. 301). Possibly Miriam so led her countrywomen. The same writer thinks that in Song of Solomon 6:13, the words tljom]µynjMh (A.V. "company of two armies") imply two rows of dancing girls, and that the address in the singular number, "return, return," and again in 7:1, applies to the movements of the individual performer in a kind of *contre-danse*. This interpretation, however, does not remove the obscurities of the passage.

Picture for Dance 2

From being exclusively, or at least principally, reserved for occasions of religious worship and festivity, dancing came gradually to be practiced in common life on any remarkable seasons of mirth and rejoicing (Jeremiah 31:4; Psalm 30:11). In early times, indeed, those who perverted the exercise from a sacred use to purposes of amusement were considered profane and infamous; and hence Job. introduces it as a distinguishing feature in the character of the ungodly rich, that they encouraged a taste for dancing in their families (Job 21:11). During the classic ages of Greece and Rome society underwent a complete revolution of sentiment on this subject, insomuch that the Grecian poets represent the gods themselves as passionately fond of the diversion (Potter's Grec. *Antiq.* ii. 400), and that not only at Rome, but through all the provinces of the empire it was a favorite pastime, resorted to not only to enliven feasts, but in the celebration of domestic joy (Luke 15:25; Matthew 14:6). Notwithstanding, however, the strong partiality cherished for this inspiriting amusement, it was considered beneath the dignity of persons of rank and character to practice it. The well-known words of Cicero, that "no one dances unless he is either drunk or mad," express the prevailing sense as to the impropriety of respectable individuals taking part in it; and hence the gay circles of Rome and its provinces derived all their entertainment, as is done in the

East to this day, from the exhibitions of professional dancers. Under the patronage of the emperors, and of their luxurious tributaries, like Herod, the art was carried to the utmost perfection, the favorite mode being pantomime, which, like that of the modern Almahs or Arab women, was often of the most licentious description (see Lane's *Mod. Eg*. 2:105-9; St. John's *Nubia*, p. 268 sq.). A story of love was chosen-generally an adventure of the gods-as the plan of the dance, and the address of the performer consisted in representing, by the waving of his hands, the agility of his limbs, and the innumerable attitudes into which he threw himself, all the various passions of love, jealousy, disgust, that sway the human breast. (See at large Lucian's *Treatise on Dancing*.)

Picture for Dance 3

Amateur dancing in high life was, as that writer informs us, by no means uncommon in the voluptuous times of the later emperors. But in the age of Herod it was exceedingly rare and almost unheard of, and therefore the condescension of Salome, who volunteered, in honor of the anniversary of that monarch's birthday, to exhibit her handsome person as she led the mazy dance in the saloons of Machaerus for, though she was a child at this time, as some suppose (Michaelis, *Introd*.), she was still a princess — was felt to be a compliment that merited the highest reward. The folly and rashness of Herod in giving her an unlimited promise, great as they were, have been equaled and even surpassed by the munificence which many other Eastern monarchs have lavished upon favorite dancers. Shah Abbas (to mention only one anecdote of the kind), having been on a particular occasion extremely gratified with a woman who danced before him, and being at the time much intoxicated, made her a present of a magnificent khan that yielded him a considerable revenue. Next morning his minister reminded him of his extravagant liberality, whereupon, being now cool and ashamed of his folly, he sent for the dancer, and obliged her to be contented with a sum of money (Thevenot's *Trav. in Persia*, p. 100). It is by no means improbable that Herod too was flushed with wine, and that it was from fear he should retract his promise if she delayed till the morning that Herodias sent immediately for the head of the Baptist.

It remains to notice further that the Jewish dance was performed by the sexes separately. There is no evidence from sacred history that the diversion was promiscuously enjoyed, except it might be at the erection of the deified calf, when, in imitation of the Egyptian festival of Apis, all

classes of the Hebrews intermingled in the frantic revelry. In the sacred dances, although both sexes seem to have frequently borne a part in the procession or chorus, they remained in distinct and separate companies (Psalm 68:25; Jeremiah 31:13.)

Dancing formed a part of the religious ceremonies of the Egyptians, and was also common in private entertainments (see Wilkinson's *Anc. Eg.* abridgment, 1:133 sq.). Many representations of dances both of men and women are found in the Egyptian paintings. The "feast unto the Lord," which Moses proposed to Pharaoh to hold, was really a dance (gj; see above).

Picture for Dance 4

A modern Oriental dancing-party is thus described by Layard (*Nineveh.* 1:119): "The dance of the Arabs, the *Debkè*, as it is called, resembles in some respects that of the Albanians, and those who perform in it are scarcely less vehement in their gestures or less extravagant in their excitement than those wild mountaineers. They form a circle, holding one another by the hand, and, moving slowly round at first, go through a shuffling step with their feet, twisting their bodies into various attitudes. As the music quickens their movements are more active; they stamp with their feet, yell their war-cry, and jump as they hurry round the musicians. The motions of the women are not without grace; but as they insist on wrapping themselves in their coarse cloaks before they join in the dance, their forms, which the simple Arab shirt so well displays, are entirely concealed. When those who formed the debkè were completely exhausted by their exertions, they joined the lookers-on, and seated themselves on the ground. Two warriors of different tribes, furnished with shields and naked cimeters, then entered the circle, and went through the sword-dance. As the music quickened the excitement of the performers increased. The by-standers at length were obliged to interfere and to deprive the combatants of their weapons, which were replaced by stout staves. With these they belabored one another unmercifully, to the great enjoyment of the crowd. On every successful hit, the tribe to which the one who dealt it belonged set up their war-cry and shouts of applause, while the women deafened us with the shrill *tahlehl*, a noise made by a combined motion of the tongue, throat, and hand vibrated rapidly over the mouth. When an Arab or a Kurd hears this *tahlehl* he almost loses his senses through excitement, and is ready to commit any desperate act. A party of Kurdish jesters from the

mountains entertained the Arabs with performances and imitations more amusing than refined. They were received with shouts of laughter. The dances were kept up by the light of the moon the greater part of the night."

See Renz, *De saltationibus Jud. vett. relig*. (Lips. 1738); Danov, *De choreis sacris Ebr.* (Gryph. 1766); Spencer, *De saltat. vett. Hebr*. (in Ugolini *Thesaur.* 30); Zeltner, *De choreis vett. Hebr*. (Altorf. 1726); Altenon, *De choreis Paulo interdictis* (Misen. 1744); Bromel, *Festanze der ersten Christen* (Jen. 1701); Grunenberg, *De saltatione Christiano licita* (Rost. 1704,1719, 1730); Purmann, *De saltatione* (Freft. 1785); Burette (in the *Mem. de l'Acad. des Inscr*. 1:93 sq.); Bonnet, *Hist. de la Danse* (Par. 1724); Hecker, *Die Tanzwuth* (Berl. 1832). *SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS*.

Dancers

a sect which appeared on the Rhine and in the Netherlands about 1374. They paraded the streets, entered houses and churches half naked, crowned with garlands, dancing and singing, uttering unknown names, falling senseless on the ground, and exhibiting other marks of demoniacal agitation. It was customary for persons of both sexes, in their public worship, to begin dancing; and, holding each other's hands, to continue their extraordinary violence till they fell down on the ground breathless. They affirmed that during these intervals of vehement agitation they were favored with wonderful visions. They evinced open contempt for the authority, rites, and doctrines of the Roman Church, and were considered as possessed with devils. The same phenomena appeared at Strasburg in 1418. — Mosheim, *Ch. Hist.* 2:416; Gieseler, *Ch. History*, § 121.

Dancing

A form of religious dancing sometimes made part of the public worship of the early Christians. The custom was borrowed from the Jews, in whose solemn processions choirs of young men and maidens, moving in time with solemn music, always bore a part. It must not be supposed that the "religious dances" had any similarity to modern amusements; they were rather processions in which all who took part marched in time with the hymns which they sung. The custom was very early laid aside, probably because it might have led to the adoption of such objectionable dances as were employed in honor of the pagan deities. Prohibitions of dancing, as an amusement, abound in the Church fathers and in the decrees of the

councils. See Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. xvi, ch. xi, § 15. On dancing as an amusement, see Crane, *On Dancing*, N. Y. 12mo.

Dandini Girolamo,

a Roman theologian and papal legate, was born at Cesena in 1554. After being professor of philosophy at the University of Paris, and professor of theology at the University of Padua, he entered the order of Jesuits, and became its provincial in Poland and at Milan. In 1596 he was sent by Clement XI as nuncio to the Maronites in order to effect their union with the Church of Rome, but in this mission he was not successful. He died at Forli Nov. 29, 1634. He is the author of a work on *Ethica Sacra* (Cesena, 1651; Antw. 1676, fol.). He also published a report on his mission to the Maronites (*Missione Apostolica al Patriarcha e Maroniti del Monte Libano* (Cesena, 1656; Paris, 1675; English, 1698). According to the French translator, Richard Simon, Dandini gave an incorrect account of the creed of the Maronites. Pierer, *Univers. Lex.* 4:686; Hoefer, *Biog. Gen.* 12:910.

Danforth Calvin,

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Fort Covington, Franklin Co., N. Y., Nov. 28, 1809, was licensed to exhort in 1828, entered the Oneida Conference in 1830, was superannuated in 1834, went South for his health, and took a situation in an academy at Warrenton, Ga., still retaining his connection with the Church in the North. In 1837 he served for a time as professor of mathematics in Covington Manual Labor School, but his health soon failed. By medical advice he went to St. Augustine, Fla., where he died in great peace in May, 1839. Mr. Danforth endeared himself to thousands by his piety, zeal for education, love for souls, and eloquence. *Minutes of Conferences*, 2:675; Gorrie, *Black River Conf. Memorial.*

Danforth Joshua Noble, D.D.

a Presbyterian minister, was born in Pittsfield, Mass., in 1792. He was educated at Williams College, and in his last year there determined to devote himself to the ministry. After three years' study in the Princeton Theological Seminary (1818-21), he took his first pastoral charge at Newcastle, Del.; his second was at the City of Washington. After a short time spent in the service of the American Colonization Society, he became pastor of a Congregational Church at Lee, Mass., and afterwards of the

Second Presbyterian Church at Alexandria, Va., where he remained fifteen years. Everywhere his ministry was productive of abundant fruit. He was also a frequent writer in the periodical press. Finally he re-entered the service of the Colonization Society, and remained in it till a short time before his death, which occurred Nov. 14, 1861, at Washington. — Wilson, *Presbyterian Almanac*, 1863, p. 293.

Danforth Samuel,

a Congregational minister, was born at Framingham, Suffolk Co., England, September, 1626, and came with his father to New England in 1634. He graduated at Harvard in 1643, and was chosen tutor and fellow. In 1650 he was installed colleague pastor in Roxbury, where he labored during his life, which ended Nov. 19, 1674. He studied astronomy carefully, and published several almanacs, and astronomical and theological remarks upon the comet (1664). — Sprague, *Annals*, 1:138.

Danforth, Samuel,

son of the preceding, was born Dec. 18, 1666, and graduated at Harvard College in 1683. He was one of the most learned and eminent ministers of his day. In the beginning of the year 1705, through his labors, a deep impression was made upon the minds of his people, and a revival occurred, of which an account is given in some letters of Mr. Danforth, preserved in Prince's *Christian History*. He published a eulogy on Thomas Leonard, 1713, and the election sermon, 1714. He left behind him a manuscript Indian dictionary, a part of which is now in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society. It seems to have been formed from Eliot's Indian Bible, as there is a reference under every word to a passage of Scripture. He died Nov. 14, 1727.

Dan'iel

Picture for Dan'iel

(Heb. and Chald. — *Daniyel'*, לַאיֵנָד; also [Ezekiel 14:14, 20; 28:3] in the shorter form *Daniel'*, לֵאנָד; see below), the name of at least three men.

1. (Sept. Δαμνιήλ v. r. Δαλονία, Vulg. Daniel.) King David's second son, "born unto him in Hebron," "of Abigail the Carmelitess" (1 Chronicles 3:1), B.C. cir. 1051. In the parallel passage, 2 Samuel 3:3, he is called

CHILEAB. For the Jewish explanation of the origin of the two names, see Bochart, *Hierozoic*. 2:55, p. 663.

2. (Sept. and N.T. Δανιήλ, Josephus Δανιῆλος.) The celebrated prophet and minister at the court of Babylon, whose life and prophecies are contained in the book bearing his name. The exact meaning of the name is disputed. The full form (l aYeinD) is probably more correct, and in this the *yod* appears to be not merely formative, but a pronominal suffix (as hbyl ha; l ayerwx), so that the sense will be *God is my Judge* (C. B. Michaelis ap. Rosenmüller, *Schol*. § 1). Others interpret the word as the *Judge of God*, and the use of a *yod* formative is justified by the parallel of Melchizedek, etc. (Hitzig, § 2). This interpretation is favored by the Chaldaean name, Belteshazzar (rXiavif]l Be, 1:7, i.e. *the prince of Bel*; Sept. [Theod.]; Βαλτάσαρ; Vulg. *Baltassar*), which was given to Daniel at Babylon (Daniel 1:7), and contains a clear reference to his former name. Hitzig's interpretation ("Pala tschaiara = *Erndhrer und Verzehrer*") has nothing to recommend it. Such changes have been common at all times; and for the simple assumption of a foreign name, compare Genesis 41:45; Ezekiel 1:11; 5:14 (*Sheshbazzar*). *SEE NAME*.

Daniel was descended from one of the highest families in Judah, if not even of royal blood (Daniel 1:3; comp. Josephus, *Ant.* 10:10, 1; of Zedekiah, according to Epiphan. *Opp.* 2:242). Jerusalem was thus probably his birth-place, though the passage (Daniel 9:24) quoted in favor of that opinion is considered by many commentators as not at all conclusive. He appears to have possessed considerable personal endowments (Daniel 1:4). He was taken to Babylon (while yet a boy, according to Jerome, adv. Jovin. 1:276, ed. Ven.; of twelve years, says Ignatius, *ad Magnes*. p. 56, ed. Cotel.), together with three other Hebrew youths of rank, Ananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, at the first deportation of the people of Judah in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, B.C. 606. He and his companions were obliged to enter the service of the royal court of Babylon, on which occasion he received the Chaldaean name BELTESHAZZAR *SEE BELTESHAZZAR* (q.v.), according to Eastern custom when a change takes place in one's condition of life, and more especially if his personal liberty is thereby affected (comp. 2 Kings 23:34; 24:17; Esther 2:7; Ezra 5:14). In this his new career, Daniel received that thorough polish of education which Oriental etiquette renders indispensable in a courtier (comp. 3:6; Plato, *Alcib*. § 37), and was more especially instructed "in the writing and speaking Chaldaean" (Daniel 1:4),

that is, in the dialect peculiar to the Chaldaeans. *SEE CHALDEE LANGUAGE*. In this dialect were composed all the writings of the ecclesiastical order, containing the substance of all the wisdom and learning of the time, and in the knowledge of which certainly but few favored laymen were initiated. That Daniel had distinguished himself, and already at an early period acquired renown for high wisdom, piety, and strict observance of the Mosaic law (comp. Ezekiel 14:14, 20; 28:3; Daniel 1:8-16), is too evident from passages in the truly authentic Scriptures to require any additional support from the ill-warranted apocryphal stories concerning the delivery of Susannah by the wisdom of the lad Daniel, etc. A proper opportunity for evincing both the acuteness of his mind and his religious notions soon presented itself in the custom of the Eastern courts to entertain the officers attached to them from the royal table (Athenaeus, 4:10, p. 145, ed. Casaub.). Daniel was thus exposed to the temptation of partaking of unclean food, and of participating in the idolatrous ceremonies attendant on heathen banquets. Like Joseph in earlier times, he gained the favor of his guardian, and was divinely supported in his resolve to abstain from the "king's meat" for fear of defilement (Daniel 1:8-16). His prudent proceedings, wise bearing, and absolute refusal to comply with such customs, were crowned with the divine blessing, and had the most important results. Another reason of a sanitary nature may also be assigned for this temperance, as it is probable he was at this time undergoing the curative process after emasculation, in accordance with the barbarous custom of Oriental courts. *SEE EUNUCH*.

At the close of his three years' discipline (Daniel 1:5, 18), Daniel had an opportunity of exercising his peculiar gift (Daniel 1:17) of interpreting dreams (comp. Herod. 1:34; Diod. Sic. 2:29) on the occasion of Nebuchadnezzar's decree against the Magi (Daniel 2:14 sq.). In consequence of his success, by the divine aid — like Joseph of old in Egypt — he rose into high favor with the king, and was entrusted with two important offices — the governorship of the province of Babylon, and the head-inspectorship of the sacerdotal caste (Daniel 2). *SEE MAGI*. Considerably later in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar we find Daniel interpreting another dream of the king's, to the effect that, in punishment of his pride, he was to lose for a time his throne, but to be again restored to it after his humiliation had been completed (Daniel 4). Here he displays not only the most touching anxiety, love, loyalty, and concern for his princely benefactor, but also the energy and solemnity becoming his position,

pointing out with vigor and power the only course left for the monarch to pursue for his peace and welfare. Under the unworthy successors of Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel and his merits seem to have been forgotten, and he was removed from his high posts. His situation at court appears to have been confined to a very inferior office (comp. Daniel 8:27); neither is it likely that he should have retained his rank as head inspector of the *order of the Magians* in a country where these were the principal actors in effecting changes in the administration whenever a new succession to the throne took place. We thus lose sight of Daniel until the first year of king Belshazzar (Daniel 5:7, 8), when he was both alarmed and comforted by two remarkable visions (Daniel 7, 8), which disclosed to him: the future course of events, and the ultimate fate of the most powerful empires in the world, but in particular their relations to the kingdom of God, and its development to the great consummation. He afterwards interpreted the handwriting on the wall which disturbed the feast of Belshazzar (v. 10-28), though he no longer held his official position among the magi (Daniel 5:7, 8, 12), and probably lived at Susa (Daniel 8:2; comp. Joseph. *Ant.* 10:11, 7; Bochart, *Geogr. Sacr. 3,* 14). After the conquest of Babylon by the united powers of Media and Persia, Daniel, being made first of the “three presidents” of the empire (comp. 1 Esdras 3:9), seriously busied himself under the short reign (two years) of Darius the Mede or Cyaxares II with the affairs of his people and their possible return from exile, the term of which was fast approaching, according to the prophecies of Jeremiah. In deep humility and prostration of spirit he then prayed to the Almighty, in the name of his people, for forgiveness of their sins, and for the Divine mercy in their behalf; and the answering promises which he received far exceeded the tenor of his prayer, for the visions of the seer were extended to the end of Judaism (Daniel 9). In a practical point of view, also, Daniel appeared at that time a highly-favored instrument of Jehovah. Occupying, as he did, one of the highest posts of honor in the state, the strictness and scrupulousness with which he fulfilled his official duties could not fail to rouse envy and jealousy in the breasts of his colleagues, who well knew how to win the weak monarch, whom they at last induced to issue a decree imposing certain acts, the performance of which they well knew was altogether at variance with the creed of which Daniel was a zealous professor (comp. the apocryphal Bel and the Dragon). For his disobedience the prophet suffered the penalty specified in the decree; he was thrown into a den (q.v.) of lions, but was miraculously saved by the mercy of God — a circumstance which enhanced his reputation, and again raised him to the

highest posts of honor. He had at last the happiness to see his most ardent wishes accomplished — to behold his people restored to their own land. Though his advanced age would not allow him to be among those who returned to Palestine, yet did he never for a moment cease to occupy his mind and heart with his people and their concerns (Daniel 10:12). At the accession of Cyrus he still retained his prosperity (6. 28; comp. 1:21; Bel and the Dragons 2), though he does not appear to have remained at Babylon (comp. Daniel 1:21). In the third year of Cyrus he had a series of visions, in which he was informed of the minutest details respecting the future history and sufferings of his nation, to the period of their true redemption through Christ, as also a: consolatory notice to himself to proceed calmly and peaceably to the end of his days, and then await patiently the resurrection of the dead at the end of time.

From that period the accounts respecting Daniel are vague and confused (see Prideaux, *Connection*, 1:206). According to the Mohammedan tradition (D'Herbelot. *Bibl.* Or. 1:561) he returned to Judaea, held the government of Syria, and finally died at Susa (Rosenmüller, *Schol*. p. 5, n.), where his tomb is still shown (Ouseley's *Trav*. *in Persia*, 1:422; 3, 564), and is visited by crowds of pilgrims (see Loftus, *Trav*. *in Chaldaea*, p. 320 sq.). Ezekiel mentions Daniel as a pattern of righteousness (14:14, 20) and wisdom (28:3); and since Daniel was still young at that time, some have thought that another prophet of the name must have lived at some earlier time (Bleek), perhaps during the captivity of Nineveh (Ewald, *Die Propheten*, 2:560), whose fame was transferred to his later namesake. Hitzig imagines (Vorbemerk. § 3) that the Daniel of Ezekiel was purely a mythical personage, whose prototype is to be sought in Melchizedek, and that the character was borrowed by the author of the book of Daniel as suited to his design. These suppositions are favored by no internal probability, and are unsupported by any direct evidence. The order of the names "Noah, Daniel, and Job" (Ezekiel 14:14) seems to suggest the idea that they represent the first and last historic types of righteousness before the law and under it, combined with the ideal type (comp. Delitzsch, p. 271). On the other hand, the narrative in Daniel 1:11 implies that Daniel was conspicuously distinguished for purity and knowledge at a very early age (comp. the apocryphal *Hist. of Susan*. 45), and he may have been nearly forty years old at the time of Ezekiel's prophecy (B.C. 592). See Alexander, *De Daniele* (in his *Hist. Eccl.* 3, 566); Robinson, *Script. Char*. ii; M'Gavin, *Life of Daniel* (1832); Evans, *Script. Biog*. 2:174; Williams,

Char. of O.T. p. 301; Kennedy, *Daniel, his Life and its Lessons* (Lond. 1858); Knox; *Reflections on Daniel's Life and Character* (Lond. 1849). *SEE PROPHET*.

Allusion has been made above to the comparison which may be instituted between Daniel and Joseph, who stand at the beginning and the close of the divine history of the Jews as representatives of the true God in heathen courts (Auberlen, Daniel, p. 32,33). In this respect the position of Daniel must have exercised a powerful influence upon the form of the revelations conveyed through him; and in turn the authority which he enjoyed renders the course of the exile and the return clearly intelligible. By station, by education, and by character, he was peculiarly fitted to ful fil the work assigned to him. He was not only a resident in a foreign land, like Jeremiah or Ezekiel, but the minister of a foreign empire, and of successive dynasties (Daniel 2:48; 6:28). His political experience would naturally qualify him to give distinct expression to the characteristics of nations in themselves, and not only in their relation to God's people. His intellectual advantages were as remarkable as his civil dignity. Like the great lawgiver who was "trained in all the wisdom of the Egyptians," the great seel was trained in the secrets of Chaldaean wisdom, and placed at the head of the school of the Magi (Daniel 2:48). He was thus enabled to preserve whatever was true in the traditional teaching of the East, and to cast his revelations into a form suited to their special character. But, though engaged in the service of a heathen prince and familiar with Oriental learning, Daniel was from the first distinguished by his strict observance of the Mosaic law (1. 8-16; comp. 6:10, 11) In this way the third outward condition for his work was satisfied, and at the close of the exile he offered a pattern of holiness for the instruction of the Dispersion of after times (comp. Auberlen, DANIEL, p. 24, etc.). *SEE DANIEL, BOOK OF*.

Various apocryphal fragments attributed to Daniel are collected by Fabricius (*Cod. Pseud. V. T.* 1:1124), and his wisdom is extravagantly lauded by the Rabbins (Gemara, *Yoma*); but it is surprising that his fame in later times seems to have been obscured (Hottinger, *Hist. Orient.* 92). Comp. Epiph. *Vit. Dan.* ii, p. 243, ed. Petav.; *Vit. Dan.* ap. *Fabric.*; Josephus, *Ant.* 10:11, 7. *SEE DANIEL, APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS TO*.

Daniel, Book Of

This important and in many respects remarkable book takes its name not only from the principal person in it, but also and chiefly from him as its real

author, there being no just cause of doubt that, as the book itself testifies, it was composed by Daniel (Daniel 7:1, 28; 8:2; 9:2). It occupies, however, but a third rank in the Hebrew canon; not among the *Prophets*, but in the *Hagiographa*, owing apparently to the correct view of the composers of the canon, that Daniel did not exercise his prophetic office in the more restricted and proper sense of the term "prophecy," but stood to the theocracy in a different relation from those real prophets whose calling and profession consisted exclusively in declaring the messages they received, and in the communion which they held with God. These latter are termed, in the ancient Hebrew idiom, µyaybn] *prophets*, in contradistinction to µyzij ρ*seers*, who, though they were equally favored with divine revelations, were nevertheless not prophets by profession, a calling that claimed the entire service of a man's whole life. *SEE CANON*. The Babylonian exile supplied the outward training and the inward necessity for this last form of divine teaching; and the prophetic visions of Ezekiel form the connecting link between the characteristic types of revelation and prophecy (comp. Lucke, *Versuch*, 1:17 sq.; Hitzig, *Daniel, Vorbem*. § 9; Hilgenfeld, *Die Jud. Apok*. 1 sq.). This book has given rise to many and various polemical discussions both mi ancient and modern times.

1. The book of Daniel divides itself into two parts, *historical* (ch. 1-6) and *prophetic* (ch. 7-12), arranged respectively in chronological order. In the first seven chapters, accordingly, Daniel is spoken of historically (Daniel 1:8-21; 2:14-49; 4:8-27; 5:13-29; Daniel 6:2-28; 7:1, 2); in the last five he appears personally as the writer (Daniel 7:15-28; Daniel 8:1-9:22; 10:1-19; 12:5). Its object is by no means to give a summary historical account of the period of the exile, or of the life of Daniel himself, since it contains only a few isolated points both as to historical facts and prophetic revelations. But the plan or tendency which so consistently runs through the whole book is of a far different character; it is to show the extraordinary and wonderful means which the Lord made use of, in a period of the deepest miisery, when the theocracy seemed dissolved and fast approaching its extinction, to afford assistance to his people, proving to them that he had not entirely forsaken them, and making them sensible of the fact that his merciful presence still continued to dwell with them, even without the Temple and beyond the Land of Promise.

The wonders related in Daniel (ch. 1-6) are thus mostly of a peculiar, prominent, and striking character, and resemble in many respects those

performed of old time in Egypt. Their divine tendency was, on the one hand, to lead the heathen power, which proudly fancied itself to be the conqueror of the theocracy, to the acknowledgment that there was an essential difference between the world and the kingdom of God; and, on the other, to impress degenerate and callous Israel with the full conviction that the power of God was still the same as it was of old in Egypt.

The following are the essential features of the prophetic tenor of the book of Daniel, while the visions in ch. 2 and 7, together with their different symbols, may be considered as embodying the leading notion of the whole. The development of the whole of the heathen power, until the completion and glorification of the kingdom of God, appeared to the prophet in the shape of four powers of the world, each successive power always surpassing the preceding in might and strength, namely, the Babylonian, Medo-Persian, Greek, and Syrian (otherwise Roman). The kingdom of God proves itself conqueror of them all; a power which alone is everlasting, and showing itself in its utmost glorification in the appearance of the Messiah, as Judge and Lord of the world. Until the coming of the Messiah, the people of God have yet to go through a period of heavy trials. That period is particularly described, ch. 8 and 11, in the struggles of the Maccabaean time, illustrative of the last and heaviest combats which the kingdom of God would have to endure. The period until the appearance of the Messiah is a fixed and sacred number — seventy weeks of years (ch. 9). After the lapse of that period ensues the death of the Messiah; the expiation of the people is realized; true justice is revealed, but Jerusalem and the Temple are in punishment given up to destruction. The true rise from this fall and corruption ensues only at the end of time, in the general resurrection (ch. 12).

The interpretation of Daniel has hitherto proved an inexhaustible field for the ingenuity of commentators, and the certain results are comparatively few. According to the traditional view, which appears as early as the fourth book of Ezra, *SEE ESDRAS* and the epistle of Barnabas (ch. 4), the four empires described in ch. 2 and 7 are the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Greek, and the Roman. With nearly equal consent it has been supposed that there is a change of subject in the eleventh chapter (Daniel 11:31 sq.), by which the seer passes from the persecutions of Antiochus to the times of Antichrist. A careful comparison of the language of the prophecy with the history of the Syrian kings must, however, convince every candid student of the text that the latter hypothesis is wholly unfounded and arbitrary. The

whole of the eleventh chapter forms a history of the struggles of the Jewish Church with the Greek powers up to the death of its great adversary (Daniel 11:45). This conflict, indeed, has a typical import, and foreshows in its characteristic outlines the abiding and final conflict of the people of God and the powers of evil, so that the true work of the interpreter must be to determine historically the nature of each event signalized in the prophetic picture, that he may draw from the past the lesson of the future. The traditional interpretation of "the four empires" seems to spring from the same error as the other, though it still finds numerous advocates (Hofmann, Auberlen, Keil, Halvernick, Hengstenberg, and most English commentators). It originated at a time when the triumphant advent of Messiah was the object, of immediate expectation, and the Roman empire appeared to be the last in the series of earthly kingdoms. The long interval of conflict which has followed the first Advent formed no place in the anticipations of the first Christians, and in succeeding ages the Roman period has been unnaturally prolonged to meet the requirements of a theory that took its rise in a state of thought which experience has proved false. *SEE HORN, LITTLE*.

The parallel character and striking fulfillment of Daniel's predictions, many of which are carried out with a detail elsewhere unknown, may be seen from the following synoptical table. Those relating to the seventy weeks (Daniel 9:24-27) will be treated separately under that head.

2. The language of the book is partly Chaldee (Daniel 2:4; 7:28) and partly Hebrew. The latter is not unlike that of Ezekiel, though less impure and corrupt, and not so replete with anomalous grammatical forms. The Chaldee is noways that of the Chaldaeans *proper*, but a corrupt vernacular dialect, a mixture of Hebrew and: Aramaic, formed during the period of the exile. It resembles mostly the Chaldee pieces in Ezra, but differs greatly from the dialect of the later Targums (see Hilgenfeld, *Esra u. Daniel und ihre neuesten Bearbeitungen*, Halle, 1863). *SEE CHALDEE LANGUAGE*.

The *style* is, even in the prophetic parts, more prosaic than poetical, as Lowth has already observed. The historical descriptions are usually very broad and prolix in details; but the prophecies have a more rhetorical character, and their delivery is frequently somewhat abrupt; their style is descriptive, painting with the most lively colors the still fresh impression which the vision has made on the mental eye.

3. The *unity* of the book has been disputed by several critics, and more especially by Eichhorn and Bertholdt, who conceived it to have been written by more than one author, on account of some contradictions which they thought they had discovered in it, such as in Daniel 1:21, compared with Daniel 10:1; and in Daniel 1:5-18, compared with Daniel 2:1. With regard to the first supposed contradiction, we consider the meaning of Daniel 1:21, to be that Daniel had lived to see the first year of the reign of Cyrus, as a particularly memorable, and, for the exiled people, a very important year. This does by no means exclude the possibility of his having lived still longer than up to that period.

Picture for Daniel

Respecting the second presumed contradiction, the matter in Daniel 1:5-18, belongs properly to the co-regency of Nebuchadnezzar, which term is there added to his period of government, while in Daniel 2:1, his reign is counted only from the year of his actual accession to the throne. These attempts to disturb the harmony of the work are also discountenanced by the connecting thread which evidently runs through the whole of the book, setting the single parts continually in mutual relation to each other. Indeed, most critics have now given up that hypothesis, and look at the book as a closely connected and complete work in itself.

4. Much greater is the difference of opinion respecting the *authenticity* of the book. The oldest known opponent of it is the heathen philosopher Porphyry, in the third century of the Christian era. The greater the authority in which the book of Daniel was held at that time by both Jews and Christians in their various controversies, the more was he anxious to dispute that authority, and he did not disdain to devote one whole book (the twelfth) — out of the fifteen which he had composed against the Christians — to that subject alone. He there maintains that the author of the book of Daniel was a Palestinian Jew of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, that he wrote it in Greek, and fraudulently gave to past events the form of prophecies. Porphyry was answered by Eusebius of Caesarea, Methodius of Tyre, and Apollinaris of Laodicea. But their works, as well as that of Porphyry himself, are lost; and we know the latter only from the numerous quotations and refutations in the *Commentary* of Jerome.

Porphyry found no successor in his views until the time of the English deists, when Collins attempted to attack the authenticity of Daniel, as was

done by Semler in Germany. After this a few critics, such as J. D. Michaelis and Eichhorn, disputed the authenticity of the first six chapters. The learned Swiss, Corrodi (*Freimuth. Versuch*, etc., Berlin, 1783), went still further, and, reviving the views of Porphyry, questioned the genuineness of the whole book. The question of the authenticity of the book is discussed in most of the later commentaries, and specially by Hengstenberg (*Die Authentie der Daniel erwiesen*, 1831, translated by Ryland, Edinb. 1847, 8vo), Havernick (*Neue krit. Untersuch*. Hamb. 1838, 8vo), Delitzsch (in Herzog's *Encyklopadie*, s.v. 1854), Keil (*Lehrb. der Ein. in der A. T.* Frank. 1853, 8vo), Davidson (*Introduction to the O.T.* 2, Lond. 1846, 8vo, who maintain the affirmative; and by Bleek (*Berl. theolog. Zeitschr.* 3, 1822), Bertholdt (Einleit. *Erlang*. 1814), Lucke (*Versuch einer vollstind. Einl*. 2d ed. Bonn. 1852), and De Wette (*Einlit*. 7th ed. Berl. 1852), who deny its authenticity. See Ewald (*Die Proph. d. Alt. Bund.* 2:559 sq.).

The real grounds on which most modern critics rely in rejecting the book are the "fabulousness of its narratives" and "the minuteness of its prophetic history." "The contents of the book," it is said, "are irrational and impossible" (Hitzig, § 5). It is obvious that it is impossible to answer such a statement without entering into general views of the providential government of the world. It is admitted that the contents of the book are exceptional and surprising; but revelation is itself a miracle, however it be given, and essentially as inconceivable as any miracle. There are times, perhaps, when it is required that extraordinary signs should arrest the attention of men, and fix their minds upon that Divine Presence which is ever working around them. Prodigies may become a guide to nature. Special circumstances may, and, according to the Bible, usually do determine, the peculiar form which the miraculous working of God will assume at a particular time; so that the question is, whether there is any discernible relation between the outward wonders and the moral condition of an epoch. Nor is it impossible to apply this remark to the case of Daniel. The position which he occupied was as exceptional as the book which bears his name. He survived the exile and the disappointment which attended the first hopes of the Jews. The glories which had been connected with the return in the foreshortened vision of earlier prophets were now felt to be far off, and a more special revelation may have been necessary as a preparation for a period of silence and conflict. The very character of the Babylonian exile seems to have called for some signal exhibition of divine power. As the first exodus was distinguished by great marvels, it might

appear natural that the second should be also (comp. Micah 7:15; Delitzsch, p. 272, etc.). National miracles, so to speak, formed the beginning of the theocracy; personal miracles, the beginning of the Church. To speak of an "aimless and lavish display of wonders" is to disregard the representative silnilicance of the different acts, and the relation which they bore to the future fortunes of the people. A new era was inaugurated by fresh signs. The Jews, now that they were left among the nations of the world, looked for some sure token that God was able to deliver them and work out his own purposes. The persecution of Antiochus completed the teaching of Daniel; and the people no longer sought without what at length they had found within. They had withstood the assault of one typical enemy, and now they were prepared to meet all. The close of special predictions coincided with the consolidation of the national faith. *SEE ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES*.

The following are the more important of the arguments which evidence the genuineness of the book (see the works on the *Authenticity of Daniel*, by Boyle [Lond. 1863] and Waters [ib. eod.]).

(1.) The existence and authority of the book are most decidedly testified by the New Testament. Christ himself refers to it (Matthew 24:15), and gives to himself (in virtue of the expression in Daniel 7:13) the name of Son of Man; while the apostles repeatedly appeal to it as an authority (1 Corinthians 6:2; 2 Thessalonians 2:3). Apart from the general type of apocalyptic composition which the apostolic writers derived from Daniel (Rev. *passim*; comp. Matthew 26:64; 21:44?), the New Testament incidentally acknowledges each of the characteristic elements of the book, its miracles (Hebrews 11:33, 34), its predictions (Matthew 24:15), and its doctrine of angels (Luke 1:19, 26). To the objection that Christ and the writers of the New Testament are here no real authority, inasmuch as they accommodate themselves to the Jewish notions and views, we reply that the genuineness of the book of Daniel is so closely connected with the truth of its contents — in other words, that the *authenticity* of the book is so immediately connected with its *authority* — that it is impossible to doubt its *genuineness* without suspecting at the same time a willful cheat in its contents; so that the *accommodation* in this case to national views would be tantamount to willfully confirming and sanctioning an unpardonable fraud.

(2.) The period of the exile would be altogether incomprehensible without the existence of a man like Daniel, exercising great influence upon his own people, and effecting their return to Palestine by means of his high station in the state, as well as through the peculiar assistance of God with which he was favored. Without this assumption, it is impossible to explain the continued state of independence of the people of God during that period, or to account for the interest which Cyrus took in their affairs. The exile and its termination are indicative of uncommon acts of God towards highly-gifted and favored men; and the appearance of such a man as Daniel is described in that book as having been, is an indispensable requisite for the right understanding of this portion of the Jewish history.

(3.) An important hint of the existence of the book in the time of Alexander is found in Josephus (*Ant.* 11:8, 4), according to which the prophecies of Daniel had been pointed out to that king on his entrance into Jerusalem. It is true that the fact may have been somewhat embellished in its details by Josephus, yet is it historically undeniable that Alexander did bestow great favors on the Jews, a circumstance which is not easily explained without granting the fact recorded by Josephus to be true in the main. *SEE ALEXANDER (THE GREAT)*.

(4.) The first book of the Maccabees, which is almost contemporary with the events related in it, not only presupposes the existence of the book of Daniel, but actually betrays acquaintance with the Alexandrian version of the same (1 Maccabees 1:54; comp. Daniel 9:27; 2:59; comp. Daniel 3), a proof that the book must have been written long before that period.

(5.) If the book had been written in the Maccabsean period, there would probably have been produced in that period some similar prophetic and apocalyptic productions, composed by Palestinian Jews. Of such, however, not the slightest notice can anywhere be found; so that our book-if of the Maccabaean timeforms an isolated enigmatical phenomenon in the later Jewish literature.

(6.) The reception of the book into the canon is also an evidence of its authenticity. In the Maccabaean age the canon had long been completed and closed; but, even doubting that point, it is not likely that, at a time when so much scrupulous adherence was shown towards all that was hallowed by time and *old* usage, and when scriptural literature was already flourishing — it is not probable, we say, that a production then recent should have been raised to the rank of a canonical book.

(7.) We have an important testimony for the authenticity of the book in Ezekiel 14:14, 20; 28:3. Daniel is there represented as an unusual character, as a model of justice and wisdom, to whom had been allotted superior divine insight and revelation. This sketch perfectly agrees with that contained in our book.

(8.) The book betrays such an intimate acquaintance with Chaldaean manners, customs, history, and religion as none but a contemporary writer can fairly be supposed to possess. Thus, e.g. the description of the Chaldaean magians and their regulations perfectly agrees with the accounts of the classics respecting them. The account of the illness and insanity of Nebuchadnezzar is confirmed by Berosus (in Joseph. c. *Apion*. 1:20). The edict of Darius the Mede (Daniel 5) may be satisfactorily explained from the notions peculiar to the Medo-Persian religion, and the importance attached in it to the king, who was considered a sort of incarnate deity. The scene and characters of the book are *Oriental*. The colossal image- (צלם Daniel 3, 1, not necessarily a human figure; the term is applied familiarly to the *cross*, Buxtorf, *Lex. Rabb.* s.v.), the fiery furnace, the martyr-like boldness of the three confessors (Daniel 3:16), the decree of Darius (Daniel 6:7), the lions' den (Daniel 6:7, 19, בגב), the demand of Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 2:5), his obeisance before Daniel (Daniel 2:46), his sudden fall (Daniel 4:33; comp. Eusebius, *Praep. Ev*. 9:41; Joseph. c. Ap. 1:20), are not only consistent with the nature of Eastern life, but in many instances directly confirmed by other evidence. *SEE DARIUS THE MEDE* for the difficulties of Daniel 1:1; 2:1; 5:31.

(9.) The religious views, the ardent belief in the Messiah, the purity of that belief, the absence of all the notions and ceremonial practices of later Judaism, etc., the agreement of the book in these respects with the genuine prophetic books, and more especially with the prophets in and after the exile-all this testifies to the genuineness of Daniel. In doctrine the book is closely connected with the writings of the exile, and forms a last step in the development of the ideas of Messiah (Daniel 7:13, etc.), of the resurrection (Daniel 12:2, 3), of the ministry of angels (Daniel 8:16; 12:1, etc.), of personal devotion (Daniel 6:10, 11; 1:8), which formed the basis of later speculations, but received no essential addition in the interval before the coming of our Lord.

(10.) The linguistic character of the book is most decisive for its authenticity. In the first instance, the language in it, by turns Hebrew and

Arammean, is particularly remarkable. In that respect the book bears a close analogy to that of Ezra. The author must certainly have been equally conversant with both languages — an attainment exactly suited to a Hebrew living in the exile, but not in the least so to an author in the Maccabaean age, when the Hebrew had long since ceased to be a living language, and had been supplanted by the Aramaean vernacular dialect. The Hebrew in Daniel bears, moreover, a very great affinity to that in the other later books of the Old Testament, and has, in particular, idioms in common with Ezekiel. The Aramaic, also, in the book differs materially from the prevailing dialect of the later Chaldaean paraphrastic versions of the Old Testament, and has much more relation to the idiom of the book of Ezra. Nor is the mention of Greek musical instruments (3, 5, 7, 10, srtyqi, κίθαρα; akBsiσαμβυκή; hynPmls, συμφωνία; (^yriT]sP], ψαλτήριον), for these words only can be shown to be derived from the Greek (De Wette, *Einl*. p. 255 b.), other than suitable to a time when the intercourse of the East and West was already considerable, and when a brother of Alcaeus (B.C. 600-500) had gained distinction "at the farthest end of the world, aiding the Babylonians" (Alc. *Frag*. 33, Bergk.; Brandis, in Delitzsch, p. 274). (For a full view of the criticism, history, and literature of the book of Daniel, see Stuart's *Commentary*, p. 373-496.)

5. There is no Chaldee *translation* of Daniel, and the deficiency is generally accounted for, as in the parallel case of Ezra, by the danger which would have existed in such a case of confounding the original text with the paraphrase; but, on the other hand, the whole book has been published in Hebrew. Kennicott prepared a special commentary on the Chaldee portions (ed. Schulze, Hal. 1782, 8vo); comp. Bird (*Lectures*, Lond. 1845).

The Greek version has undergone singular changes. At an early time the Sept. translation was supplanted in the Greek Bibles by that of Theodotion, which in the time of Jerome was generally "read by the churches" (c. *Ruffin*. 2:33; *Praef. in Comm.*). This change, for which Jerome was unable tf account (*Praef. in Vers, Dan.*), may have been made in consequence of the objections which were urged against the corrupt Sept. text in controversy with Jews and heathen. The Sept. version was certainly very unfaithful (Jerome, 1. c.); and the influence of Origen, who preferred the translation of Theodotion (Jerome in Daniel 4:6), was probably effectual in bringing about the substitution (comp. *Credner*, *Beitr*. 2:256 sq.). In the course of time, however, the version of Theodotion was interpolated from the Sept., so that it is now impossible to recover the original text. Comp.

Wald, *Curae in hist. textus Dan*. (Lips. 1783). *SEE DANIEL, APOCRYPHAL ADDITIONS TO*. Meanwhile the original Sept. translation passed entirely out of use, and it was supposed to have been lost till the last century, when it was published at Rome from a *Codex Chisianus (Daniel secundum LXX*. . . . Romas, 1772, ed. P. de Magistris), together with that of Theodotion, and several illustrative essays. It has since been published several times (ed. Michaelis, Gotting. 1774; ed. Segaar, Utrecht, 1775; ed. Hahn, Lpz. 1845), and lastly by Tischendorf in the second edition of his Septuagint (Lips. 1856). Another recension of the text is contained in the Syro-Hexaplaric version at Milan (ed. Bugatus, 1788); but a critical comparison of the several recensions is still required. *SEE SEPTUAGINT*.

On other ancient versions, see Munter, *Spec. versionumn Daniel Copticarum.* etc. (Romans 1786); Wald, *Ueb. d. Arab. Uebers. d. Dan*. (in Eichhorn's *Repertor*. 14:205 sq.). *SEE VERSIONS*.

6. The *commentaries* on Daniel are very numerous. Those in Hebrew by R. Saadiah Haggaon († 942), Rashe († c. 1105), and Aben Ezra († c. 1167), are printed in the great Rabbinic Bibles of Bomberg and others. That of Abarbanel († c. 1507) has been printed separately several times (Amst. 1647, 4to), and others are enumerated below. Among the patristic commentaries the most important is that of Jerome (vol. v, ed. Migne), who noticed especially the objections of Porphyry; also those of Chrysostomn (*Opera,* 6:228), Theodoret (2. 1053 sq., ed. Schulze; *interp. Gabio, Rom*. 1562, fol.), and Ephraem Syrus (*Op. Syr. ii, Romae*, 1740). 'There are also annotations by Rupert Tuitiensis (*Opera,* 1:520), Thos. Aquinas [rather Thos. Wallensis] (*Commentarii*, etc., Paris, 1641, fol.), Albertus Magnus (*Opera,* viii), and Peter the Archdeacon (*Martene and Durand's Collectio,* 9:275). Considerable fragments remain of the commentaries of Hippolytus (collected in Migne's edition, Paris, 1857) and Polychronius (Mai, *Script. Vet. Nov. Coll*. vol. i); and Mai has published (*ib*.) a catena on Daniel, containing fragments of Apollinarius, Athanasius, Basil, Eusebius, and many others. The chief reformers, Luther (*Auslegung d. Proph. Daniel* 1530-1546; *Op. Germ. vi, ed*. Walch), Ecolampadius (*In Daniel libri duo,* Basil. 1530), Melancthon (*Comm. in Daniel proph*. Vitemb. 1543), and Calvin (*Praelect. in Daniel Geneve*, 1563, etc.; in French, 1565; in English, Lond. 1852-3), wrote on Daniel; also Joachim the Abbot (Ven. 1519, 4to). A comparison of the prophecies of Daniel with the visions of the Apocalypse (Newton, *On the Prophecies*, London, 1733, 4to) opened the way to a true understanding of Daniel. Auberlen

(*Der Proph. Daniel u. d. Ojfenbarung Joh*. etc. 2d ed. Basel, 1857, translated into English from the 1st ed. by Saphir, 1856, 12mo) has thrown considerable light upon the general construction and relations of the book. Comp. Hofmann, *Weissag. u. Erfullung*, 1:276 sq.; Burton, *Numbers of Daniel and John* (Norw. 1766-8); Anon., *Seven prophetical Periods* (Lond. 1790); Birks, *The four prophetic Empires* (London, 1844), and *The two later Visions of Daniel* (ib. 1846); Elliott, *Horce Apocalyptice* (Lond. 1844); Tregelles, *Remarks on the prophetic Visions of Daniel* (Lond. 1852); Stuart, *Hints on Prophecy* (Andov. 1844); Desprez, *Daniel the Apocalypse of the O.T.* (Lond. 1865, 8vo). *SEE REVELATION*. Among subsidiary works additional to the above may be named Bleek, *Weissag. in D.* (in the *Jahrb. f. Deutsche Theol.* 1860, v); Walter, *Genuineness of Daniel* (Lond. 1862); Baxmann, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1863, 4; Fuller, *Authenticity of Daniel* (Cambr. 1864); *Bosanquet, Inspiration of Daniel* (Lond. 1866); Harman, in the *Meth. Quart. Rev*. Oct. 1854.

Other special exegetical works on the entire book. or principal portions of it, are the following, of which the most important are designated by an asterisk (*) prefixed: Bafiolas, vWdPe(s. 1. ante 1480, 4to; and in the *Rabb.* Bibles); Alscheich, ˆ/rVhitlXbij}(Safet, 1568, 4to, and since); Teitsak, µyritsµj,l,(Ven. 1608, 4to); Joy, *Exposition* (Genev. 1545, 16mo; Lond. 1550, 8vo); Draconites, *Commentarius* (Marb. 1544, 8vo); *Suaningius, *Commentarii* (Havn. 1554-66, also 1688, 2 vols. fol.); Strigelius, *Concio* (Lips. 1565,1571, 1572, 8vo); Selnecker, *Erklrung* (Jen. 1567,1608, 4to); Wigand, *Explicatio* (Jen. 1571, Erf. 1581, 8vo); Bullinger, *Homiliae* (Tigur. 1576, fol.); Pintus, *Commentarii* (Conimb. 1582, 8vo; Ven. 1583, 4to; Colon. 1587, Antw. 1595, 8vo); Pererius, *Commentarii* (Rom. 1586, fol.; Lugd. 1588, 4to; 1591, 1602, 8vo; Antw. 1594, 4to); Heilbrunner, *Loc communes* (Lauing. 1587, 8vo); Marcellinus, *Commentarius* (Ven. 1588, 4to); Rollock, *Commentariets* (Edinburgh, 1591, 8vo; Basil. 1594, 4to; Genev. 1598, 8vo; 1670, 4to); Junius, *Expositio* (Heidelb. 1593, Genev. 1594, 4to); Broughton, *Annotations* (in *Works*, p. 164, 261; in Lat. ed. Boreel, Basil. 1599, 4to); Polanus, *Commentarius* (Basil. 1599, 4to; 1606, 8vo); Gesner, *Disputationes* (Viteb. 1601, 4to; 1607, 1611, 1638, 8vo); Elucidarius (ib. 1658, 8vo); Veldius, *Commentarius* (Antw. 1602, 8vo); Leyser, *Commentarius* (in 6 parts, Darmst. and Francof. 1609-10, 4to); Willet, *Hexzspla* (Cantuar. 1610, fol.); Veld, *Commentarius* (Antwerp, 1611, 4to); Sanctius, *Commentarius* (Lugd. 1612, fol.); Rhumelius, *Paraphrasis* (Norimb. 1616,

8vo); Angelocrator, *Erklarung* (Cassel, 1638, 4to); Alsted, *Trifolium* (Herb. 1640, 4to); Huit, *Paraphrase* (London, 1643, 4to); Brightman, *Exposition* (ib. 1644, 4to); Parker, *Exposition* (ib. 1646, 4to); *Geier, *Praelectiones* (Lips. 1667, 1684, 1697, 1702, 4to); Varenius, *Animadversio* (Rost. 1667, 4to); Wingendorp, *Paraphrasis* (Leyd. 1674,1680, 8vo); Jungmann, *Commentarius* (Cass. 1681, 4to); Moore, *Exposition* (Lond. 1681, 4to); *Answers* (ib. 1684, 4to); *Supplement* (ib. 1685, 4to); *Notes* (ib. 1685, 4to); Bekker, *Vitlegginge* (Amst. 1688,1698, 4to); Meissner, *Amerkungen* (Hamb. 1695, 12mo); Anon., *Explanation* (Lond. 1700, 12mo); Kerkhedere, *Prodromus* (Lovan. 1710, 8vo); Wells, *Help, etc*. (Lond. 1716, 8vo); Friderici, *Daniel et ejus vaticinia* (Lpz. 1716, 4to); Musaus, *Schola* (Quedlinb. 1719, 4to); — Michaelis, *Annotationes* (Hal. 1720, 4to); Petersen, Sinn, etc. (F. *ad* M. 1720, 4to); Koch, *Auslejung* (Lemg. 1740, 4to); Venema, *Dissertationes* (Leid. 1745, 1752, 1768, 4to); Petri, *Zahlen Daniels* (Offenb. 1768, 8vo); Roos, *Auslegung* (Lpz. 1771, 8vo; tr. into *Engl.* Edinb. 1811, 8vo); Harenberg, *Asfilarung* (Blankenb. and Quedlinb. 1773, 4to); Scharfenberg, *Animadversiones* (Lips. 1774, 8vo); Segaar, *Animadversiones* (Utr. 1775, 8vo); *Ammer*, *Essay*, etc. (Lond. 1776, 8vo); Zeis, *Erklar*ung (Dresd. 1777, 8vo); Holber, *D. Zeiten in d. Danielschen Weisag*. (Frkf. and Lpz. 1777, 8vo); Wald, *Curse* (Lips. 1783, 4to); Muller, *Animadversiones* (Heidelb. 1786, 4to); Luderwald, *Prifung* (Helmst. 1787, 8vo); Volborth, *Ammerkungen* (Hanover, 1788, 8vo); Anon., *Briefe* (in Beytrage zum Denken in d. Rel. pt. 9); Kemmericb, *Uebers. etc*. (Helmst. 1791, 2 vols. 8vo); *Wintle, *Notes*, etc. (Oxf. 1792, 4to; Lond. 1807. 4to; 1836, 8vo); Thube, *Erklarung* (Schwerin and Wism. 1797, 8vo); *Bertholdt, *Erklarung*, etc. (Erlang. 1806, 8vo); Ben-Jachajah, [illegible] (ed. Philippsohn, etc.; Dessau, 1808, 4to and 8vo); Menken, *Monarchienbild* (Brem. 1809, 8vo); Frere, *Combined View*, etc. (Lond. 1815,8vo); Griesinger, *Ansicht* (Stuttg. and Tub. 1815, 8vo); Girdlestone, *Observations* (Oxford, 1820, 8vo); Bleek, *Verfasser u. Zweck* (in the *Theolog.* Zeitschr. Berl. 1822, in); Wilson, *Dissertations* (Oundle, 1824, 8vo); Irving, *Discourse* (Glasg. 18~6, 2 vols. 12mo); Kirmss, *Commentatio* (Jen. 1828, 4to); *Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (Lips. 1832, 8vo); *Havernick, *Commentatar* (Hamburg, 1832, 8vo); Jeitteles, [illegible] etc. (Vienna, 1835, 8vo); Cox, *Lectures* (Lond. 1834, N. Y. 1836, 12mo); *Lengerke, *Auslegung* (Konigsb. 1835, 8vo); Tyso, *Elucidation* (London, 1838, 8vo); Farquharson, *Illustrations* (London, 1838, 8vo); Gaussen, *Lectures* (London, 1840, 12mo); Miles, *Lectures* (ib. 1840-1, 2 vols. 12mo);

Folsom, *Interpretation* (Boston, 1842, 12mo); Chase, *Remarks* (ib. 1844, 8vo); George (Duke of Manchester), *Times of Daniel* (Lond. 1846, 8vo); Wood, *Lectures* (ib. 1847, 12mo); Jacobi, vol. i of *Kirchliche Lehre*, etc. (Berl. 1847, 8vo); Harrison, *Outlines* (Warburt. *Lect*. London, 1849, 8vo); *Stuart, *Commentary* (Bost. 1850, 8vo); *Barnes, *Notes* (N. Y. 1850, 12mo); *Hitzig, *Erklar*. (Lpz. 1850, 8vo); Cumming, *Lectures* (Lond. 1850, 8vo); Ramsay, *Exposition* (ibid. 1853, 12mo); Oshon, *Daniel Verified* (N. Y. 1856, 12mo); Magnin. *Notes* (Par. 1861, 8vo); Zundel, *Untersuch*. (Basel, 1861, 8vo); Bellamy, *Translation* (Lond. 1863, 4to); Pusev, *Lectures* (new ed. ibid. 1865, 4to); Shrewsbury, *Notes* (Edinb. 1865, 8vo); Cowles, *Commentary* (N. Y. 1867,12mo); Kranichfeld, *Erklar*. (Berl. 1868, 8vo); Kliefoth, *Erklar*. (Schw. 1868, 8vo); Fuller, *Erklar*. (Basel, 1868, 8vo). *SEE PROPHETS*.

Daniel, Apocryphal Additions To,

i.e. pieces found in the Greek translations, but not in the Hebrew text. *SEE DEUTERO-CANONICAL*. The most important of these additions are contained in the Apocrypha of the English Bible under the titles of *The Song of the three holy Children* (Daniel 3), *The History of Susanna* (Daniel 8), and *The History of Bel and the Dragon* (Daniel 14). *SEE APOCRYPHA*.

I. *Their Character*. —

1. The first of these pieces is incorporated into the narrative of Daniel. After the three confessors were thrown into the furnace (Daniel 3:23), Azarias is represented as praying to God for deliverance (Song of the three Children, 3-22); and in answer the angel of the Lord shields them from the fire which consumes their enemies (23-27), whereupon “the three, as out of one mouth,” raise a triumphant song (29-68), of which a chief part (35-66) has been used as a hymn (*Benedicite*) in the Christian Church since the fourth century (*Rufin*. *Apol.* 2:35; comp. Concil. Tolet. iv, Song of Solomon 14). Like several similar fragments, the chief parts of this composition are given at the end of the Psalter in the Alexandrine MS. as separate psalms, under the titles of “The Prayer of Azarias” and “The Hymn of our Fathers;” and a similar arrangement occurs in other Greek and Latin psalters.

2. The two other pieces appear more distinctly as appendices, and offer no semblance of forming part of the original text. *The History of Susannah* (or

The Judgment of Daniel) is generally found at the beginning of the book (Gr. MSS. Vet. Lat.), though it also occurs after the 12th chapter (Vulg. ed. Compl.). *The History of Bel and the Dragon* is placed at the end of the book, and in the Sept. version it bears a special heading as "*Part of the Prophecy of Habakkuk*" (ἐκ προφητείας Ἀμβακοὺμ υἱοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Λευΐ).

II. *Their Currency*. — The additions are found in both the Greek texts — the Sept. and Theodotion — in the Old Latin and Vulgate, and in the existing Syriac and Arabic versions. On the other hand, there is no evidence that they ever formed part of the Hebrew text, and they were originally wanting in the Syriac (Polychronius ap. Mai, *Script. Vett. Nov. Coll*. i, p. 113, says of the hymn expressly οὐ κεῖται ἐν τοῖς ῾Εβρ κοῖς ἢ ἐν τοῖς Συριακοῖς βιβλίοις). From the Sept. and Vulgate the fragments passed into common use, and they are commonly quoted by Greek and Latin fathers as parts of Daniel (Clem. Alex. *Ecl. proph*. i; Origen, *Ep. ad Afric*.; Tertull. *de Pudic*. 17, etc.), but rejected by those who adhered to the Hebrew canon. Jerome in particular, called attention to their absence from the Hebrew Bible (*Praef. in Dan*.), and, instead of any commentary of his own, adds shortly Origen's remarks "on the fables of Bel and Susanna" (*Comm. in Dan.* 13:1). In a similar manner, he notices shortly the Song of the three Children, "lest he should seem to have overlooked it" (*Comm. in Dan.* 3:23).

III. *Their Derivation*. — Various conjectures have been made as to the origin of the additions. It has been supposed that they were derived from Aramaic originals (De Wette, *Einl*. 2:2, Kap. 8, gives the arguments at length), but the intricate evidence is wholly insufficient to establish the point. The character of the additions themselves indicates rather the hand of an Alexandrine writer; and it is not unlikely that the translator of Daniel wrought up traditions which were already current, and appended them to his work (comp. Fritzsche, *Exeg. Handb. zu den Apok.* 1:121). The abruptness of the narrative in Daniel furnished an occasion for the introduction of the prayer and hymn; and the story of the Dragon seems like astrange exaggeration of the record of the deliverance of Daniel (Daniel 6), which may naturally have formed the basis of different legends. Nor is it difficult to see in the history of Susanna a pointed allusion to the name of the prophet, though the narrative may not be wholly fictitious.

The Sept. appears to be the original source from which all the existing recensions of the fragments were derived (comp. Hody, *De Bibl. text*. p. 583). Theodotion seems to have done little more than transcribe the Sept. text, with improvements in style and language, which are considerably greater in the appended narratives than in the Song incorporated into the canonical text. Thus, while the history of Susanna and Bel and the Dragon contain large additions which complete and embellish the story (e.g. *Hist. Sus*. 1518; 20, 21; 24-27; 46, 47, 49, 50; Bel and Dr. 1, 9-13; Eichhorn, p. 431 sq.), the text of the Song is little more than a repetition of that of the Sept. (comp. De Magistris, *Daniel*, etc. p. 254 sq.; Eichhorn, *Einleit. in der Apokryph*. Schrift. p. 422 sq.). The Polyglot-Syriac, Arabic, and Latin versions are derived from Theodotion, and the Hexaplar-Syriac from the Sept. (Eichhorn, p. 430, etc.).

The stories of Bel and Susanna received various embellishments in later times, which throw some light upon the manner in which they were originally composed (comp. Origen, *Ep. ad* Afric. § 7, 8; Bochart, *Hieroz*. 3, 3; Eichhorn, p. 446, etc.), just as the change which Theodotion introduced into the narrative of Bel, to give some consistency to the facts, illustrates the rationalizing process through which the legends passed (comp. Delitzsch, *De Habacuci vita et aetate*, 1844). It is thus useless to institute any inquiry into the historic foundation which lies below the popular traditions; for, though the stories cannot be regarded as mere fables, it is evident that a moral purpose determined the shape which they assumed. A later age found in them traces of a deeper wisdom, and to Christian commentators Susanna appeared as a type of the true Church tempted to infidelity by Jewish and pagan adversaries, and lifting up her voice to God in the midst of persecution (Hippol. *In Susann*. p. 689 sq., ed. Migne).

V. *Their Spuriousness*. — These addenda are regarded as canonical by the Roman Church, but the only evidence that can be adduced for this authority being attached to them is the fact of their existence in the Sept., Vulg., and other versions, and their quotation by the early Church fathers. On the other hand, these arguments are more than counterbalanced by the fact of their non-existence in the Hebrews text and the earliest Syriac, the weak authority of the Sept. (especially in the book of Daniel), and consequently of the Vulg., which is based upon it, and the general manner in which these fathers refer to them. Jerome, indeed, frequently and openly

ridicules their abgurd legends; and their own contradictions are sufficient to stamp them as spurious upon their very face.

See *Josippon ben Gorion* (ed. Breithaupt, Goth. et Lips. 1710), p. 34; Whitaker, *Disputation on Scripture* (Parker Society ed.), p. 76 sq.; Du Pin, *History of the Canon* (London, 1699), p. 14 sq., 117 sq.; Arnold, *Commentary on Apocrypha*; Zunz, *Gottesdienstlichen Vortrige*, p. 122; Herzfeld, *Geschichte der Israel*, p. 317; Griatz, *Gesch. der Juden*, 3, 308, Ewald, *Gesch. Israel*, 4:557 sq.; Fritzsche, *Exeg. Handb.* 1:111; Davidson, *Text of the O.T.* p. 976. *SEE SONG OF THE THREE HOLY CHILDREN*; *SEE SUSANNA, HISTORY OF*; *SEE DESTRUCTION OF BEL AND THE DRAGON, HISTORY OF*.

3. (Sept. Δανιήλ.) A priest of the family of Ithamar, who returned from the exile in the time of "Artaxerxes" (Ezra 8:2), B.C. 459. He is probably the same with the priest Daniel who joined in the covenant drawn up by Nehemiah (Nehemiah 10:6), B.C. 410. He has been confounded with the prophet in the apocryphal addenda to the Sept. (Daniel 14:1, Sept., not Theodotion), where he is called "a priest by the name of Daniel, the son of Abda" (Jerome, *Praefat. in Daniel*.).

Daniel the Stylite

was born near Samosata about A.D.4410, and died near Constantinople about 490. He entered a monastery at twelve, and determined in middle life to imitate Simeon the Stylite (q.v.). In 461 he fixed himself on a pillar on the height called Anapla, near Constantinople, and exposed himself there day and night. It is said that he had the gift of prophecy, and was at last escorted to heaven by the angels! He is celebrated as a saint in the Greek and Roman churches, Dec. 11. — Butler, *Lives of the Saints*, Dec. 11.

Daniel

bishop of Winchester, a monk in the convent of Malmesbury, was raised to the see of Winchester in 705. The convent from whence came Boniface, the apostle of Germany, was situated in his diocese, and Daniel himself strongly encouraged Boniface in his resolution of preaching the Gospel on the Continent. He gave him, on the occasion of his first journey to Rome, two letters of introduction, one addressed to all Christians, kings, and bishops (*epist. B. ed. Wurdtwein, ep*. 1), and another to Gregory II, which has been lost. He remained in relation with Boniface, and sustained him by

his advice, instructions, and sympathy (*ep. B. ep*. 12-14). In 721 he undertook a pilgrimage to Rome, and on his return furnished to Bede the sources of his history of the kingdom of Wessex, as the latter himself states in his *Ecclesiastical History of the Anglo-Saxons*. Having become blind, he renounced his charge, and returned to the convent of Malmesbury, where he died in 745 or 746. The four letters mentioned above are all that remains of his writings; the ep. 14, by Wiirdtwein, is also to be found in Baronius A.D. 724. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* s.v.; Wright, *Biographica Literaria* (Anglo-Saxon Period), p. 292 sq.

Dan'ite

(Heb. always with the article *had-Dani'*, ynDhi; Sept. ὁ Δάν, Δάν, οἱ Δανῖται; A. V. "Danites," Judges 13:2; 18:1, 11; 1 Chronicles 12:35; "of Dan," Judges 18:30), a member of the tribe of DAN *SEE DAN* (q.v.).

Dan-ja'in

(Heb. but once and with h local appended, *Da'nah Ya'an*, ˆ[yi hnD;Sept. Δανιδὰν καὶ Οὐδάν v. r. Δανιαρὰν καὶ Ιουδάν; Vulg. *Dan silvestria*), a place named only in 2 Samuel 24:6 as one of the points visited by Joab in taking the census of the people. It occurs after Gilead, between "the land of Tahtimn-hodshi" and Zidon, and therefore may have been somewhere in the direction of Dan (*Laish*), at the sources of the Jordan. The reading of the Alexandrian Sept. and of the Vulg. was evidently r2P[yiˆD; *Dan-jaar*, the nearest translation of which is "Dan in the wood." This reading is approved by Gesenius (*Thes. Heb*. p. 336), and agrees with the well-wooded character of the country about Tel et-Kadi. *SEE DAPHNE*. Farst (*Heb. Handwirterbuch*, p. 303) compares Dan-jaan with Baal-jaan, a Phoenician divinity whose name is found on coins. Thenius suggests that Jaan was originally *Laish*, they having fallen away, and ˆ[having been substituted for v (*Exeg. Hdbuch. on Sam*. p. 257). There seems no reason for doubting that the well-known DAN, or *Leshem*, is intended. We have no record of any other Dan in the north, and even if this were not the case, Dan, as the accepted northern limit of the nation, was too important a place to escape mention in such a list as that in the text. Dr. Schultz, however, the late Prussian consul at Jerusalem, discovered an ancient site called Danian or Danyal, in the mountains above Khan en-Nakura, south of Tyre, which he proposes to identify with Danjaan (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 306).

Dan’nah

(Heb. *Dannah’*, hNDi prob. murmuring, but Furst thinks lowly; Sept. ῾Ραννά v. r. ῾Ρεννά, evidently by mistake of r for d; Vulg. *Danna*), a city in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Socoh and Kirjath-sannah (Joshua 15:49), and evidently lying in the group south-west of Hebron (Keil, *Comment. in loc*.); possibly the modern ed-Dhoheriyeh, a conspicuous village on the hills west of Wady el-Khulil, consisting of stone hovels with remains of older structures, and surrounded by a fine grazing region (Robinson, *Researches*, 1:308, 311). Knobel (*Exeg. Handb.* in loc.) suggests the site *Zanuta*, but this is probably that of the ancient Zanoah.

Dannhauer Conrad,

a Lutheran divine, was born in the Breisgau 1603, and studied at the universities of Marburg, Altdorf, and Jena. In 1628 he became professor of eloquence, and later of theology at Strasburg, where also in 1638 he became pastor of the Cathedral church. He died in 1666. Dannhauer was a learned theologian, and an earnest Lutheran controvertist against Romanism and Syncretism (q.v.). For an account of his numerous writings, see Tholuck, *Akademisches Leben d. 17 Jahrhunderts*, saec. xvii, p. 274; and Tholuck’s article in Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19:386.

Dante (Properly Durante) Alighieri

one of the greatest Christian poets of all times, and, on account of his views of religion and the Church, generally counted among the forerunners of the Reformation of the sixteenth century. He was born at Florence May 8, 1265; according to others, May 27, 1263. He studied philosophy at the universities of Bologna and Padua; later, when an exile, he devoted himself to the study of philosophy at Paris. According to a statement of Boccaccio, he also visited England. In his youth Dante took an active part in the politics of his native city, and in 1300 was for two months one of its two *Priori*. In the party strife between the *Neri* (Blacks), the unconditional adherents of the pope, and the *Bianchi* (Whites), who rather sympathized with the Ghibellines, Dante was one of the leading men of the latter. His party sent him to Rome to counteract the plans of the Neri, who had implored the aid of Boniface VIII. The pope induced Charles of Valois, brother of Philip IV of France, to go to Florence to make peace. Charles recalled the exiled chiefs of the Neri and gave up the houses and the

property of the Bianchi to plundering. Many of the prominent men of the party, among them Dante, were banished. Dante never saw his native city again, and his subsequent life was very unsettled. After the last unsuccessful attempt of the "Whites" to re-enter Florence, he probably left Italy for Paris. When emperor Henry VII marched against Rome, Dantp wrote enthusiastic letters in favor of the emperor against the pope. It is thought that his work De monarchia was compiled at the same time. The death of the emperor disappointed his last hope. The last years of his life were spent at Ravenna, where prince Guido Novello da Polenta was his patron. He died Sept. 14, 1321.

The first powerful influence which awakened in him the poetical inspiration was the love which at the age of nine years he conceived for Beatrice Portinari, then eight years old, the daughter of a rich citizen. How pure, chaste, and tender this love was is testified by his first work, the *Vita Nuova*, which was published about 1300, and consists of a collection of poems, all having reference to his first love (best edition by Marchese Trivulzio, Milan, 1827). Beatrice died early (1290) as the wife of the knight Simone de Bardi, and a few years after her death Dante married a lady named Gemma, of the powerful house of Donati, by whonm he had five or six children. A fruit of the philosophical studies in which he sought consolation for the death of Beatrice was the *Convito* (Banquet), which was to consist of 15 *trattati* and 14 *canzone*, of which, however, only 4 *trattati* and three *canzone* were finished (best edition by Trivulzio, Milan, 1826).

But the great work, which has settled for all the ages the reputation of Dante as one of the greatest Christian poets, is his immortal *Commedia*, or, as it was subsequently called, the *Divina Commedia*, written in terze rime, and consisting of 100 cantos, of which the first is introductory to the following visions, and 33 are devoted to Hell (*Inferno*), Purgatory (*Purgatorio*), and Paradise (*Paradiso*) each. "The poet is conducted first by Virgil, the representative of human reason, through hell and purgatory, and then by Beatrice, the representative of revelation, and finally by St. Bernard, through the several heavens, where he beholds the triune God. Hell is represented in the poem as a funnel-shaped hollow, formed of gradually contracting circles, the lowest and narrowest of which is at the earth's center. Purgatory is a mountain rising solitary from the ocean on that side of the earth that is opposite to us: it is divided into terraces, and its top is the terrestrial paradise, the first abode of man. From this the poet

ascends through the seven planetary heavens, the heaven of the fixed stars, and the ‘primum mobile,’ to the empyrean, or fixed seat of God. In all parts of the region thus traversed there arise conversations with noted personages, for the most part recently deceased. At one time the reader is filled with the deepest sorrow, at another with horror and aversion; or the deepest questions of the then philosophy and theology are discussed and solved; and the social and moral condition of Italy, with the corruptions of Church and State, are depicted with a noble indignation” (Chambers). The conversations contained in the *Divina Commedia* give a full expose of most of the fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion. The creation of the world, the fall of angels and man, and the atonement, are treated of with great fullness. The doctrine that salvation can be found in faith in Christ alone is repeatedly insisted on. The poet in many places complains of the moral, social, and political degeneracy of the time, and of the corruption of the Church and the papal see. He violently inveighs against indulgences and the false veneration of saints, against the preference given to the decretals of the popes over the holy Scriptures, and thrusts three popes in succession into hell. A thorough reformation of the Church in head and members is expected, not from the popes, but from the emperors. “Fifty-two years after the poet’s death, the republic of Florence, at the instigation of Boccaccio, set apart an annual sum for public lectures to explain the *Divine Comedy* to the people in one of the churches, and Boccaccio himself was appointed first lecturer. The example was imitated in several other places in Italy. The works of these men are among the earliest commentaries on Dante that we possess. The number of editions of the work amounts by this time to about 300. Only a few deserve notice. They are, that printed at Fuligno in 1472 — the earliest of all; the Nidobeatine edition at Milan (1478); the first Aldine edition (1502), the first Cruscan edition (1695); that of Volpi (1727); of Venturi (1732); of Lombardi (1791), and with additions and illustrations in 1815, 1821, and 1822; of Dionisi (1795); of Ugo Foscolo (Lond. 1842-1843). A reprint of the Fuligno edition above mentioned, together with those printed at Jesi (1472), at Mantua (1472), and at Naples by Francisco del Tuppo (about 1478), appeared at London in 1858 under the superintendence of Mr. Panizzi, and at the expense of Lord Vernon” (Chambers). Among the most recent editions are those by Bianchi (Florence, 5th ed. 1857) and Karl Witte (Berlin, 1862, 4to and 8vo). The last is regarded as the best from a critical point of view. “*The Divina Commedia* has been translated into almost all European languages. Two translations of the whole into Latin

have been printed, one by Carlo d'Aquino (1728), and lately by Piazza (1848). In French there are a number of translations both in prose and verse. The earliest, by Grangier, in 1596, is still the nearest to the original in form, but none is good. The German translations are numerous, and such as no other modern language can equal in faithfulness. Kannegiesser has translated the whole in the measure and rhyme of the original (Leipsic, 1843, 4th ed.); prince [subsequently king] John of Saxony's translation is said by some to be the best. The chief English translations are Boyd's (1785) and Cary's (1814), in blank verse; Wright's (1833), in triple rhymes; Cayley's, in the original ternary rhyme (the *Inferno*, 1851; the *Purgatorio*, 1853; the *Paradiso* in 1854, with a volume of notes in 1855);' Dr. John Carlyle's, the *Inferno*, in prose, with a judicious commentary (1849); Fred. Pollock's, in blank verse (1854)" (Chambers). The first complete American translation is by Longfellow (*The Divine Comedy of Dante*, Boston, 1867, 3 vols.).

Of the other works of Dante, his Latin work, *De Monarchia*, written in the interest of the emperor against the temporal power claimed by pope Boniface VIII over all secular rulers, is the most important. Dante takes the ground that both powers, like two swords, have been directly ordained by God to support each other. This book became a powerful weapon in the hands of the opponents of the papacy. Pope John XXII forbade it, and ordered it to be burned. The *Rime sacre*, containing the seven penitential psalms and the Credo in *terze rime*, were for the first time published in 1752, and their genuineness is still doubted by some.

The religious and ecclesiastical views of Dante have been for centuries, and still are, the subject of an animated controversy. Matthias Flacius placed him in his *Catalogus testiun veritatis evangelicae* (1556), and since then Protestant writers generally have claimed him as a forerunner of the Reformation, or, at least, as an ardent opponent of many of the worst corruptions prevalent in the Papal Church during the Middle Ages. The Jesuit Harduin, in order to save Dante from the charge of heresy, ascribed the *Divina Commedia* to a disciple of Wickliffe; but most of the Roman Catholic writers (in particular the Frenchmen Ozanam and Artaud de Montor) maintain that Dante, in spite of his opposition to some abuses in the Church, was, in point of doctrine, a faithful adherent of the Church of Rome. See Baumgarten-Crusius, *De Doctrina Dantis Aligerii theologica* (1836); Aroux, *Dante heretique, revolutionnaire et socialiste* (Par. 1854);

Boissard, *Dante revolutionnaire et socialiste, mais non heretique* (Paris, 1854).

The literature on the life and the works of Dante is immense. The first who wrote a critical life was Pelli (1758), after whom the Italians Dionisi, Orelli and Misserini wrote valuable works. Among the numerous works of Germany on the subject we mention Abeken, *Beitrage fir das Studium der gottlichen Komidie Dante's* (Berlin, 1826); Schlosser, *Dante-Studien* (Lpz. 1855); Ruth, *Studien iber Dante* (Tub. 1853); Wegele, *Dante's Leben und Werke* (Jena, 1852); Floto, *Dante Alighierii; sein Leben und seine Werke* (Stutt. 1858); Paur, *Ueber die Quellen zur Lebensgeschichte Dante's* (Gdrlitz, 1862). The best among recent Italian works is Balbo's *Vita di Dante* (2 vols. Turin, 1839). A list of all editions, translations, and commentaries on the *Divina Commedia* is given in Colomab de Batine's *Bibliograjia Dantesca* (2 vols. Prato, 1845-1848). The best illustrations of the chief works of Dante are from Flaxman (*Atlante Dantesco*, Milan, 1822), Genelli, and Dord. In 1865, from the 14th to the 16th of May, the sixth centenary of the birth of Dante was celebrated at Florence with immense enthusiasm, and his statue (by Enrico Pazzi in Ravenna) erected at the Piazza della Croce. See Brockhaus, *Conversations-Lex*icon, s.v.; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3:286.

Danz Johann Andreas,

a Lutheran theologian and distinguished Hebrew scholar, was born in 1654 at Sundhausen, near Gotha. He became professor at the 'University of Jena, first in the philosophical, and subsequently (1713) in the theological faculty, remaining, however, at the same time professor of the Oriental languages. He was the founder of a new school of Oriental philologists, and had the reputation of being the greatest Hebrew scholar of the age. He was intimate with Spener and Francke, but yet his private life was not beyond reproach. He died Dec. 22, 1727. The most important of his works are *Compendium grammaticoe hebr. and chald*. (3d edition, 1706); *Rabbinisnus enucleatus* (Frankf. 1761); *Literator Ebraeo Chaldaeus* (Jena, 1696; the first edit. had been published under the title *Nucifrangibulum* [nut-cracker], Jena, 1686). — —Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19:388; Pierer, *Univ.-Lex.* 4:735.

Danz Johann Traugott Leberecht,

a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born May 31, 1769, at Weimar. He studied at the universities of Jena and Göttingen, became in 1807 professor of theology at Jena, which position he retained until 1837, and died at Jena May 16, 1851. He was a man of immense learning in all departments of literature, an interesting writer on a number of subjects, and a popular professor. In his theological views he was a representative of the school of Biblical Rationalists, advocating the mutual toleration of Rationalists and Supranaturalists in the same church, and opposing the views both of Schleiermacher and Strauss. Among his theological works the following are the most important*: Lehrbuch der Kircheingeschichte* (Jena, 1824); *Die Wissenschaften des geistlichen Berufs* (Jena, 1824); *Theolog. Encyclopcedia* (Weimar, 1832); *Universal-Woirterbuch der theolog. und religionsgeschichtl. Literatur* (Leipsic, 1837, sq.); *Initia Doctrince Patristicce* (Jena, 1839); *Geachichte des Tridentiner Concils* (Jena, 1846), according to Paul Sarpi. His edition of the *Libri Symbolici ecclesice Romano-Catholicae* (Vimar. 1835) was dedicated to Gregorio XVI, *Pontfici Maximo, ecclesiae Romano-Catholicae praesuli*, with some good Protestant advice. He also published a biography of his deceased (1835) friend and colleague, H. A. Schott (Jena, 1836), and edited a posthumous work of the latter on the authenticity of the Gospel according to Matthew (Leips. 1837). One of his last works was "*Two Conversations*" on the Life of Jesus by Strauss (*Zwcei Gesprache*, 1839). — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19:389 sq.

Daph'ne

(Δάφνη, the laurel; so called from the verdure of the place, or because this tree was sacred to Apollo), the name of several localities mentioned in later writers.

1. A celebrated grove and sanctuary of Apollo near Antioch (q.v.), in Syria. Its establishment, like that of the city, was due to Seleucus Nicator. The distance between the two places was about five miles (Strabo, 16:750), and in history they are associated most intimately together (Antioch being frequently called Ἀ. ἐπὶ Δάφνῃ, and ἡ πρὸς Δάφνην, and conversely Daphne entitled Δ. ἡ πρὸς Ἀντιοχείαν, Josephus, *War*, 1:12, 5; comp. *Ant.* 14:15, 11; 17:2, 1). The situation was of extreme natural beauty, with perennial fountains and abundant wood. Seleucus localized

here, and appropriated to himself and his family the fables of Apollo and the river Peneus, and the nymph Daphne. Here he erected a magnificent temple and colossal statue of the god (Libanius, *De Daphnao Templo*, 3, 334). The succeeding Seleucid monarchs, especially Antiochus Epiphanes, embellished the place still further. Among other honors, it possessed the privileges of an asylum. It is in this character that the place is mentioned, 2 Maccabees 4:33. In the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes (B.C. 171), the aged and patriotic high-priest Onias, having rebuked Menelaus for his sacrilege at Jerusalem, took refuge at Daphne, whence he was treacherously brought out, at the instance of Menelaus, and murdered by Andronicus, who was governor of Antioch during the king's absence on a campaign. Josephus does not give this account of the death of Onias (*Ant.* 12:5, 1). When Syria became Roman, Daphne continued to be famous as a place of pilgrimage and vice. "*Daphnici mores*" was a proverb (see Gibbon's 23d chapter). The beginning of the decay of Daphne must be dated from the time of Julian, when Christianity in the empire began to triumph over heathenism. The site has been well identified by Pococke and other travelers at *Beit el-Miaa*, "the House of the Water," on the left bank of the Orontes, to the south-west of Antioch, and on higher ground, where the fountains and the wild fragrant vegetation are in harmony with all that we read of the natural characteristics of Apollo's sanctuary. — Smith, s.v. It is a small natural amphitheatre on the declivity of the mountains, where the springs burst with a loud noise from the earth, and running in a variety of directions for a distance of about two hundred yards, terminate in two beautiful cascades, which fall into the valley of the Orontes. The largest of the fountains rises from under a vertical rock, forming a small abyss or concavity, on the top and sides of which are the massive remains of an ancient edifice, perhaps those of the Temple of Apollo (Kelly's *Syria*, p. 281). For a translation of an ancient inscription recently discovered on the site, see the *Jour. Am. Or. Sot*;. 6:550. See Muller, *Antiq. Antiochen*, p. 64; Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geogr.* s.v. *SEE ANTIOCH*.

2. A town or village (χώριον) near the fountains of the little Jordan (Josephus, *War*, 4:1, sec. 1). Reland (*Paloestina*, p. 263) and others have considered this as identical with Dan, proposing to read Δάνης for Δάφνης, and referring in support to Josephus, *Ant.* 8:8, 4. Recent explorers have shown this to be an error, and have discovered the site of the Daphne of Josephus in the present *Dufneh*, two miles to the south of Tell el-Kady, the site of Dan (Van de Velde, *Memoir*, p. 306; *Syria and*

Palestine, 2:419; Robinson, *Later Researches*, p. 393; Wilson, *Bible Lands*, 2:172); Thomson, *Land and Book*, 1:388),

3. In Numbers 34:11, the clause rendered in the Λ. V. "on the east side of Ain" (q.v.), and by the Sept. "on the east to (of) the fountain," is given in the Vulgate "contra fontem Daphnim." The word *Daphnim* is most probably a marginal gloss, and may perhaps refer to No. 2. Jerome, in his commentary on Ezekiel (c. 47), refers to the passage in Numbers, and gives reasons for concluding that "the fountain" is Daphne No. 1. The Targums of Jonathan and of Jerusalem give Daphne or Dophne as the equivalent of Riblah (q.v.) in Numbers 34:11 (q.v.). The error into which Jerome and the Targums have fallen appears to have arisen either from a confusion between Daphne on the Jordan with Daphne on the Orontes, or from mistaking the fountains near the mouth of the Orontes for those at its source.

4. A fortified town on the Pelusiac branch of the Nile (Δάφναι, Herod. 2:30, 107), the TAHPENES *SEE TAHPENES* (q.v.) of Scripture, distant from Pelusium sixteen Roman miles (*Itin. Ant.* Iter a Pelusio Memphim).

Dar

SEE MARBLE.

Da'ra

(Heb. *Daroa'*, [rD; Sept. Δαρά v. r. Δαράδ, Δαραδέ), a contracted or corrupt form (1 Chronicles 2:6) of the name DARDA *SEE DARDA* (q.v.).

Darbyites

SEE PLYMOUTH BRETHREN.

Daromonim

SEE DARIC.

Dar'da

(Heb. *Darda'*, [DirDi pearl of knowledge; Sept. Δαρδάλα v. r. τὸν δάραα; Josephus, Δάρδανος v. r. Δάρθανος, *Ant.* 8:2, 5; Vulg. *Dorda*), a son of Mahol, one of four men of great fame for their wisdom, but who were excelled by Solomon (1 Kings 4:31). B.C. ante 1010. Ethan, the first

of the four, is called “the Ezrachite,” but it is uncertain whether the designation extends to others. In 1 Chronicles 2:6, however, the same four names occur again as “sons of Zerach,” of the great family of Pharez, in the tribe of Judah, with the slight difference that “Darda” appears as “Dara.” The identity of these persons with those in 1 Kings 4 has been greatly debated (see the arguments on both sides in Burrington, 1:206-8); but there cannot be much reasonable doubt that they are the same (Movers, *Kritik. Unters*. p. 237); although Keil argues that nothing can be proved from the mere identity of the names (*Versuch ub. der Chron*. p. 164). There is nothing to support the Jewish tradition (in the *Seder Olam Rabba*) that they prophesied during the Egyptian bondage. *SEE ETHAN*.

(1.) A great number of Hebr. MSS. read Darda in Chron. (Davidson, *Hebr. Text*, p. 210), in which they are followed by the Targum and the Syriac and Arabic versions. *SEE DARA*.

(2.) The son of Zerach would without difficulty be called in Hebrew the Ezrachite, the change depending merely on the position of a vowel point. And further, the change is actually made by the Targum Jonathan, which in Kings has “son of Zerach.” *SEE EZRAHITE*.

(3.) The word “son” is used in Hebrew so often to denote a descendant beyond the first generation that no stress can be laid on the “son of Mahol” as compared with the “son of Zerach.” For instance, of the five “sons of Judah” in 1 Chronicles 4:1, the first was really Judah’s son, the second his grandson, the third his great grandson, and the fourth and fifth still later descendants. Besides, there is some plausibility in the conjecture that “Bene Mahol” means “sons of the choir” (comp. “daughters of music,” Ecclesiastes 12:4), in which case the men in question were the famous musicians, two of whom are named in the titles to Psalms 88and 89. *SEE MAHOL*.

Dardar

SEE THISTLE.

Daric

Picture for Daric

(ˆ/mK]r Þ¡ *darkemon’*, or ˆ/K r Þ¡a} *adarkon’*, only in plur.; Talm. ˆ/K r Þ¡ *darken’*; Sept. χρυσοῦς; Vulg. *solidus*, drachma; rendered “dram” [q.v.],

Ezra 2:69; 8:27; Nehemiah 7:70, 71, 72; 1 Chronicles 29:7), a gold coin (Xenoph. *Anab*. 1:7, 18; 1:1, 9; 7:6, 1; Cyrop. v 2, 7; *A*Elian, 1:22; Plutarch, *Artax*. 22) current in Palestine in the period after the return from Babylon, and used even for the Temple tax (Mishna, *Shekal*. 2:4). That the Hebrew word is, in the Bible, the name of a coin and not of a weight, appears from its similarity to the Greek appellation of the only piece to which it could refer (Lysias in *Eratosth*. 11; Athen. 12:534). The mentions in Ezra and Nehemiah show that the coin was current in Palestine under Cyrus and Artaxerxes Longimanus. At these times there was no large issue of gold money except by the Persian kings, who struck the coin known to the Greeks as the στατήρ Δαρεικός, or simply δαρεικός. The darics which have been discovered are thick pieces of pure gold (see Wurm, *De ponder. et mensur*. p. 58 sq.), of archaic style, bearing on the obverse the figure of a king with bow and javelin, or bow and dagger (Plutarch, *Artax*. 20; Agesilaus, *Lac. Apoph*. 40), and on the reverse an irregular incuse square. Their full weight is about 128 grains troy, or a little less than that of an Attic *stater*, and is most probably that of an early didrachm of the Phoenician talent (see Bockh, *Metrolog. Untersuch*. p. 130). They must have been the common gold pieces of the Persian empire. The oldest that are often seen cannot be referred to an earlier period than about the time of Cyrus, Cambyses, or Darius Hystaspis, and it is more probable that they are not anterior to the reign of Xerxes, or even to that of Artaxerxes Longimanus. There are, however, gold pieces of about the same weight, but of an older style, found about Sardis, which cannot be doubted to be either of Croesus or of an earlier Lydian king, in the former case the Κροισεῖοι (στατῆρες) of the Greeks (Rawlinson, *Herod* 1:561). It is therefore probable, as these followed a Persian standard, that darics were struck under Cyrus or his nearer successors. The origin of this coin is attributed by the Greeks to a Darius, supposed by the moderns to be either Darius the Mede or Darius Hystaspis (see *Schol. ad Aristoph. Eccles*. p. 741; Hengstenberg, *Authentie Daniel* p. 51). That the Greeks derived their distinctive appellation of the coin from this proper name cannot be doubted; but the difference of the Hebrew forms of the former from that of the latter vwy;r]* D, renders this a questionable derivation. Gesenius suggests the ancient Persian word *Dara* (*Lex*. s.v.), "king;" but (in his *Thesaur*. s.v.) inclines to connect the Hebrew names of the coin and that of Darius. In favor of the derivation from Dara, it must be noted that the figure borne by these coins is not that of any one king, but of the king of Persia in an abstract sense, and that on the same principle the coins would

rather be called regal coins than darics. The silver darics mentioned by Plutarch (*Cim*. 10) are probably the Persian silver pieces similar in type to the gold daries, but weighing a drachm and a third of the same standard. (See Harenberg, in *Ugolini Thesaur*. 28; Eckhel, *Doctrin. num. I*, 3, 551 sq.; Boden, *De daricis, Viteb*. 1779; Wesseling, *Observv. var*. Amst. 1729, p. 241 sq.) *SEE MONEY*; *SEE DRACHMA*.

Dari'us

Picture for Dari'us

(Heb. *Dareya'vesh*, vwy;r]* D, Ezra 4:4; Nehemiah 12:22; Daniel 9:1; 11:1; Haggai 1:1, 15; 2:10; Zechariah 1:1, 7; 7:1; Chald. the same, Ezra 4:24; 5:5-15; Daniel 5:31; 6:1-28; Gr. Δαρεῖος, 1 Esdras 2:30; 3:1-8; 4:47; 5:2, 6, 73; 6:1, 6, 7, 23, 34; 7:1, 4, 5; 1 Maccabees 1:1; 12:7; Strabo Δαρειήκης, 16. p. 785; Ctesias Δαριαῖος), the name of several kings of Persia, three of whom are mentioned in the O.T. and the Apocrypha. The original form of the name, to which the Hebrew and Greek words are only approximations, has been read by Grotefend, in the cuneiform inscriptions of Persepolis, as *Darheush* or *Darjeush* (Heeren's *Ideen*, 2:350), and by Beer as *Daryawush* (*Allg. Lit. Zeit*. 1838, No. 5). Herodotus assigns to the name the sense of ἐρξίης, or, according to another reading, ἐρξείης (6:98): probably meaning *coercer* or *conservator*. The former accords with *holding fast*, which is the sense of *Dara*, the modern Persian name of Darius, the latter with the derivation (according to Lassen, *Inschriften*, p. 39,158) from Sanscrit *dri*, to preserve. (See Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 350.) According to Rawlinson (*Herod*. 3, 455), "It does not appear to mean either ἐρξείης, 'the worker,' as Herodotus states, or φρόνιμος, 'the wise,' as Hesychius, or πολεμικός, 'the wearlike,' as the author of the *Etymologicum* says. The root appears to be the Old Persian *dar*, 'to hold' or 'possess,' which is *dere in Zend, dhri* in Sanscrit, and *dar* in Modern Persian. The remainder of the word is thought to be a mere appellative suffix, elongated on euphonic grounds; but no very satisfactory account can be given of it." The name occurs both in the Assyrian and Egyptian inscriptions. This title appears to have been the proper name of the son of Hystaspes, who first won it, but was assumed as a throne-name by Ochus (i.e. Darius Nothus), son and successor of Artaxerxes Longimanus (Ctesias, *Pers*. 48:57), in like manner as Arsaces, successor of this Darius (ib. 53:57) and Bessus (Curt. 6:6), both took the royal name of "Artaxerxes" (q.v.). See Smith's *Dict. of Class. Biog.* s.v. *SEE PERSIA*.

I. "DARIUS THE MEDE" (ydmmhD, Daniel 11:1, Sept. ὁ Κῦρος; Chald. hadmD, Sept. Δαρεῖος ὁ Μῆδος), "the son of Ahasuerus of the seed of the Medes" (ix. 1, Sept. Δαρεῖος ὁ υἱὸς Ἀσουήρου), who succeeded to (lBqi) the Babylonian kingdom on the death of Belshazzar, being then sixty-two years old (Daniel 5:31; 9:1), B.C. 538. Only one year of his reign is mentioned (Daniel 9:1; 11:1), but that was of great importance for the Jews. Daniel was advanced by the king to the highest dignity (Daniel 6:1 sq.), probably in consequence of his former services (compare Daniel 5:17); and after his miraculous deliverance, Darius issued a decree enjoining throughout his dominions "reverence for the God of Daniel" (Daniel 6:25 sq.). *SEE MEDE*.

The statement (Daniel 6:28) that "Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian," seems to represent him as the immediate predecessor of Cyrus. No Darius occupying this place, nor indeed any Darius anterior to the son of Hystaspes, is found either in profane history or (hitherto) on monuments. *SEE AHASUERUS*. Only the *Scholiast on Aristoph.* (*Eccl.* 602), followed by Suidas (s.v. Δαρεικός), and Harpocration, says that the daric took its name from "another Darius, earlier than the father of Xerxes" (D. Hystaspis). Herodotus and Ctesias, differing widely in other respects, agree in making Astyages last king of the Median dynasty, with no male heir, conquered and deposed by Cyrus, first king of the Medo-Persian dynasty at Babylon. Xenophon, however, in the *Cyropoedia* (i. 5, 2) introduces, as son and successor of Astyages, and uncle (mother's brother) of Cyrus, a second Cyaxares, acting under whose orders Cyrus takes Babylon, and receives in marriage his daughter, unnamed, with Media as her portion. Josephus (*Ant.* 10:11, 1) clearly means the Cyaxares II of Xenophon when he says that "Darius was the son of Astyages, but known to the Greeks by a different name;" and the statement of Aben Ezra, who reports from "a book of the kings of Persia" that this Darius was Cyrus's father-in-law, probably rests at last on the supposed authority of Xenophon. See CYRUS. Under these circumstances, the extreme obscurity of the Babylonian annals has given occasion to three different hypotheses as to the name under which Darius the Mede is known in history.

1. The first of these, which identifies him with Darius Hystaspis, rests on no plausible evidence, and may be dismissed at once (Lengerke, *Dan.* p. 219 sq.). See below, No. 2.

2. Another identification is that maintained by Iarcus von Niebuhr (*Gesch. Ass. u. Bab*. p. 45), by which Darius is represented as the personal name of "Astyages," the last king of the Medes. It is contended that the name "Alstyages" was national and not personal, and that Ahasuerus represents the name Cyaxares, borne by the father of "Astyages" (Tob. 14:15). On the contrary, however, Ahasuerus (Heb. *Achashverosh*) is Xerxes (cuneiform *Khshyarsha*), and not Κυαξάρης (cuneiform *Uvakshatra*). The description of the unnamed king in *A*Eschylus (*Pers*. 763 sq.) as one whose "feelings were guided by wisdom," is moreover assumed, on this view, to be applicable to the Darius of Scripture and the Astyages of Herodotus. Assuming the immediate fulfillment of the announcement of Daniel 5:28, in the catastrophe of 6:1, Niebuhr (ib. p. 91 sq.) determines that Belshazzar is Evil-merodach, son and successor of Nebuchadnezzar; that, on his death (slain by Neriglissar, his sister's husband), B.C. 559, Astyages, who is Daniel's Darius the Mede, reigned one year at Babylon, which year in the Canon is 1 Neriglissar; in the following year he was conquered by Cyrus, B.C. 558. in exact accordance with the apparent incompleteness of the political arrangements which Darius "purposed" to make (Daniel 6:3, tyvæ). For the short duration of his supreme power may have caused his division of the empire (Daniel 6:1) — a work congenial to his character — to fall into abeyance, so that it was not carried out till the time of his namesake Darius Hystaspis: a supposition that may go for what it is worth. Daniel himself passed from the service of Darius to that of Cyrus, and did not again return to Babylon; so Daniel 6:28 is explained. The mention, Daniel 8:1, of the third year of Belshazzar makes a difficulty — not as Von Niebuhr puts it, because Evil-merodach has but two years in the Canon, for the actual reign may — very well have reached its third year, but from the mention of Susa as the scene of the vision; for Susa, being Median, was not subject to any Chaldaean king. The explanation gravely proposed by Niebuhr is, that Daniel, while at Susa in the service of Darius the Mede, continued to date by years of Belshazzar's reign, and this though he is related to have been present in Babylon the night in which Belshazzar was slain. The difficulty is not confined to Niebuhr's scheme: Belshazzar, whoever he was, was a Chaldaean; and the explanation may be, that the prophet is at Susa, not in bodily presence, but transported in spirit to the city which was to be the metropolis of the Persian monarchy, the fate of which, under the emblem of the ram, is portrayed in the ensuing vision. *SEE DANIEL*. After the fall of this Darius Astyages, Babylon recovered its

independence under Nabonned, to fall finally under the arms of Cyrus, B.C. 538. *SEE BABYLON*.

The chronological difficulties which have been raised (Rawlinson, *Herodotus*, 1:331) against the identification of Darius with Astyages on the assumption that the events in Daniel 5 relate to the taking of Babylon by Cyrus (B.C. 538), in which case he would have ascended the throne at seven years of age, are indeed set aside by the view of Niebuhr; but it is clogged with other objections (in addition to those already alluded to), which render it as untenable as it is ingenious and intricate, to say nothing of the fact that it is made up of a series of assumptions throughout. In the first place, the supposition that Belshazzar was Evil-merodach is inadmissible; for it is now pretty well determined that he was the son of Nabonned, the actually last king of the Babylonian line. *SEE BELSHAZZAR*. Secondly, this hypothesis sets up a Medo-Persian prince at Babylon during the very time assigned by well-approved history to a native sovereign, and even then leaves a blank of eighteen years between him and Cyrus, whom Daniel's history and prophecies evidently make immediately contiguous. *SEE ASTYAGES*.

3. There remains, therefore, but one other view, which was adopted by Josephus (*Ant.* 10:11, 4), and has been supported by many recent critics (Bertholdt, Von Lengerke, Havernick, Hengstenberg, Auberlen, and others). According to this, the "Darius" in question was Cyaxares II, the son and successor of Astyages, who is commonly regarded as the last king of Media. It is supposed that the reign of this Cyaxares has been neglected by historians from the fact that through his indolence and luxury he yielded the real exercise of power to his nephew Cyrus, who married his daughter, and so after his death received the crown by direct succession (*Xen. Cyrop*. 1:5, 2; 4:5, 8; 8:5, 19). It is true that the only direct evidence for the existence of a second Cyaxares is that of Xenophon's paedagogic romance. The title "*Cyrus* [*filius*] *Cyaxaris*," which has been quoted from an inscription (Auberlen, *Daniel u. d. Ofenbarung*, p. 18), is either a false reading or certainly a false translation (Niebuhr, *Gesch. Ass. u. Bab*. p. 214, 1:4); and the passage of Eschylus (*Pers*. p. 766) is not very consistent with the character assigned to Cyaxares II. On the other hand, Herodotus expressly states that "Astyages" was the last king of the Medes, that he was conquered by Cyrus, and that he died without leaving any male issue (*Herod*. 1:73, 109, 127 sq.); and Cyrus appears as the immediate successor of "Astyages" in the Chronicle of Eusebius (*Chron. ad* 01. 54; Syncell. p.

188; comp. Bel and Dragon, 1). These objections, however, are not insuperable, and must give way before the manifest exigencies of the case (see Bertholdt's able excursus on the subject in his *Commentatar zu Dan*.). We may add that an important chronological difficulty is best adjusted by assuming the existence and reign of this Cyaxares (Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, p. 301 sq.). . *SEE CYAXARES*.

II. "Darius, king of Persia," in whose second year the building of the Temple was resumed, and completed in his sixth (Ezra 4:5, 24; 6:15), under the prophesying of Haggai and Zechariah, is understood by most writers, ancient and modern, to be Darius son of Hystaspes, whose reign in the Canon extends from B.C. 521 to 485. Scaliger, however, makes him Darius Nothus (B.C. 424-405), and this view has been advocated by the late Dr. Mill (*The Evangelical Accounts of the Birth and Parentage of our Savior*, etc., 1842, p. 153-165), who refers for further arguments to Hottinger (*Pentas Dissertationum*, p. 107-114). Before we examine the grounds on which this conclusion rests, it will be convenient to consider the difficulties with which it is attended.

Zerubbabel, son of Shealtiel, as prince of the house of David, and Jeshua, son of Jozadak, as high-priest, headed the first colony of exiles from Babylon in the first year of Cyrus (Ezra 3:2), at which time neither can have been less than twenty years old. By these same two persons the work of rebuilding the Temple was resumed and completed after its suspension. Now from the first year of Cyrus, in the Biblical reckoning (B.C. 536), to the second of Darius Nothus (B.C. 423), are 113 years; so that, if he be the Darius of this history, both Zerubbabel and Jeshua must then have reached the age of 130 years at least. This is incredible, if not in itself, certainly under the entire silence of the history and the contemporary prophets as to a fact so extraordinary. Moreover, that the work of rebuilding the Temple should have been abandoned for a century and more is scarcely conceivable. Its suspension during fifteen or sixteen years is sufficiently accounted for by the history and the representations of the prophets. The adversaries weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and troubled them in building, and hired counsellors against them to frustrate their purpose all the days of Cyrus, even until the reign of Darius" (Ezra 4:4, 5). Besides molesting the builders in their work, they prevailed by their machinations at the court of Cyrus, or of his viceroy, to bring it to a stand-still, by interposing official obstacles, stopping the grants from the royal treasury (vi. 4), and the supply of materials from the forest and the quarry (3, 7). So

the people were discouraged: they said, “The time is not come for the house of the Lord to be built,” and turned to the completion of their own houses and the tilling of their lands (Haggai 1:3). This is intelligible on the supposition of an interval of fifteen or sixteen years, during which, there having been no decree issued to stop it, the work was nominally in progress, only deferred, as the builders could allege at the time of its resumption, “Since that time (2d of Cyrus), even until now, hath it been in building, and yet it is not finished” (Ezra 5:16). But in no sense could the Temple be said to have “been in building” through the entire reigns of Cambyses, Darius, Xerxes, and Artaxerxes I: there is no testimony to the fact, nor any means of accounting for it. Again, the persons addressed by Haggai are “the residue of the people” who came from Babylon with Zerubbabel and Jeshua, some of whom had seen the first house in its glory (ii. 2, 3), i.e. who might be some 80 years old on the usual view, but on the other must have been 170 at the least. The prophet further admonishes his countrymen that the blights, droughts, and mildews which year by year disappointed their labors in the fields were the chastisement of their want of faith in letting the house of God lie waste, while they dwelt in their “ceiled houses” (Haggai 1:4-17); so long as they had been guilty of this neglect, so long had they been visited with this punishment. On the one supposition, this state of things had lasted from twelve to fifteen years at most; on the other, we are required to imagine that the curse had been on the land for three successive generations, an entire century. Lastly, in the same second year of Darius, Zechariah distinctly intimates what length of time had elapsed from the destruction of the first Temple — “threescore and ten years” (Zechariah 1:12). So in Zechariah 7:5, mention is made of a period of 70 years, during which the people had “fasted and mourned in the fifth and’seventh month.” The events commemorated by those fasts were the destruction of the Temple in the fifth, and the murder of Gedaliah in the seventh month of the same year. From that year to the second of Darius I are almost, if not exactly, 70 years. To the corresponding year of Darius II the interval is more than 160 years, and the mention of “those 70 years” is quite unintelligible, if that be the epoch of Zechariah’s prophesying. Certainly, if the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, and the first five chapters of Ezra, are worth anything as testimony, “the second year of Darius” must lie within one generation from the decree of Cyrus, and not more than 70 years from the destruction of the first Temple.

The reasons alleged on the other side may be thus stated:

1. In Ezra 4, between the edict of Cyrus for the return of the exiles and rebuilding of the Temple, and that of Darius for the completion of the work after its discontinuance, two Persian kings are named, Achashverosh and Artachhshashta, "which the names on the Zendic monuments will not permit us to apply to other kings than Xerxes and his son" (Dr. Mill, *u. s.* 153, *note*). The Persian history, as related by the Greeks and the Astronomical Canon, give three names in succession, Xerxes, Artaxerxes I, Darius II; Ezra, in like manner, three, Achashverosh, Artachshashta, and Dareyavesh. By those who hold this last to be Darius, son of Hystaspes, the first two are commonly supposed to be Cambyses and the impostor Smerdis, whom Justin (i. 9) calls Oropasta, Ctesias (*de reb. Pers*. 10) Sphendadates, who reigned under the name of Cambyses's younger brother Tany-oxarces (see Ewald, *Gesch. des V. I*. 4:81 and 118). But nowhere on monuments is Cambyses called Khshyarsha, or Smerdis Artakashasha; the former is constantly Kabujiya (Pers.), Kambudsiya (Bab.), Kembath (hierogl.); the latter, Bart'iya (Pers.), Bardsija (Bab.). Moreover, as Artachshashta (or —shasht) elsewhere in Ezra and Nehemiah is constantly Artaxerxes, and it scarcely admits of a doubt that Achashverosh in Esther is Xerxes, it would be strange if these two names were here applied to other quite different kings.

The true explanation of this difficulty, proposed long ago by Mr. Howes, and adopted by Dr. Hales, has been recently put forward by Bartheau (in the *Kurzgefast. exeget. Hdb*. on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, 1862, p. 69-73). This writer had formerly upheld the more usual view (Beitrsige *zu der Gesch. der Isr*. p. 396); so had Vaihinger (in the *Studien u. Kritiken*, 1854, p. 124), who (i5. 1857, p. 87) abandons it for the other. (See also Schultz, *Cyrus der Grosse*, in the *Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 624, and Bunsen, *Bibelwerk*). It is clear that, as in 4:24, the narrative returns to the point at which it stood in verse 5; in the interposed portion it either goes back to times before Darius, for the purpose of supplying omitted matter, or goes forward to record the successful machinations of the people of the land under subsequent kings, Xerxes and Artaxerxes I. But nothing in the contents of ver. 6-23 intimates a reverting to an earlier time. After reading of Darius we naturally take for granted that Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes are later than he. It appears that the adversaries had succeeded in hindering the building of the Temple till the second year of Darius. In the beginning of the next reign (Xerxes) they "wrote an accusation, "the purport and issue of which are not recorded. In the following reign mention is made of

another letter addressed to Artaxerxes, its contents not specified; but a second letter to the same king is given in extenso, together with the royal rescript. It is represented to the king that the Jews are building the city, and have “set up the walls thereof, and joined (excavated) the foundations.” The rescript orders that this work be made to cease. Not a word is said of the Temple. It may indeed be alleged that the “walls’“ are part of it, intended for its defense; but with their straitened resources the builders would hardly attempt more than was essential to the fabric itself. Besides, in the representations given by Haggai and Zechariah from their own observation, nothing implies that quite recently the people had been actively engaged in the work of rebuilding either city walls or Temple, as according to these documents they had been, if Artachshashta be the impostor Smerdis with his brief reign of a few months; nor, again, is it possible to reconcile the statement in Ezra 5:16, “Since that time even until now (2 Darius) hath it (the Temple) been in building, and yet it is not finished,” with the assumption that the work had been peremptorily stopped by command of Smerdis. But it is certain that at some time between the 7th and the 20th year of Artaxerxes some great reverse befell the colonists, in consequence of which “the wall of Jerusalem was broken down, and the gate thereof burned with fire,” Nehemiah 1:3 (for it is absurd to imagine that this can relate to the desolation effected by Nebuchadnezzar a hundred and forty years before), and the documents under consideration show what that reverse was. It was the result of that rescript of Artaxerxes, in virtue of which “Rehum and Shimshai and their companions went up to Jerusalem to the Jews,” and made them to cease by force and power” (Ezra 4:23); to cease from walling the city (ver. 21), not from building the Temple, which was finished long before. So far, all is plain and consistent. But at ver. 24, with the word ˆydeiaBe, ”at that time,” prop. “at the same time,” arises the difficulty. Were the last clause of verse 5, “until the reign of Darius,” absent, the obvious import would be, that at the time when the order from Artaxerxes caused the building of the wall to cease, the work of rebuilding the Temple ceased also, and consequently that Darius (ver. 24) reigned after Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes. But as this view is beset with insuperable difficulties, in whichever way it is taken, i.e. alike whether Darius be supposed to be the first or the second of that name, we are forced by the necessity of the case to conclude that ver. 24 refers not to what immediately precedes, but to the time spoken of above ver. 4, 5, and that the whole passage from ver. 6 to 23 is digression. Having shown how the machinations of “the people of the land” prevailed

for a time to delay the rebuilding of the Temple, the narrative breaks off at that point to notice their subsequent, also for a while successful, plottings against the building of the city and its walls. If the ˆydaiaBe can only refer to the matter immediately preceding, we must either accept the consequences, part incredible and absurd, part directly opposed to statements of the contemporary prophets, or charge it as an error upon the redactor of this book, that he inserted ver. 6-23 in the wrong place (so Kleinert in the *Dorpat Beitrdge zu den Theol. Wissensch.* 1832). Considered as a prolepsis, it is, as Bertheau remarks, less striking than that which occurs in 6:14: "and they builded and finished (the Temple, viz. in 6 Darius) . . . according to the commandment of Cyrus and Darius, and Artaxerxes, king of Persia."

2. A second reason alleged by Dr. Mill (*u. s.* p. 165, note) is "the circumstance that, in the next ascent from Babylon, that of Ezra himself, . . . the chief of David's house was removed from Zorobabel by at least six generations . . . thus proving . . . the impossibility of the descendant's ascent from Babylon being earlier than the reign next to that of Darius Nothus, viz. that of Artaxerxes II." This argument is derived from the Davidic genealogy, 1 Chronicles 3:19-22, compared with Ezra 8:2. It is assumed that Hattush in both places is the same person; now, in the genealogy, it is alleged there are at least six generations between his ancestor Zerubbabel and him, yet he accompanied Ezra from Babylon; of course this is impossible, if between the ascent of Zerubbabel and that of Ezra are but eighty years (1 Cyrus to 7 Artaxerxes Longimanus). Dr. Mill (p. 152, note) mentions "four ways of exhibiting the offspring of Hananiah, son of Zerubbabel;" the first, that of the common Hebrew text and our version, which, "if intelligible, yet leaves the number of generations undetermined;" and three others, followed by ancient interpreters, and versions, which result severally in making Hattush sixth, eighth, and ninth from Zerubbabel. There is no absolute necessity for departing from the Hebrew text, which is both "intelligible"' and consistent with the customary chronology. The genealogy, perhaps, proceeds thus: 1. Zerubbabel; 2. his children, Meshullam, Hananiah, Shelomith (sister), and five others; 3. the sons of this Hananiah are Pelatiah and Jeshaiah; and there the pedigree of Zerubbabel ends, i.e. with the two grandsons. Then, "the sons of Rephaiah, the sons of Arnan, the sons of Obadiah, the sons of Shechaniah; and the sons of Shechaniah, Shemaiah; and the sons of Shemaiah, Hattush" and five others. That is to say, the genealogist, having

deduced the Davidic line through Solomon, and the regal succession down to the grandsons of Zerubbabel, proceeds to mention four other branches of the house of David, and gives a particular account of the fourth, namely, of Shemaiah, the father of that Hattush who went up from Babylon with Ezra, and was in his generation the representative of the Davidic house of Shechaniah. (So likewise Movers, *Ueber die bibUische Chronik*, p. 29: Havernick, *Handb. der Einleit. in das A. T.* 2:1, 266; Herzfeld, *Gesch. des V. I. von der Zerstirung des ersten Tempels an*, 1:379; Keil, *Apolog. Versuch fiber die Biicher der Chronik*, p. 43. On the other hand, Ewald, *Gesch. des V. I* . 1:219, note, makes Shechaniah son of Hananiah and father of Shemaiah, so that Hattush is fourth from Zerubbabel; and so Bertheau in the *Kgyf exeget. Hdb*. on 1 Chronicles 3:21; which view is consistent with the usual chronology, as of course it is quite possible that a grandson of Zerubbabel's grandson may have been adult at the time of Ezra's mission, eighty years after the 1st of Cyrus. See, however, a different explanation in Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels*, p. 17, note m.) *SEE ZERUBBABEL*. So, in fact, the Hattush who accompanied Ezra is described (according to the reading, proposed by some, of the passage, 8:2, 3), "of the sons of David, Hattush, of the sons of Shechaniah;" for the last clause is out of place as prefixed to the following enumeration "of the sons of Parosh," etc. So the Sept. read it (ἀπὸ υἱῶν Δαυίδ, Ἀττοὺς ἀπὸ υἱῶν Σαχανία); and the apocryphal version more plainly still (1 Esdras 8:29, ἐκ τῶν υἱῶν Δαυίδ, Λαττοὺς ὁ Σεχενίου). But still more probably *a different Hattush* (q.v.) is meant.

3. The concluding argument on the same side is derived from "the circumstance that in the next ascent from Babylon after that of Ezra, and in the same reign, the principal opponent of Nehemiah in his work of rebuilding Jerusalem was a man [Sanballat] who can be demonstrated to have continued an active chief of the Samaritans till the time of Alexander the Great, and to have then founded the temple on Mount Gerizim, Joseph. *Ant.* 11:8, 2-4" (Dr. Mill, u. s.). Josephus's story is that Sanballat, satrap in Samaria of Darius 3, had given his daughter in marriage to a brother of the high-priest Jaddua, named Manasses, who, refusing to put her away, took refuge with his father-in-law, and became the first high-priest of the rival temple built on Mount Gerizim by permission of Alexander, then engaged in the siege of Tyre. All this, with perhaps the marvelous romance that follows about Alexander's reception by the high-priest Jaddua, needs a better voucher than Josephus before it can be accepted as history. The

story about Manasses and Sanballat is clearly derived from the last recorded act of Nehemiah, his expulsion of a son of Joiada, and grandson of the then high-priest Eliashib, who was son-in-law to Sanballat the Horonite. It is remarkable that Josephus, in his account of Nehemiah, makes no mention of this act, and does not even name Sanballat: the reason of which may be that, after referring the mission of Nehemiah, as also of Ezra, to the reign of Xerxes, to extend the life of this active chief of the Samaritans from that time to the time of Alexander, full 130 years later, would have' been too absurd. *SEE SANBALLAT*. So is the assumption of Petermann (s.v. "Samaria," in Herzog's *Real-Encyklop.* 13:1, p. 367) that there were two Sanballats, one contemporary with Nehemiah, the other with Alexander, and that both had daughters married into the family of the high-priest (Eliashib and Jaddua), whose husbands were therefore expelled. As to Jaddua, the fact may be, as Josephus represents it, that he was still high-priest in the time of Alexander. The six who are named in lineal succession in Nehemiah 12:10, 11; Jeshua, Joiakim, Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan, and Jaddua, will fill up the interval of 200 years from Cyrus to Alexander. Of these, Eliashib was still high-priest in the thirty-second year of Nehemiah's Artachshashta, and later (xiii. 6, 28); it is scarcely possible that this could be Artaxerxes Mnemon, whose thirty-second year is removed from the first of Cyrus by more than 160 years, which is far too much for a succession of three high-priests. It does not follow from the mention of the successors of Eliashib down to Jaddua in 12:10 sq., that Nehemiah lived to see any of them in the office of high-priest, but only that these genealogies and lists were brought down to his own times by the compiler or last redactor of this book (see under No. 3 below). *SEE NEHEMIAH*.

Darius Hystaspis

(i.e. son of Hystaspes or Vashtaspa), the fifth in descent from Achaemenes, the founder of the Perso-Arian dynasty, or ninth in the succession of the Archeemenids (comp. Herod. 7:11), as he styles himself in the *Behistun* (q.v.) Inscription (Rawlinson, *Herod*. 2:491), being third descendant from the younger brother of Cambyses, father of Cyrus, was, according to the popular legend (*Herod*. 1:209, 210), already marked out for empire during the reign of Cyrus. Cambyses having died without issue, and no other son of Cyrus surviving, Darius was hereditary successor to the throne, to which, as Herodotus relates, he was elected on the death of the pretended Smerdis by his fellow-conspirators. In the Canon, the date of his succession

is B.C. 521, and the length of his reign 36 years, both points confirmed by Herodotus (vii. 1-4), according to whom he died five years after the battle of Marathon (therefore B.C. 485), after a reign of thirty-six years (also attested by an Egyptian inscription, Rosellini, *Mon. Storici*, ii; 164). He devoted himself to the internal organization of his kingdom, which had been impeded by the wars of Cyrus and Cambyses, and the confusion of the reign of Smerdis. His designs of foreign conquest were interrupted by a revolt of the Babylonians, under a pretender who bore the royal name of Nabukudrassar (Niebuhr, *Gesch. Ass. und Bab*. p. 94), which was at length put down, and punished with great severity (B.C. cir. 516). After the subjugation of Balylon, Darius turned his arms against Scythia, Libya (Herod. 4:145 sq.), and India (Herod. 4:44). Thrace and Macedonia acknowledged his supremacy, and some of the islands of the Agaeean were added to his dominion in Asia Minor and the seaboard of Thrace (B.C. 513505). Shortly afterwards he came into collision with Greece, and the defeat of Marathon (B.C. 490) only roused him to prepare vigorously for that decisive struggle with the West which was now inevitable. His plans were again thwarted by rebellion. Domestic quarrels (Herod. 7:2) followed on the rising in Egypt, and he died (B.C. 485) before his preparations were completed (*Herod*. 7:4).

With regard to the Jews, Darius Hystaspis pursued the same policy as Cyrus, and restored to them the privileges which they had lost. For the usurpation of Smerdis involved a religious as well as a political revolution, and the restorer of the Magian faith willingly listened to the enemies of a people who had welcomed Cyrus as their deliverer (Ezra 4:17 sq.). But in the second year of Darius, B.C. 520, as soon as his power had assumed some solidity, Haggai (Haggai 1:1; 2:1, 10) and Zechariah encouraged their countrymen to resume the work of restoration (Ezra 5:1 sq.), and when their proceedings came to the king’s knowledge he confirmed the decree of Cyrus by a new edict, and the Temple was finished in four years (B.C. 516; Ezra 6:15), though it was apparently used before that time (Zechariah 7:2, 3). The benefits conferred by Darius upon the Jews are not mentioned in his inscriptions. Of the satrapies, twenty in number, into which he formed the empire, Palestine would be part of the fourth, including Syria, Phoenicia, and Cyprus. The fourth king of Persia, who should “be far richer than they all, and by his strength, through his riches, should stir up all against the realm of Grecia (Daniel 11:2), may be Darius,

if the pseudo-Smerdis is reckoned, but the description better suits Xerxes (see Hitzig in the *Kgf. exeget. Hdb*. in loc.).

III. “Darius the Persian” (yseæ]Phi8D, Sept. Δαρεῖος ὁ Πέρσης) occurs (Nehemiah 12:22) in a passage which merely states that the succession of priests was registered up to his reign. The question as to the person here intended bears chiefly on the authorship of the passage. It may be briefly stated thus: If, as is more commonly believed, this king be Darius Nothus (originally Ochus), who came to the throne in B.C. 424, and reigned nineteen years, we must (assuming that the Jaddua here mentioned is the high-priest who went out to meet Alexander the Great [q.v.] on his entry into Jerusalem, Josephus, *Ant.* 11:8) conceive either that Jaddua reached an age exceeding a century — for so long he must have lived, if he was already high-priest in the reign of Darius Nothus, and saw Alexander’s entry; or that the Jaddua of Nehemiah and of Josephus are not the same person. Carpzov has tried to show, from this very chapter, that the Jaddua of ver. 22 was a Levite, and not the high-priest (*Introduct. ad Libr. Vet. Test*. p. 347). *SEE JADDUA*. If, however, the register was continued to a later time, as is not improbable, the occurrence of the name Jaddua (ver. 11, 22), who was high-priest at the time of the invasion of Alexander (q.v.), points to Darius III Codomannus, the antagonist of Alexander, and last king of Persia, B.C. 336-330 (1 Maccabees 1:1). Compare Jahn, *Archaol*. II, 1:272 sq.; Keil, *Lehrb. d. Einleit*. § 152, 7, who defends at length the integrity of the passage. On this latter view, we must either assume that Nehemiah himself attained the age of 130 years at least, or that this passage is an interpolation by a later hand (Bertholdt, *Einleit*. 3, 1031). Perhaps the meaning of the verses in question only is, that the priests enumerated were those included in the genealogical records down to the time of the return from Babylon, i.e. as finally made out by Nehemiah and Ezra (ver. 26); and therefore containing those prospectively high-priests, although at the time but children. Supposing that Jaddua was five years of age at the time of the closing of the O.T. canon, *SEE EZRA*, in B.C. 406 (to which date Nehemiah undoubtedly lived), he would have been but about fifty years old on his accession as high-priest (q.v.), B.C. cir. 359. The king referred to in Nehemiah 12:22, would then be Darius Nothus. This explanation is consistent with all the circumstances, and leaves the authenticity of the passage unaffected.

DARIUS II was named OCHUS (Ωχος), but on his accession he was distinguished by the epithet NOTHUS (Νόθος), from his being one of the

seventeen illegitimate sons of Artaxerxes I or Longimanus, who made him satrap of Hyrcania. He rebelled against Sogdianus, another brother, who had murdered their father, and, with the aid of several of the provincial satraps, succeeded in gaining supreme power, putting the usurper to death. He was a weak prince, completely under the control of his favorites, and especially of his wife Parysatis; and his reign was distinguished by continual insurrections, particularly that of the Egyptians, who succeeded in gaining for a while their independence (B.C. 414). Darius died in B.C. 405-4, and was succeeded by his oldest son Artaxerxes II (Ctesias, *Pers*. 44-56; Diod. Sic. 12:71; 13:36, 70, 108; Xenoph. *Hell*. 1:2, 19; 2:1, 8; *Anab*. 1:1, 1).

Darkemon

SEE DARIC.

Darkness

(properly Ëv,j , cho'shek; σκότος), the absence of light; the state of chaos as represented by the sacred writer in Genesis 1:2. *SEE CREATION*.

The plague of darkness in Egypt (Exodus 10:21) was one so thick and intense as to seem almost palpable. The "palpable obscure" of Milton appears to express the idea in a forcible manner. The Tamul translation gives "darkness which causeth to feel," or so dark that a man is obliged to feel his way, and until he shall have so felt he cannot proceed. Some expositors are disposed to contend for the literal palpableness of this darkness by supposing that the agency employed was a wind, densely filling the air with particles of dust and sand. Such winds are not unknown in the Eastern deserts, and they are always very appalling and destructive in their effects. Others think that a dense fog was spread over the land; but a darkness consisting of thick clammy fogs and exhalations, so condensed as to be perceived by the organs of touch, might have extinguished animal life in a few hours. Whether the darkness was exhibited in these or any other forms, the miracle must have struck the Egyptians with astonishment and horror, as the sun was one of their principal deities, and was supposed to be the source of life and the soul of the world, and with the moon to rule all things. *SEE PLAGUES OF EGYPT*.

In the Gospels of Matthew (Matthew 27:45) and Luke (Luke 23:44) we read that, while Jesus, hung upon the cross, "from the sixth hour there was darkness over all the land unto the ninth hour." Most of the ancient

commentators believed that this darkness extended to the whole world. But their arguments are now seldom regarded as satisfactory, and their proofs even less so. Of the latter the strongest is the mention of an eclipse of the sun, which is referred to this time by Phlegon Trallianus, and, after him, by Thallus (ap. Africanum). But even an eclipse of the sun could not be visible to the whole world, and neither of these writers names the place of the eclipse. Some think it was Rome; but it is impossible that an eclipse could have happened from the sixth to the ninth hour both at Rome and Jerusalem. It is, therefore, highly probable that the statement of Phlegon, which in the course of time has come to be quoted as independent authority, was taken from the relation of the Christians or from the Scriptures. That the darkness could not have proceeded from an eclipse of the sun is further placed beyond all doubt by the fact that, it being then the time of the Passover, the moon was at the full. This darkness may therefore be ascribed to an extraordinary and preternatural obscuration of the solar light, which might precede and accompany the earthquake that took place on the same occasion; for it has been noticed that often before an earthquake such a mist arises from sulphureous vapors as to occasion a darkness almost nocturnal (see the, authors cited in Kuinoil *ad Matt*. 24:29, and compare Joel 3:3; Revelation 6:12 sq.). *SEE EARTHQUAKE*. Such a darkness might extend over Judaea, or that division of Palestine in which Jerusalem stood, to which the best authorities agree that here, as in some other places, it is necessary to limit the phrase πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν, rendered "all the land." In the "Acts of Pilate" (q.v.), which have been' quoted by Justin Martyr and Tertullian, we find the following document, in which this preternatural darkness is referred to. *SEE ECLIPSE*.

> "Pilate to Tiberius, etc.
>
> "I have at length been forced to consent to the crucifixion of Jesus Christ, to prevent a tumult among the Jews, though it was very much against my will. For the world never saw, and probably never will see, a man of such extraordinarypiety and uprightness. But the high-priests and Sanhedrim fulfilled in it the oracles of their prophets and of our sibyls. While he hung on the cross, a horrid darkness, which covered the earth, seemed to threaten its final end. His followers, who profess to have seen him rise from the dead and ascend into heaven, and acknowledge him for their God, do still subsist, and, by their excellent lives, show themselves the worthy disciples of so extraordinary a master. I did all I could to save him

> from the malice of the Jews, but the fear of a total insurrection made me sacrifice him to the peace and interest of your empire," etc.

The "thick darkness" in which God is said to have been (Exodus 20:21), was doubtless the "thick cloud upon the mount" mentioned Exodus 19:16; and the "thick darkness" in which "the Lord said that he would dwell" (1 Kings 8:12), has reference to the cloud upon the mercy-seat, in which he promised to "appear" to Aaron, and which seems to have been rather a cloud of glory and light than of darkness. *SEE CLOUD*. When it is said (Psalm 97:2) "' clouds and darkness are round about him," the reference is apparently to the inscrutability of the divine nature and working. The darkness which is frequently (Isaiah 13:9, 10; Joel 2:31; 3:15; Matthew 24:29, etc.) connected with the coming of the Lord has reference to the judgments attendant on his advent.

Darkness is often used symbolically in the Scriptures as opposed to light, which is the symbol of joy and safety, to express misery and adversity (Job 18:6; Psalm 107;10; 143:3; Isaiah 8:22; 9:1; 59:9, 10; Ezekiel 30:18; 32:7, 8; 34:12); hence also captivity (Isaiah 47:5; Lamentations 3:6). 'He . . that maketh the morning darkness,' in Amos 4:13, is supposed to be an allusion to the dense black clouds and mists attending earthquakes. 'The day of darkness' in Joel 2:2, alludes to the obscurity occasioned by the flight of locusts in compact masses. *SEE LOCUST*. In Ezekiel 8:12, darkness is described as the accompaniment of idolatrous rites. Darkness of the sun, moon, and stars is used figuratively to denote a general darkness or deficiency in the government or body politic (Isaiah 13:10; Ezekiel 32:7; Joel 2:10-31). In Ephesians 5:11, the expression 'works of darkness' is applied to the heathen mysteries on account of the impure actions which the initiated performed in them. 'Outer darkness' in Matthew 8:12, and elsewhere, refers to the darkness outside, in the streets or open country, as contrasted with the blaze of cheerful light in the house, especially when a convivial party is held in the night time. And it may be observed that the streets in the East are utterly dark after nightfall, there being no shops with lighted windows, nor even public or private lamps to impart to them the light and cheerfulness to which we are accustomed. This gives the more force to the contrast of the 'outer darkness' with the inner light. Darkness is used to represent the state of the dead (Job 10:21; 17:13). It is also employed as the proper and significant emblem of ignorance (Isaiah 9:2; 60:2; Matthew 6:23; John 3:9; 2 Corinthians 4:1-6)."

Dar'kon

(Heb. *Darkon'*, ˆ/q r Þi according to Gesenius, *strewer*; according to Furst, *porter*; Sept. Δαρκών, Δορκών; Vuig. *Deron*), a person whose "children" or descendants were among "Solomon's servants" that returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2:56; Nehemiah 7:58). B.C. ante 536.

Darling

(dy j ø *yachid'*, only, hence beloved) stands (Psalm 22:21; 35:17) for life (as a thing not to be replaced); hence *self* (like v p ß, soul; comp. "dear me").

Darom

(µ/r D; Sept. λίψ and Δαρόμ). This word is generally used in Scripture to denote "the south" (Ezekiel xl, 24; Job 37:17). -Its meaning in Deuteronomy 33:23 is doubtful. Moses in blessing Naphtali says, "'Possess thou the *sea and Darom*." The A. V. renders it "the west and the south;" the Septuagint, θάλασσαν καὶ λίβα; the old Latin, "mare et Africum;" and the Vulgate, "mare et meridiem." The territory of Naphtali lay on the north-east of Palestine. It did not touch or go near the Mediterranean; consequently "the sea" cannot mean the Mediterranean. The sea of Galilee is doubtless referred to, the whole western shore of which belonged to Naphtali. The Septuagint rendering of Darom in this passage (Λίψ, i.e. Africa) must be wrong. Naphtali never had any connection with Africa, or with that region on its northern frontier afterwards called Darom. The word seems here to denote a district near Tiberias, and probably the sunny plain of Gennesaret, which surpassed all the rest of Palestine in fertility (Joseph. *War*, 3:10, 8). With. this agrees the probable etymology of the word, which, according to Gesenius, signifies *bright*, according to Furst, *glowing*.

In Ezekiel 20:46 (21:2), Darom appears to be a proper name. "Son of man, set thy face towards Teman, and drop the word towards *Darom*." The A.V. translates both words "south," but the Septuagint more correctly Θαιμὰν and Δαρώμ. Instead of Δαρώμ Symmachus gives Λίβα. We learn from Jerome and other ancient writers that the plain which lies along the southern border of Palestine and extends towards Egypt was formerly called Darom. Thus, Jerome says, Duma "is a large village in Darom —

that is, in the *south country* in the region of Eleutheropolis, seventeen miles distant from that city" (*Onomast.* s.v. Darom); and Eusebius describes Gerir as situated ὑπὲρ τὸν Δαρωμᾶν (ib. s.v. Γέραρα). The name appears to have been applied to the whole plain from the Mediterranean to the Arabah, and southern shore of the Dead Sea (Reland, *Palest.* p. 185 sq.). In the early ages of Christianity a Greek convent was erected near the coast; about seven miles south of Gaza, and named Daron. During the crusades it was converted into a fortress, and was the scene of many a hard struggle between the Christians and Saracens (Will. Tyr. in *Gesta Dei per Francos*, p. 988; Marinus Sanutus, p. 86, 246; Bohadin, *Vita Saladini*, p. 72, and *Index Geog.* s.v. Darounum; Robinson, *Bib. Res.* ii, 375). The site is now marked by a small village called Deir el-Balah, "the convent of the dates" (Porter, *Handbook for S. and P.* p. 266).

Dart

(in Proverbs 7:23, חֵצ *chets*, an arrow, as elsewhere; in Job 41:26, מַשָּׂא *massa'*, an arrow; in 2 Samuel 17:14, שֶׁרֶבְ *sherbet*, a rod or staff, as elsewhere; in 2 Chronicles 32:5, שֶׁלַח, *she'lach*, any missile weapon; in Job 41:29, תֹּתָח, *tothach'*, a bludgeon; in the New. Test. βέλος, Ephesians 6:16, or βολίς, Hebrews 12:20, a javelin), an instrument of war similar to an arrow or light spear. It is thought that the Hebrews were in the habit of discharging darts from the bow while on fire. These fiery darts were made of the shrub *rothem* or Spanish broom (the *Spartium junceum* of Linn.), which grows abundantly in the Arabian desert. It is probably in reference to this fact that arrows are sometimes compared to lightnings (Deuteronomy 32:23,42; Psalm 7:13; 120:4; Zechariah 9:14). The fiery darts among the Romans, according to Ammianus Marcellinus, consisted of a hollow reed, to the lower part of which, under the point or barb, was fastened a round receptacle, made of iron, for combustible materials, so that such an arrow had the form of a distaff. This was filled with burning naphtha, and when the arrow or dart was shot from a slack bow (for if discharged from a tight bow the fire went out) it struck the enemies' ranks and remained fixed, the flame consuming whatever it met with; water poured on it increased its violence, and there were no other means to extinguish it but by throwing earth upon it. Similar darts or arrows, which were twined round with tar and pitch and set fire to, are described by Livy as having been made use of by the inhabitants of the city of Saguntum when besieged by the Romans

(*Hist*. 21:9). The apostle alludes to these fiery darts in Ephesians 6:11-16. *SEE ARMS*.

Datarius

(*datary*), a chancellor in the papal court. His title is derived from datum, usually prefixed to the date of the documents issued (e.g. datum, given, August 20). He is always a prelate, and sometimes a cardinal, and receives his name from his office, which is to date certain petitions for benefices that have been presented and registered: he writes upon them *Datum Romae apud,* etc. He is empowered to grant, without acquainting the pope therewith, all benefices which do not produce upwards of twenty-four ducats annually; for such as amount to more he is obliged to get the provisions signed by the pope, who admits him to audience every day. If there be several candidates for the same benefice, he has the liberty of bestowing it on any whom he may select. His salary is two thousand crowns, exclusive of perquisites. When the pope's consent has been obtained, the datary subscribes the petition with the words *Annuit sanctissimus*. The pope's assent is subscribed in these words, *Fiat ut petitu*; "Be it according to the petition." The pope's bull granting the benefice is then dispatched by the datary; and passes through the hands of many persons, belonging to different offices, who have all their stated fees. It is very expensive to procure the pope's bull for a benefice, and very large sums go into the office of the datary, especially when the provisions are for bishoprics, or other rich benefices. — Buck, *Theol. Dict.* s.v.; Farrar, s.v.

Date

Picture for Date 1

(2 Chronicles 31:5, margin, for vbD] *dbash'*, "honey," Sept. μέλι, Vulg. mel), the fruit of one species of the palm (rm;T;[Talm. lqÞ] comp. δάκτυλος, date], φοῖνιξ, *Phoenix dactilifera* of Linn.). This tree formerly grew abundantly in Palestine (Joel 1:12; Nehemiah 8:15; Judges 4:5; Mishna, *Biccurim*, 1:10; comp. Pliny, 13:6; Tacitus, *Hist*. v. 6, 2; Theoph. *Plaut*. 2:8; Pausan. 9:19, 5), especially in certain warm localities (Schubert, *Reisen*, p. 105), namely, around Jericho (which hence was called the Palm City, Josephus, *Ant.* 15:4, 2; Pliny, v. 15; 13:9; Strabo, 16:763; Philostr. *Apollon*. 6:39), En-gedi (Solin. 38:12), and the Dead Sea (Diod. Sic. 2:48;

19:98); also at the Sea of Galilee (Josephus, *War*, 3:10, 8); as a stately tree (especially fine at Jericho, Strabo 17:800; Galen, *Facult. alim*. 2:26; Buxtorf, *Lex*. Chald. col. 109; Pliny, 13:9), so that on Jewish and Roman coins (also Phoenician, Spanheim. *Praestant. et us. num*. p. 272) it was even empoyed as the symbol of the country (Froelich, *Ann. Syr. tab*. 18; see the praises of Idumaean palms in Virgil, *Georg*. 3, 12; *Sil. Ital*. 3, 600; 7:456; Lucan, 3, 216; *Martial*, 10:50, 1). At present it is seldom to be met with there (Shaw, *Travels*, p. 297; Schubert, 3, 114; at Jericho there exists but a solitary one, Robinson, *Researches*, 2:537; at Engedi none whatever, Robinson, 2:441); they are abundant, however, and even grow wild in Arabia (in Arabia Petraea they were anciently found here and there, Exodus 15:27; Numbers 33:9; comp. Burckhardt, *Reisen*, 2:815; Robinson, 1:256, 264), in Egypt (Strabo, 17, p. 818; Gellius, 7:16, 5; *Prosp. Alpin. Plantt. Eig*. c. 7) and Persia (Kampfer, *Amnen*. p. 669: on the extent of the date-palm, see Link, *Urwelt*, 1:347 sq.; Arago, in the *Annuaire du Bureau des Longitudes*, 1834), in which countries it has from antiquity been regarded as the choicest of fruit-trees (Strabo, 16:742; Plato, *Sympos*. 8:4-5; compare Hasselquist, p. 541). It loves a light, sandy, warm soil (Josephus, *War*, 3:10, 8), yet not one deficient in moisture (Sirach 24:14; Strabo, 16:776; *Pallad*. R. R. 11:12), attains a height of 30 to 40 (in some instances 60 and even 100) feet, and lives till about 200 years old (Pliny, 16:89; Plutarch, *Sympos*. 8:4, 2; Shaw, p. 128; comp. [in the Sept.] Job 29:18); it has a slim (Song of Solomon 7:7), straight, single trunk of 10 to 18 inches' diameter, covered rather with the scaly remains of the boughs that have fallen or broken off than with a proper bark. At its summit only the palm bears a large number (40 to 80) slender branches, which, growing shorter and shorter towards the top (the bottom ones being some 20 feet long), and bending at the ends in a curve towards the ground, enclose a considerable extent of shade (Wellsted, 1:70). The boughs generally surround the body in a circle six in number, and put forth rush-like, sword-shaped, evergreen (Psalm 92:13; comp. Shaw, p. 128) leaves, about 2 inches broad, and 8 to 12 feet long. In the midst of the topmost and youngest branches is found a pointed, pithy heart (ἐγκέφαλον, or head), nearly two yards in length, which contains the buds of new twigs and leaves (this, when cut off, was relished as a dainty article of food from the taste of the drupes, Theophr. *Plantt*. 2:8; Pliny, 13:9; Mishna, *Okzin*, 3, 7; Mariti, *Trav*. p. 407). Staminate and pistillate flowers are upon separate stems. This renders an artificial fertilization necessary in order to insure the produce (see Mishna, *Pesach*, 4:8; Ammian. Marc. 24:3, p. 13, Bip.), for

which the right time must be very exactly observed. For in February there appear on the stem, at the joints of the lowest branches, long (even one yard) capsules, enclosed in a leathery skin, which in May shoot up into male blossoms and female buttons. The former are now plucked off (about March), slit through the length, and inserted upon the female germs (Kampfer, *Amon*. p. 707; Hasselquist, p. 133, 223 sq.; Shaw, p. 127; Thevenot, 2:170). *SEE BOUGH*.

Picture for Date 2

The fruit (Talm. t b,T]Kµ, Surenhusius, *Mischna*, 2:253; 6:91), which comes to maturity in about five months (August and September, or October), hangs in clusters (Song of Solomon 7:7) together, in form like the acorn, but mostly larger, and with a fine ruddy (Diod.Sic. 2:53) or white skin. The best kind is call *jeni*. They were sometimes used in a fresh state (Heliod. *Eth*. 2:23; comp. Hasselquist, p. 540) as a very common article of food (Burckhardt, *Arab*. p. 45, 575; Harmar, 3, 415), sometimes dried as a dessert-fruit (Xenoph. *Anab*. 2:3, 15), and sometimes their juice was pressed out (comp. Jonathan’s *Targum on Deuteronomy* 8:8), which, as *date-wine* οἶνος φοινίκων), was made use of from ancient times (Herod. 1:193; 3, 86; Xenoph. *Anab*. 2:3, 14; Pliny, 13:9; 14:19; Philostr. *Apol*. 2:6, 1; *Athen*. 14:651; Strabo, xvi, p. 742; *Dioscor*. v. 40; Wilkinson, 3, 174 sq.), or occasionally boiled down into a kind of *palm-honey* (*Targ*. Jon. and *Jerus*. on Deuteronomy 8:3; Strabo, 11:742; Pliny, 13:9; Ammian. Marcel. 23:10; Josephus, *War*, 4:8, 3; Shaw, p. 128; Heeren, *Ideen*, I, 2:46). *SEE WINE*; *SEE HONEY*. The dates (caryotce, φοινικοβάλανοι) left by this last operation of squeezing, being still fulr. ther subjected to the action of hot water, and thus macesrated, are made into an inferior but palatable wine. The ripe dates are also at the present day pressed into large, firm, caky masses, which serve the travelers in caravans as a satisfying and refreshing aliment (Sonnini, 2:26; Burckhardt, *Arab*. p. 45), This is the form, similar to that of raisins or figs, in which they appear in modern commerce. From the twigs (ribs of the leaves) baskets are made (Mishna, *Chel*. 26:1), also bird-cages and other wicker-ware; their fibres are twisted into ropes and thread, but the leaves themselves are manufactured into baskets, mats, and brooms (Horace, *Sat*. 2:4, 83; Mishna, *Okzin*, 1:3; Pococke, *East*, 1:306; Dobel, *Wander*. 2:194: hence the palm-twigs were called καλλυντήρια or κάλλυντρα; compare Sept. at Leviticus 23:42 sq., µyr;m;T] t/PKi; accordingly, in Song of Solomon 7:8, by µyNæsænsæsi,

boughs, we are to understand the crown of the palm; ascetics used the leaves for clothing, Jerome, *Opp.* 2:10; they are now made into fans). The Jews employed palm-branches on the Feast of Tabernacles (Leviticus 23:40; Nehemiah 8:15; like the Egyptians in honor of Osiris, *Minutoli*, p. 16), and on festive occasions they carried them before princes and distinguished personages, and waved them in token of joy and triumph (Revelation 7:9; comp. Virgil, *Georg.* 2:47; *AEn.* v. 111; Plutarch, *Sympos.* 8:4, 1; 1 Maccabees 13:51; John 12:13; Philo, *Opp.* 1:101; Minutoli, *Trav.* tab. 13). Even the kernels of the dates are made use of at the present day as fodder for cattle (Burckhardt, *Arab.* p. 542). The seed of the male tree, which sheds a fragrant odor, is greedily eaten by the modern Arabs (Wellsted, 1:200). The wood is very spongy, but it lasts pretty well as building material for inside beams (Xenophon, *Cyrop.* 7:5, 11; Strabo, 15:731; 16:739; 17:822. See generally *Theophr. Plantt.* 2:6 (Sprengel, *Erlaut.* 2:73 sq.); Plin. 13:6 sq.; *Descr. de l'Egypte*, 17:108 sq.; Celsius, 2:445 sq.; Oken, *Lehrb. d. Botanilk*, II, 1:1003 sq. *SEE PALMTREE*.

Da'than

(Heb. *Dathan'*, ˆ t Þ; *welled*, q. d. *Fontanus*; Sept. Δαθάν; Joseph. Δάθαμνος, *Ant.* 4:2, 2), a Reubenite chieftain, son of Eliab, who joined the conspiracy of Korah (q.v.) the Levite, and with his accomplices was swallowed up by an earthquake (Numbers 16:1; 26:9; Deuteronomy 11:6; Psalm 106:17; comp. Ecclesiasticus 45:18). B.C. cir. 1618. *SEE EXODE*.

Dathe Johann August,

an eminent Oriental scholar and Biblical critic, was born at Weissenfels July 4, 1731, became professor of Oriental literature at Leipsic in 1762, and, died March 17, 1791, at Leipsic. His chief work is *Libri Vet. Test. ex recensione textus leb. notisque philolog. et crit. illustrati* (Halae, 1791, 6 vols. 8vo). He also edited *Glassius, Philologia Sacra*, and the *Prolegomena to Walton's Polyglot* (Lips. 1777); a *Syriac Psalter*, with the translation and notes of Erpenius (Halle, 1768); and (posthumous) *Opuscula ad Crisin et interp. Vet. Test. spectantia* (ed. by Rosenmüller, jun., Lips. 1795).

Dath'ema

(Λιάθεμα; Alex. and Josephus, Δάθεμα; other MSS. Δάμεθα; Vulg. *Dathema*), a fortress. (τὸ ὀχύρωμα; Joseph. φρούριον) in which the

Jews of Gilead took refuge from the heathen (1 Maccabees 5:9; Joseph. *Ant.* 12:8, 1). Here they were relieved by Judas and Jonathan (1 Maccabees 5:24). They marched from Bozora to Dathema (ver. 28, 29), and left it for Maspha (*Mizpeh*) (ver. 35). The reading of the Peshito, Ramtha, points to Ramoth-Gilead, which can hardly fail to be the correct identification. Ewald, however, *Gesch. Isr.* 3, 2, p. 359, note), would correct this to Damtha, which he compares with Dhamri, a place reported by Burckhardt (*Syr*. 1. 196).

Dathenus Petrus,

one of the Dutch Reformers, was born at Yperen, in Flanders. At an early age, he entered the Carmelite monastery at Poperingen. Here he became acquainted with the doctrine of the Reformation, and was so captivated by it that he soon resolved to leave the monastery and repair to England. In London he followed the occupation of a printer. Enjoying liberty of conscience under the reign of Edward VI, he applied himself diligently to the study of the Scriptures, in the knowledge of which he made such proficiency that he was soon admitted to the service of the Church. He soon left England, and entered on the work of the ministry at Frankfort. He subsequently sojourned in the Palatinate. Here he seems to have been held in high esteem. He was one of the five Reformed preachers who, in the presence of the elector and the duke of Würtemberg, held a disputation with five Lutheran ministers on the ubiquity of Christ’s body. In 1566 he returned to his native land. West Flanders was at first the scene of his labors. He soon became known as one of the most zealous of the Reformed preachers. His enthusiasm, the cogency of his reasoning, and his rude but captivating eloquence, attracted multitudes. His audience sometimes amounted to more than fifteen thousand. His labors were not confined to Flanders, but extended to Zealand and other parts of Holland. Obliged to flee for his life, he again sought refuge in the Palatinate, and at Frankenthal, whither many Dutch, French, and Walloons had fled, he exercised his ministry. From here he went to Heidelberg, where he became court. preacher to John Casimir. In 1578 he was sent as delegate from Ghent to the General Synod at Dort, over whose deliberations he presided. He preached in various cities of Holland, but made Ghent the place of his permanent abode. Here he became involved in political affairs. His harangues so inflamed the populace that the Romanists were driven out of the city, and great excesses were committed in and around Ghent. As a consequence he was again obliged to flee, and again he sought and found

refuge with his former protector, John Casimir. In the midst of his active and troublous life he still found time for literary pursuits. His translation of the Heidelberg Catechism into Dutch was adopted, and has, with slight modifications, continued in use to the present time. He also gave a Dutch versification of the Book of Psalms, according to the French of Beza and Marot. This was also adopted by the Reformed Church, and was used in public worship till 1773, when it was superseded by a version of higher poetic merit. His burning zeal and abundant labors contributed much to advance the cause of the Reformation in Holland.

Daub Karl,

a German theologian of the Hegelian school, was born at Cassel March 20, 1765. In 1791 he became tutor in the academy of Marburg, where he had been studying since 1786. He was afterwards professor of philosophy in Hanau, and finally, in 1794, became professor of theology at Heidelberg. He died Nov. 22,1836. Daub was one of the representatives of the new speculative theology. At first, especially in his *Predigten nach Kantischen Grundsdtzein* (1794), and in his *Katechetik* (Heidelb. 1801), he was a, Kantian; he afterwards inclined to Fichte; and in his *Theologoumena* (Heidelb. 1806), and *Einleitung in d. Studium d. Dogmatik* (Heidelb. 1810), he applied Schelling's doctrine to theology. As the latter ended with theosophic dualism, so Daub, in his *Judas Iscariot* (Heidelb. 1816; 2d ed. 1818), displayed a speculation almost bordering on Manicheism. This work bears witness to his struggle with Hegel's phenomenology and logic, but Hegel finally prevailed. Daub was a man of old German simplicity, great moral energy, and warm faith; yet, with a great talent for teaching, he was too abstract in his literary productions to influence a large circle. This is especially the case with his last work, *Die dogmatische Theologie jetziger Zeit* (Heidelb. 1833). He was associated with Creuzer in publishing a periodical entitled *Studien* (Heidelb. 1805-10 6 vols.). His works have been published by Marheineke and Dittenberger (Berl. 1838-44, 7 vols.). — Pierer, *Univ. Lexicon*, s.v.; Kahnis, *German Protestantism* (Edinb. 1856, 12mo, p. 243); Rosenkranz, *Erinnerungen an Can Daub* (Berl. 1837); Strauss, *Charakteristiken u. Kriti ken*; Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 19:391.

Daubeny Charles,

a divine of the Church of England, was born in Bristol 1744, and was educated at Winchester School and at New College, Oxford. He became

vicar of North Bradley 1778; obtained a prebend in Salisbury Cathedral in 1784; was appointed archdeacon of Sarum in 1804; and died in 1827. Besides numerous sermons and charges, he is the author of *A Guide to the Church* (Lond., royal 8vo, 1830); *Vindiciae Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (Lond. 1803, 8vo); *Remarks on the Unitarian Method of interpreting the Scriptures; Discourses* (3 vols. 8vo, Lend. 1802-16); and of minor works. At North Bradley he built alms-houses for twelve poor persons, an asylum, and a school-room; and the church at Rode was erected partly at his expense. — *Christian Journal and Lit. Register*, 12:177.

Daubuz Charles,

a French Protestant divine, was born in 1670, came to England on the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and became vicar of Brotherton, Cheshire. He died in 1740. His *Commentary on the Book of Revelation* (Lond. 1720, folio) is a most elaborate work, to which later writers have been much indebted, and which is one of the most learned books written on the Apocalypse. The abridgment by Lancaster (Lond. 1730, 4to) forms a good analysis of its contents. Both works are rare. He also *wrote Pro testimonio Flavii Josephi de Jesu Christo, libri duo, cum praefatione J. E. Grave* (London, 1706, 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, s.v.; Rose, *Biog. Dict.* 7:26; Elliott, *Horea Apocalypticae*, 4:457; Horne, *Introduction*, v. 388, 9th ed.

Daughter

(tBi bath, for tnB, fem. of ^Be son; θυγατήρ), a word used in Scripture in a variety of senses, some of which are unknown to our own language, or have only become known through familiarity with scriptural forms of speech. *SEE BEN*-. Besides its usual and proper sense of

(1.) a daughter, born or adopted, we find it used to designate

(2.) a Uterine sister, niece, or any female descendant (Genesis 20:12; 24:48; 28:6; 36:2; Numbers 25:1; Deuteronomy 23:17).

(3.) Women, as natives, residents, or professing the religion of certain places, as “the daughter of Zion” (Isaiah 3:16); “daughters of the Philistines” (2 Samuel 1:20); “daughter of a strange god” (Malachi 2:11); daughters of men,” i.e. carnal women (Genesis 6:2), etc.

(4.) Metaphorically small towns are called daughters of neighboring large cities — metropoles, or mother cities — to which they belonged or from which they were derived, as "Heshbon and all the daughters [*Auth. Vers. villages*] thereof" (Numbers 21:25); so Tyre is called the daughter of Sidon (Isaiah 22:12), as having been originally a colony from thence; and hence also the town of Abel is called "a mother in Israel" (2 Samuel 20:19); and Gath is in one place (comp. 2 Samuel 7:1; 1 Chronicles 18:1) called Gath-Ammah, or Gath the mother town, metropolis, to distinguish it from its own dependencies, or from another place called Gath. *SEE VILLAGE*. Comp. other instances in Numbers 21:32; Judges 11:26; Joshua 15:45, etc.

(5.) The people collectively of any place, the name of which is given, as "the daughter (i.e. the people) of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at thee" (Isaiah 37:22; see also Psalm 45:13; 137:8; Isaiah 10:30; Jeremiah 46:19; Lamentations 4:22; Zechariah 9:9). This metaphor is illustrated by the almost universal custom of representing towns under the figure of a woman.

(6.) The word "daughter," followed by a numeral, indicates a woman of the age indicated by the numeral, as when Sarah (in the original) is called "the daughter of ninety years" (Genesis 17:17).

(7.) The word "daughter" is also applied to the produce of animals, trees, or plants. Thus, "daughter of the she-ostrich," (supposed) for "female ostrich" (Leviticus 11:16); Joseph is called "a fruitful bough whose daughters (branches) run over the wall" (Genesis 49:22). See further in Gesenius and Furst, s.v. בת.

The condition of daughters, that is, of young women, in the East, their employments, duties, etc., may be gathered from various parts of Scripture, and seems to have borne but little resemblance to that of young women of respectable parentage among ourselves. Rebekah drew and fetched water; Rachel kept sheep, as did the daughters of Jethro, though he was a priest, or a prince, of Midian. They superintended and performed domestic services for the family; Tamar, though a king's daughter, baked bread; and the same of others. We have the same occupations for the daughters of princes in the ancient poets, of which Homer is an unquestionable evidence. *SEE CHILD*; *SEE EDUCATION*; *SEE WOMAN*; *SEE MARRIAGE*.

The original terms rendered “daughter-in-law” are in the Hebrews hL;Ki *kallah*’; Sept. and New Test. νύμφη, both literally meaning a bride (as elsewhere rendered), and applied to a son’s wife.

Davenant John, D.D.,

bishop of Salisbury, was born in London about 1570, and was educated at Queen’s College, Cambridge. In 1594 a fellowship was offered him, which he accepted after his father’s death in 1597. In 1609 he was elected Lady Margaret professor of divinity. In 1614 he was chosen master of his college, and in 1618 was one of the four divines sent to the Synod of Dort by James I. *SEE DORT*. He returned to England in May, 1619, after having visited the most eminent cities in the Netherlands. In 1621 he was appointed to the see of Salisbury; but in 1630-31 he incurred the displeasure of the court by a sermon on predestination, “all curious search into which” the king, in his declaration prefixed to the Thirty-nine Articles in 1628, had strictly enjoined “to be laid aside.” The bishop died of consumption in 1641. He was a man of great learning. He published *Expositio Epist. D. Pauli ad Colossenses* (Cambridge, 1630, 2d edition, fol.; translated by Allport, London, 1831, 2 vols. 8vo), *Praelectiones de duobus in theologia cont. capitibus* (Cantab. 1631, fol.); *Determinationes quaestionum theologicarum* (Cantab. 2d edition, 1639, fol.); *Dissert. II de Morte Christi et de Predestinatione* (Camb. 1630). A translation of one of the *Praelectiones* appeared under the title *A Treatise on Justification*, etc., translated from the original Latin (Lond. 1844-46, 2 vols. 8vo). After bishop Davenant’s return from the Synod of Dort, he published an earnest appeal for fraternal union among the Reformed churches, under the title *Ad fraternam communionem inter Evangelicas Ecclesias restaurandam adhortatio* (Camb. 1640; transl. into English, 1641, 8vo). — *Biographia Britannica*, 4:629.

Davenport, Christopher

an English Romanist divine, was born at Coventry about 1598, and was sent to Merton College, Oxford, at 15, but was persuaded at 17 by a priest to go to the Romanist college at Douai, France, and thence to Ypres. Here he became a Romanist and a Franciscan. Under the name of Franciscus a Sancta Clara he came as a missionary to England, and was made chaplain to Henrietta Maria, consort of Charles I. Davenport was a man of learning and of good address, and he labored zealously and successfully for the

cause of Rome. On the death of Charles I he went abroad, and only appeared in England in disguise until the restoration of Charles II, when he became chaplain of queen Catharine and provincial of the English Franciscans. He died May 31, 1680. Among his writings are, *Paraphrastica Expositio Arliculorum Conf. Anglicanae* (1635; new transl., Lond. 1865); *Deus, Natura, Gratia* (1635); both works aiming to show that the English Articles are not reaily hostile to Rome. — *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* 4:324.

Davenport, John

(elder brother of Christopher), an eminent Congregational minister, was born at Coventry, England, 1597. He was sent to Merton College, Oxford, 1613, and, after passing B.A., he entered the ministry at nineteen. Having served a short time at Hilton Castle as chaplain, he became rector of St. Stephen's Church, London. After an interview with Mr. John Cotton he became a Nonconformist, and, to escape bishop Laud, he fled to Holland in 1633. In 1635 he returned to London, and sailed for Boston, Mass., where he arrived June 26, 1637. With a number of others he sailed on March 00,1638, for Quinipiac, now New Haven. In 1639 a Church was formed, and on August 22 Mr. Davenport was installed pastor. He was ordained, with Mr. James Allen as colleague, pastor of the First Church, Boston, Dec. 9,1668, and died March 15,1670. He published *Instructions to the Elders of the English Church* (1634); *Report of some Proceedings against John Paget* (1634); *Allegations of Scripture against the Baptizing of some kind of Infants* (1634*); Catechism concerning the chief Heads of the Christian Religion* (Lond. 1659); and a number of occasional sermons. — Sprague, *Annals*, 1:94; *New Gen. Biog. Dict.* 4:325.

Da'vid

(Heb. *David'*, דָּוִד[in the full form, דָּיִוד in 1 Kings 3:14, and in Chron., Ezra, Neh., Song of Solomon, Hos., Amos, Ezekiel 34:23, and Zech.], *affectionate* or *beloved*; Arab. in common use *Daoud*; Sept. Δαυΐδ, N.T. Δαβίδ, older MSS. Δαυείδ; Joseph. Δαυΐδης), the second but most prominent of the line of Jewish kings. The prominence of this personage in the Old Testament history as well as in the Christian economy requires a full treatment of the subject here.

A. *Personal Biography*. — The authorities for the life of David may be divided into the following classes:

(I.) The original Hebrew authorities:

(1.) The narrative of 1 Samuel 16, to 1 Kings 2:10; with the supplementary notices contained in 1 Chronicles 11:1 to 29:30.

(2.) The "Chronicles" or State-papers of David (1 Chronicles 27:24), and the original biographies of David by Samuel, Gad, and Nathan (1 Chronicles 29:29). These are lost, but portions of them no doubt are preserved in the foregoing.

(3.) The Davidic portion of the Psalms, including such fragments as are preserved to us from other sources, viz., 2 Samuel 1:19-27; 3:33, 34; 22:1-51; 23:1-7. *SEE PSALMS*.

(II.) The two slight notices in the heathen historians, Nicolaus of Damascus in his Universal History (Josephus, *Ant.* 7:5, 2), and Eupolemus in his *History of the Kings of Judah* (Euseb. *Praep. Ev*. 9. 30).

(III.) David's apocryphal writings, contained in Fabricius, *Codex Apocryphus V. Test.* p. 906-1006.

(1.) Psalm 151, on his victory over Goliath.

(2.) Colloquies with God, on madness, on his temptation, and on the building of the Temple.

(3.) A charm against fire. Of these the first alone deserves any attention.

(IV.) The Jewish traditions, which may be divided into three classes:

(1.) The additions to the Biblical narrative contained in Josephus, *Ant.* 6:8-vii. 15.

(2.) The Hebrew traditions preserved in Jerome's *Quaestiones Hebraicae in Libros Regum et Paralipomenen* (vol. 3, Venice edit.).

(3.) The Rabbinical traditions reported in Basnage, *Hist. des Juwfs, lib*. v, c. 2; Calmet's *Dictionary*, s.v. David.

(V.) The Mussulman traditions, chiefly remarkable for their extravagance, are contained in the Koran, 2:250-252; 38:20-24; 21:79-82; 22:15, and explained in Lane's *Selections from the Koran*, p. 228-242; or amplified in Weil's *Legends, Eng. tr*. p. 152-170.

(VI.) In modern times his life has been often treated, both in separate treatises and in histories of Israel. Many of the monographs on almost every point in his life will be found referred to below. In English, the best known are, Delany's *Hist. Account* (Lond. 1741-2, 3 vols.), Chandler's *Life* (Lond. 1766, 2 vols.; new edit. Lond. 1853), and Blaikie, *David King of Israel* (London, 1856); in French, *De Choisi's*, and that in Bayle's *Dictionary*. One of the most recent, and, in some respects, the best treatment, is that in Ewald's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 3, 71-257. See also Kitto, *Daily Bible Illustrations*, vol. 2. Other treatises on his life as a whole, or on the several incidents of it, are referred to in Darling's *Cyclopoedia*, 3, 290 sq.

David's life may be divided into the three following portions, more or less corresponding to the three old lost biographies by Samuel, Gad, and Nathan:

I. His youth before his introduction to the court of Saul.
II. His relations with Saul.
III. His reign.

I. *The early life of David* contains in many important respects the antecedents of his after history.

1. His family are mostly well known to us by name, and are not without bearing on his subsequent career. For an extended view of David's lineage, *SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST*.

It thus appears that David (born B.C. 1083) was the youngest son, probably the youngest child, of a family of ten. His mother's name is unknown. *SEE NAHASH*. We can only conjecture her character from one or two brief allusions to her in the poetry of her son, from which we may gather that she was a godly woman, whose devotion to God's service her son commemorates as at once a token of God's favor to himself, and a stimulus to him to consecrate himself to God's service (Psalm 86:16; and perhaps Psalm 116:16). His father, Jesse, was of a great age when David was still young (1 Samuel 17:12). His parents both lived till after his final rupture with Saul (1 Samuel 22:3). Certain points with regard to his birth and lineage deserve special mention.

(a) His connection with Moab through his ancestress Ruth. This he kept up when he escaped to Moab and entrusted his aged parents to the care of the

king (1 Samuel 22:3). This connection possibly gave greater breadth to his views, and even to his history, than if he had been of purely Jewish descent. Such is probably the significance of the express mention of Ruth in the genealogy in Matthew 1:5.

(b) His birthplace, Bethlehem (q.v.). His recollection of the well of Bethlehem is one of the most touching incidents of his later life (1 Chronicles 11:17). From the territory of Bethlehem, as from his own patrimony, he gave a piece of property as a reward to Chimham, son of Barzillai (2 Samuel 19:37, 38; Jeremiah 41:17). It is this connection of David with Bethlehem that gave importance to the place again in later times, when Joseph went up to Bethlehem, "because he was of the house and lineage of David" (Luke 2:4).

(c) His general connection with the tribe of Judah, in which the tribal feeling appears to have been stronger than in any of the others. This connection must be borne in mind throughout the story — both of David's security among the hills of Judah during his flight from Saul, and of the early period of his reign at Hebron, as well as of the jealousy of the tribe at having lost their exclusive possession of him, which broke out in the revolt of Absalom.

(d) His relations to Zeruiah and Abigail. Though called in 1 Chronicles 2:16, sisters of David, they are not expressly called the daughters of Jesse; and Abigail, in 2 Samuel 17:25, is called the daughter of Nahash. Is it too much to suppose that David's mother had been the wife or concubine of Nahash, and then married by Jesse? This would agree with the difference of age between David and his sisters, and also (if Nahash was the same as the king of Ammon) with the kindnesses which David received first from Nahash (2 Samuel 10:2), and then from Shobi, son of Nahash (17:27).

2. As the youngest of the family, he may possibly have received from his parents the name, which first appears in him, of *David*, the *darling*. But, perhaps for this same reason, he was never intimate with his brethren. The eldest brother, who alone is mentioned in connection with him, and who was afterwards made by him head of the tribe of Judah (1 Chronicles 27:18), treated him scornfully and imperiously (1 Samuel 17:28), as the eldest brothers of large families are apt to act; his command was regarded in the family as law (1 Samuel 20:29); and the father looked upon the youngest son as hardly one of the family at all (1 Samuel 16:11), and as a mere attendant on the rest (1 Samuel 17:17). The familiarity. which he lost

with his brothers, he gained with his nephews. The three sons of his sister Zeruiah, and the one son of his sister Abigail, seemingly from the fact that their mothers were the eldest of the whole family, were probably of the same age as David himself, and they accordingly were to him — especially the three sons of Zeruiah — throughout life in the relation usually occupied by brothers and cousins. In them we see the rougher qualities of the family, which David shared with them, while he was distinguished from them by qualities peculiar to himself. The two sons of his brother Shimeah are both connected with his after history, and both seem to have been endowed with the sagacity in which David himself excelled. One was Jonadab, the friend and adviser of his eldest son Amnon (2 Samuel 13:3); the other was Jonathan (2 Samuel 21:21), who afterwards became the counselor of David himself (1 Chronicles 27:32). It is a conjecture or tradition of the Jews preserved by Jerome (*Qu. Heb*. on 1 Samuel 17:12) that this was no other than *Nathan* the prophet, who, being adopted into Jesse's family, makes up the eighth son, not named in 1 Chronicles 2:13-15. But this is hardly probable.

The first record of David's appearance in history at once admits us to the whole family circle. B.C. 1068. There was a practice once a year at Bethlehem, probably at the first new moon of the year, of holding a sacrificial feast, at which Jesse, as the chief proprietor of the place, would preside (1 Samuel 20:6), with the elders of the town. At this or such like feast (1 Samuel 16:1) suddenly appeared the great prophet Samuel, driving a heifer' before him, and having in his hand a horn of the consecrated oil of the Tabernacle. The elders of the little town were terrified at this apparition, but were reassured by the august visitor, and invited by him to the ceremony of sacrificing the heifer. The heifer was killed. The party were waiting to begin the feast. Samuel stood with his horn to pour forth the oil, as if for an invitation to begin (1 Samuel 9:22). He was restrained by divine intimation as son after son passed by Eliab, the eldest, by "his height" and "his countenance," seemed the natural counterpart of Saul, whose rival, unknown to them, the prophet came to select. But the day had gone by when kings were chosen because they were head and shoulders taller than the rest. Samuel said unto Jesse, Are these all thy children? And he said, There yet remaineth the youngest, and behold he keepeth the sheep." The boy was brought in. We are enabled to fix his appearance at once in our minds. He was of short stature, thus contrasting with his tall brother Eliab, with his rival Saul, and with his gigantic enemy of Gath. He

had red or auburn hair, as is occasional in the East; or at least a rufous complexion and sanguineous temperament. *SEE RUDDY*. Later he wore a beard. His bright eyes are especially mentioned (1 Samuel 16:12), and generally he was remarkable for the grace of his figure and countenance ("fair of eyes," "comely," "goodly," 16:12, 18; 17:42), well made, and of great strength and agility. His swiftness and activity made him (like his nephew Asahel) like a wild gazelle, his feet like harts' feet, and his arms strong enough to break a bow of steel (Psalm 18:33, 34). He was pursuing the occupation allotted in Eastern countries usually to the slaves, the females, or the despised of the family (comp. the case of Moses, of Jacob, of Zipporah, and of Rachel, and in later times of Mohammed; Sprenger, p. 8). The pastures of Bethlehem are famous throughout the sacred history. The Tower of Shepherds (Genesis 35:21) was there; and there too the shepherds abode with their flocks by night (Luke 2). He usually carried a switch or wand in his hand (1 Samuel 17:40), such as would be used for his dogs (17:43), and a scrip or wallet round his neck, to carry anything that was needed for his shepherd's life (1 Samuel 17:40). Such was the outer life of David when (as the later Psalmists described his call) he was "taken from the sheepfolds, from following the ewes great with young, to feed Israel according to the integrity of his heart, and to guide them by the skillfulness of his hands" (Psalm 78:70-72). The recollection of the sudden and great elevation from this humble station is deeply impressed on his after life. "The man who was raised up on high" (2 Samuel 23:1) "I have exalted one chosen out of the people" (Psalm 89:19 "I took thee from the sheepcote" (2 Samuel 7:8). The event itself prepared him to do that in which Saul had so eminently failed, viz. to reconcile his own military government with a filial respect for the prophets and an honorable patronage of the priesthood. Besides this, he became knit into a bond of brotherhood with his heroic comrades, to whom he was eminently endeared. by his personal self-denial and liberality (1 Samuel 30:21-31; 1 Chronicles 11:18).

3. But there was another preparation still more needed for his office, which probably had made him already known to Samuel, and which, at any rate, is his next introduction to the history. When the bodyguard of Saul were discussing with their master where the best minstrel could be found to chase away his madness by music, one of the young men in the guard suggested David. Saul, with the absolute control inherent in the idea of an Oriental king, instantly sent for him, and in the successful effort of David's

harp we have the first glimpse into that genius for music and poetry which was afterwards consecrated in the Psalms. It is impossible not to connect the early display of this gift with the schools of the prophets, who exercised their vocation with tabret, psaltery, pipe, and harp (1 Samuel 10:5), in the pastures (*Naioth*; comp. Psalm 23:2), to which he afterwards returned as to his natural home (1 Samuel 19:18). Whether any of the existing Psalms can be referred to this epoch of David's life is uncertain. The 23d, from its subject of the shepherd, and from its extreme simplicity (though placed by Ewald somewhat later), may well have been suggested by this time. The 8th, 19th, and 29th, which are universally recognized as David's, describe the phenomena of nature, and, as such (at least the two former), may more naturally be referred to this tranquil period of his life than to any other. The imagery of danger from wild beasts, lions, wild bulls, etc. (Psalm 7:2; 22:20, 21), may be reminiscences of this time. And now, at any rate, he must have first acquired the art which gave him one of his chief claims to mention in after times — "the sweet singer of Israel" (2 Samuel 23:1), "the inventor of instruments of music" (Amos 6:5); "with his whole heart he sung songs and loved him that made him" (Ecclesiasticus 47:8).

4. One incident alone of his solitary shepherd life has come down to us — his conflict with the lion and the bear in defense of his father's flocks (1 Samuel 17:34, 35). But it did not stand alone. He was already known to Saul's guards for his martial exploits, probably against the Philistines (1 Samuel 16:18), and when he suddenly appeared in the camp his elder brother immediately guessed that he had left the sheep in his ardor to see the battle (1 Samuel 17:28). To this new aspect of his character we are next introduced. B.C. 1063.

The scene of the battle is at Ephes-dammim (q.v.), in the frontier hills of Judah, called probably from this or similar encounters "the bound of blood." Saul's army is encamped on one side of the ravine, the Philistines on the other; the watercourse of Elah, or "the Terebinth," runs between them. A Philistine of gigantic stature, and clothed in complete armor, insults the comparatively defenseless Israelites, among whom the king alone appears to be well armed (1 Samuel 17:38; comp. 13:20). No one can be found to take up the challenge. At this juncture David appears in the camp, sent by his father with ten loaves and ten slices of cheese to his three eldest brothers, fresh from the sheepfolds. Just as he comes to the circle of wagons which formed, as in Arab settlements, a rude fortification round the Israelite camp (1 Samuel 17:20), he hears the well-known shout of the

Israelite war-cry (comp. Numbers 23:21). The martial spirit of the boy is stirred at the sound; he leaves his provisions with the baggage-master, and darts to join his brothers (like one of the royal messengers) into the midst of the lines. Then he hears the challenge, now made for the fortieth time — sees the dismay of his countrymen — hears of the reward proposed by the king-goes with the impetuosity of youth from soldier to soldier talking of the event, in spite of his brother's rebuke — he is introduced to Saul — undertakes the combat. His victory over the gigantic Philistine is rendered more conspicuous by his own diminutive stature, and by the simple weapons with which it was accomplished — not the armor of Saul, which he naturally found too large, but the shepherd's sling, which he always carried about with him, and the five polished pebbles which he picked up as he went from the watercourse of the valley, and put in his shepherd's wallet. Two trophies long remained of the battle — one, the huge sword of the Philistine, which was hung up behind the ephod in the Tabernacle at Nob (1 Samuel 21:9); the other the head, which he bore away himself, and which was either laid up at Nob, or subsequently at Jerusalem. See Nos. Psalm cxliv, though by its contents of a much later date, is by the title in the Sept. "against Goliath." But there is also a psalm, preserved in the Sept. at the end of the Psalter, and which, though probably a mere adaptation from the history, well sums up this early period of his life:

"This is the psalm of David's own writing (?) (ἰδιόγραφος εἰς Δαυίδ), and outside the number, when he fought the single combat with Goliath." "I was small amongst my brethren, and the youngest in my father's house. I was feeding my father's sheep. My hands made a harp, and my fingers fitted a psaltery. And who shall tell it to my Lord? He is the Lord, he heareth. He sent his messenger (angel?), and took me from my father's flocks, and anointed me with the oil of his anointing. My brethren were beautiful and tall, hut the Lord was not well pleased with them. I went out to meet the Philistine, and he cursed me by his idols. But I drew his own sword and beheaded him, and took away the reproach from the children of Israel."

David's susceptible temperament, joined to his devotional tendencies, must, at a very early age, have made him a favorite pupil of the prophets, whose peculiar mark was the harp and the psalm (1 Samuel 10:112, and 19:20-24; see also 2 Kings 3:15).

There is no small difficulty in reconciling the recommendation of David to Saul as a skillful player and warrior in 1 Samuel 16:14-23, with the account in the following chapter of David's appearance in the camp of Saul, and his introduction to that monarch in consequence of his victory over Goliath. Both narratives apparently give the account of David's first introduction to Saul, and yet it is not possible to combine them into one. Some would transpose the latter part of the 16th chap. so as to make it follow after 18:9 (Horsley, *Bib. Crit*. 1:332); but it is not easy to see what is gained by this; for if David was known to Saul, and accepted into Saul's service as there narrated, how could Saul send for him to his father's house, and receive him as a perfect stranger, as narrated in 1 Samuel 16:14-20? On the other hand, if David came before the notice of Saul under the circumstances mentioned in this 16th chapter, and was received into his favor and service as there narrated (21-23), how could the facts recorded in the 17th chapter, especially those in verses 31-37, and 55-58, have occurred? The Vatican MS. of the Sept. rejects 1 Samuel 17:12-31, 55-58, and 1 Samuel 18:1-5, as spurious; and this Kennicott approves as the true solution of the difficulty (see his discussion of the question, *Dissert. on the Hebrew Text*, p. 418-432, 554-558). What gives some plausibility to this is, that ver. 32 naturally connects with ver. 11, and all between has very much the aspect of an interpolation. At the same time, it can hardly be permitted on such grounds to reject a portion of Scripture which has all other evidence, external and internal, in its favor. The old solution of the difficulty, that as David, after his first introduction to Saul, did not abide constantly with him, but went and came between Saul and his father's house (1 Samuel 17:15), he may have been at home when the war with the Philistines broke out; and as Saul's distemper was of the nature of mania, he very probably retained no recollection of David's visits to him while under it, but at each new interview regarded and spoke of him as a stranger — still leaves unexplained the fact of Abner's ignorance of David's person, which appears to have been as complete as that of the king, and the fact of David's professing ignorance of warlike weapons, though he had been for some time Saul's armor-bearer. This last difficulty may be alleviated by the consideration that the statement in 1 Samuel 16:21 may be proleptical; or David, though Saul's armor-bearer, may have had so little practice in the use of armor as to prefer, in such a crisis, trusting to the weapons with which he was familiar. The best adjustment of these passages, however, is to transpose the account in 1 Samuel 16:14-23, so as to bring it in between 1 Samuel 18:4 and 5, and to regard the statement in 1 Samuel 18:2, of

David's permanent residence at court after Goliath's slaughter as referring merely to an attachment to the royal person as a general thing and for the present. On the breaking out of Saul's hypochondria, David may naturally have returned home.

II. *David's History in connection with Saul*. — The victory over Goliath had been a turning-point of his career. Saul inquired his parentage, and took him finally to his court. Jonathan was inspired by the romantic friendship which bound the two youths together to the end of their lives. The triumphant songs of the Israelitish women announced that they felt that in him Israel had now found a deliverer mightier even than Saul; and in those songs, and in the fame which David thus acquired, was laid the foundation of that unhappy jealousy of Saul towards him which, mingling with the king's constitutional malady, poisoned his whole later relations to David. Three new qualities now began to develop themselves in David's character. The first was his prudence. It had already been glanced at on the first mention of him to Saul (1 Samuel 16:18), as "prudent in matters;" but it was the marked feature of the beginning of his public career. Thrice over it is emphatically said, "he behaved himself wisely," and evidently with the meaning that it was the wisdom called forth by the necessities of his delicate and difficult situation. It was that peculiar Jewish caution which has been compared to the sagacity of a hunted animal, such as is remarked in Jacob, and afterwards in the persecuted Israelites of the Middle Ages. One instance of it appears immediately, in his answer to the trap laid for him by Saul's servants, "Seemeth it to you a light thing to be the king's son-in-law, seeing that I am a poor man and lightly esteemed?" (1 Samuel 18:23). Secondly, we now see his magnanimous forbearance called forth, in the first instance, towards Saul, but displaying itself (with a few painful exceptions) in the rest of his life. He is the first example of the virtue of chivalry. Thirdly, his hairbreadth escapes, continued through so many years, impressed upon him a sense of dependence on the Divine help, clearly derived from this epoch. His usual oath or asseveration in later times was, "As the Lord liveth who hath redeemed my soul out of adversity" (2 Samuel 4:9; 1 Kings 1:29); and the Psalms are filled with imagery taken even literally from shelter against pursuers, slipping down precipices (Psalm 18:36), hiding-places in rocks and caves, leafy coverts (Psalm 31:20), strong fastnesses (Psalm 18:2). This part of David's life may be subdivided into four portions:

1. *His Life at the Court of Saul till his final Escape* (1 Samuel 18:2-19:18). — His office is not exactly defined. But it would seem that, having been first armor-bearer (1 Samuel 16:21; 18:2), then made captain over a thousand — the subdivision of a tribe — (1 Samuel 18:13), he finally, on his marriage with Michal, the king's second daughter, was raised to the high office of captain of the king's body-guard, second only, if not equal, to Abner, the captain of the host, and Jonathan, the heir apparent. These three formed the usual companions of the king at his meals (1 Samuel 20:25). David was now chiefly known for his successful exploits against the Philistines, by one of which he won his wife, and drove back the Philistine power with a blow from which it only rallied at the disastrous close of Saul's reign. He also still performed from time to time the office of minstrel. But the successive snares laid by Saul to entrap him, and the open violence into which the king's madness twice broke out, at last convinced him that his life was no longer safe. He had two faithful allies, however, in the court — the son of Saul, his friend Jonathan — the daughter of Saul, his; wife Michal. Warned by the one and assisted by the other, he escaped by night, and was from that time forward a fugitive. B.C. 1062. Jonathan he never saw again except by stealth. Michal was given in marriage to another (Phaltiel), and he saw her no more till long after her father's death. *SEE MICHAL*. To this escape the traditional title assigns Psalm 59. Internal evidence (according to Ewald) gives Psalm 6 and 7 to this period. In the former he is first beginning to contemplate the necessity of flight; in the latter he is moved by the plots of a person not named in the history (perhaps those alluded to in 1 Chronicles 12:17) — according to the title of the psalm, Cush, a Benjamite, and therefore of Saul's tribe. *SEE CUSH*, 2.

2. *His Escape* (1 Samuel 19:18-21:15). — He first fled to Naioth (or the pastures) of Ramah, to Samuel. This is the first recorded occasion of his meeting with Samuel since the original interview during his boy. hood at Bethlehem. It might almost seem as if he had intended to devote himself with his musical and poetical gifts to the prophetical office, and give up the cares and dangers of public life. But he had a higher destiny still. Up to this time both the king and himself had thought that a reunion was possible (see 20:5, 26). But the madness of Saul now became more settled and ferocious in character, and David's danger proportionately greater. The secret interview with Jonathan, of which the recollection was probably handed down through Jonathan's descendants when they came to David's court, confirmed the alarm already excited by Saul's endeavor to seize him at

Ramah, and he now determined to leave his country, and take refuge, like Coriolanus, or Themistocles in like circumstances, in the court of his enemy. Before this last resolve he visited Nob (q.v.), the seat of the tabernacle (1 Samuel 21), partly to obtain a final interview with the high-priest Ahimelech (1 Samuel 22:9, 15), partly to procure food and weapons. On the pretext of a secret mission from Saul, he obtained from Ahimelech some of the sacred loaves of shew-bread (q.v.) and the consecrated sword of Goliath, of which he said, "There is none like that; give it me." The incident was of double importance in David's career. First, it established a connection between him and the only survivor of the massacre in which David's visit involved the house of Ahimelech. Secondly, from Ahimelech's surrender of the sacred bread to David's hunger (see Osiander, *De Davide panes propositionis recipiente*, Tubing. 1751) our Lord drew the inference of the superiority of the moral to the ceremonial law, which is the only allusion made to David's life in the N.T. (Matthew 12:3; Mark 2:25; Luke 6:3, 4). It is also commemorated by the traditional title of Psalm 52. His hospitable reception, when in distress, by Ahimelech the priest, and the atrocious massacre innocently brought by him on Nob, the city of the priests (1 Samuel 21and 22:9-19), must have deeply affected his generous nature, and laid the foundation of his cordial affection for the whole priestly order, whose ministrations he himself helped to elevate by his devotional melodies. *SEE AHIMELECH*, 1.

His stay at the court of Achish (q.v.) was short. Discovered possibly by "the sword of Goliath," his presence revived the national enmity of the Philistines against their former conqueror; and he only escaped by feigning madness, by violent gestures, playing on the gates of the city, or on a drum or cymbal, letting his beard grow, and foaming at the mouth (1 Samuel 21:13, Sept.). (See Ortlob, *De Davidis delirio*, Lips. 1706; Hebenstreit, *De Dav. furorem simulante, Vit*. 1711; Krafft, *De Dav. in aula Getheorum, Erlang*. 1768.) The 56th and 34th Psalms are both referred by their titles to this event, and the titles state (what does not appear in the narrative) that he had been seized as a prisoner by the Philistines, and that he was, in consequence of this stratagem, set freely Achish, or (as he is twice called) Abimelech. *SEE ACHISH*, 1.

3. *His Life as an independent Outlaw* (1 Samuel 22:1-26:25). —

(1.) His first retreat was the cave of Adullam, probably the large cavern (the only very large one in Palestine), not far from Bethlehem, now called

Khureitun (see Bonar's *Land of Promise*, p, 244). From its vicinity to Bethlehem, he was joined there by his whole family, now feeling themselves in danger from Saul's fury (1 Samuel 22:1). This was probably the foundation of his intimate connection with his nephews, the sons of Zeruiah. B.C. 1061. Of these, Abishai, with two other companions, was among the earliest (1 Chronicles 11:15, 20; 1 Samuel 26:6; 2 Samuel 23:13, 18). Besides these were outlaws and debtors from every part, including, doubtless, some of the original Canaanites, of whom the name of one, at least, has been preserved, Ahimelech the Hittite (1 Samuel 26:6). *SEE ADULLAM*.

(2.) His next move was to a stronghold, either the mountain afterwards called Herodium, close to Adullam, or the fastness called by Josephus (*War,* 7:8, 3) Masada, the Graecised form of the Hebrew word *Metsadah* (1 Samuel 22:4, 5; 1 Chronicles 12:16), in the neighborhood of En-gedi. While there, he had deposited his aged parents, for the sake of greater security, beyond the Jordan, with their ancestral kinsman of Moab (ib. 3). The neighboring king, Nahash of Ammon, — also treated him kindly (2 Samuel 10:2). Here another companion appears for the first time, a school-fellow, if we may use the word, from the schools of Samuel, the prophet Gad, his subsequent biographer (1 Samuel 22:5); and while he was there occurred the chivalrous exploit of the three heroes just mentioned to procure water from the well of Bethlehem, and David's chivalrous answer, like that of Alexander in the desert of Gedrosia (1 Chronicles 11:16-19; 2 Samuel 23:14-17). He was joined here by two separate bands: one a little body of eleven fierce Gadite mountaineers, who swam the Jordan in flood-time to reach him (1 Chronicles 12:8); the other, a detachment of men from Judah and Benjamin, under his nephew Amasai, who henceforth attached himself to David's fortunes (1 Chronicles 12:16-18).

(3.) At the warning of Gad, he fled next to the forest of Hareth (somewhere in the hills of Judah), and then again fell in with the Philistines, and again, apparently advised by Gad (1 Samuel 23:4), made a descent on their foraging parties, and relieved Keilah (q.v.), in which he took up his abode. While there, now for the first time in a fortified town of his own (1 Samuel 23:7), he was joined by a new and most important ally — Abiathar, the last survivor of the house of Ithamar, who came with the high-priest's ephod, and henceforth gave the oracles, which David had hitherto received from Gad (1 Samuel 23:6, 9; 22:23). By this time the 400 who had joined him at Adullam (1 Samuel 22:2) had swelled to 600 (1 Samuel 23:13).

(4.) The situation of David was now changed by the appearance of Saul himself on the scene. Apparently the danger was too great for the little army to keep together. They escaped from Keilah, and dispersed, "whithersoever they could go," among the fastnesses of Judah. Henceforth it becomes difficult to follow his movements with exactness, partly from ignorance of the localities, partly because the same event seems to be twice narrated (1 Samuel 23:19-24; 26:1-4, and perhaps 1 Samuel 24:1-22; 26:5-25). But thus much we discern. He is in the wilderness of Ziph. Once (or twice) the Ziphites betray his movements to Saul, who literally hunts him like a partridge; the treacherous Ziphites beating the bushes before him, and 3000 men being stationed by Saul to catch even the print of his footsteps on the hills (1 Samuel 23:14, 22 [Hebrews], 24 [Sept.]; 24:11; 26:2, 20). David finds himself driven to the extreme south of Judah, in the wilderness of Maon. On two, if not three occasions, the pursuer and pursued catch sight of each other. Of the first of these escapes, the memory was long preserved in the name of the "Cliff of Divisions," given to the cliff down one side of which David climbed, while Saul was surrounding the hill on the other side (1 Samuel 23:25-29), when he was suddenly called away by the cry of a Philistine invasion. On another occasion David took refuge in a cave "by the spring of the wild goats" (En-gedi), immediately above the Dead Sea (1 Samuel 24:1, 2). The rocks were covered with the pursuers. Saul entered, as is the custom in Oriental countries, for a natural necessity. The followers of David, seated in the dark recesses of the cave, seeing, yet not seen, suggest to him the chance thus thrown in their way. David, with a characteristic mixture of humor and generosity, descends and silently cuts off the skirt of the long robe spread, as is usual in the East on such occasions, before and behind the person so occupied and then ensued the pathetic scene of remonstrance and forgiveness (1 Samuel 24:8-22). The third was in the wilderness further south. There was a regular camp, formed with its usual fortification of wagon and baggage. Into this inclosure David penetrated by night, and carried of the cruse of water, and the well-known royal spear of Saul, which twice had so nearly transfixed him to the wall in former days (1 Samuel 26:7, 11, 22). The same scene is repeated as at En-gedi — and this is the 1st interview between Saul and David (1 Samuel 26:25). B.C. 1055. David had already parted with Jonathan in the forest of Ziph (1 Samuel 23:18).

To this period are annexed by their traditional titles Psalm 54 ("When the Ziphim came and said, Doth not David hide himself with us?"); 57 ("When

he fled from Saul in the cave," though this may refer also to Adullam); 63, "When he was in the wilderness of Judah" (or Idumaea, Sept.); 142 ("A prayer when he was in the cave").

While he was in the wilderness of Maon occurred David's adventure with Nabal (q.v.), instructive as showing his mode of carrying on the freebooter's life, and his marriage with Abigail. His marriage with Ahinoam from Jezreel, also in the same neighborhood (Joshua 15:56), seems to have taken place a short time before (1 Samuel 25:43; 27:3; 2 Samuel 3:2).

4. *His Service under Achish* (1 Samuel 27:1; 2 Samuel 1:27). — Wearied with his wandering life, he at last crosses the Philistine frontier, not, as before, as a fugitive, but the chief of a powerful band — his 600 men now grown into an organized force, with their wives and families around them (1 Samuel 27:3-4). After the manner of Eastern potentates, Achish gave him for his support a city — Ziklag, on the frontier of Philistia — and it was long remembered that to this curious arrangement the kings of Judah owed this part of their possessions (1 Samuel 27:6). Here we meet with the first note of time in David's life. He was settled therefor a year and four months (1 Samuel 27:7), and his increasing importance is indicated by the fact that a body of Benjamite archers and slingers, twenty-two of whom are specially named, joined him from the very tribe of his rival (1 Chronicles 12:1-7). Possibly during this stay he may have acquired the knowledge of military organization and weapons of war (1 Samuel 13:19-23), in which the Philistines surpassed the Israelites, and in which he surpassed all the preceding rulers of Israel. During his outlawry, David had also become acquainted in turn not only with all the wild country in the land, but with the strongholds of the enemy all around. The celebrity acquired in successful guerilla warfare, even in modern days, turns many eyes on a chieftain; and in an age which regarded personal heroism as the first qualification of a general (1 Chronicles 11:6) and of a king, to triumph over the persecutions of Saul gave David the fairest prospects of a kingdom. That he was able to escape the malice of his enemy was due in part to the direct help given him by the nations around, who were glad to keep a thorn rankling in Saul's side; in part also to the indirect results of their invasions (1 Samuel 23:27).

He deceived Achish into confidence by attacking the old nomadic inhabitants of the desert frontier, and representing the plunder to be of portions of the southern tribes or the nomadic allied tribes of Israel. But

this confidence was not shared by the Philistine nobles, and accordingly David was sent back by Achish from the last victorious campaign against Saul. In this manner David escaped the difficulty of being present at the battle of Gilboa, but found that during his absence the Bedouin Amalekites, whom he had plundered during the previous year, had made a descent upon Ziklag, burnt it to the ground, and carried off the wives and children of the new settlement. A wild scene of frantic grief and recrimination ensued between David and his followers. It was calmed by an oracle of assurance from Abiathar. It happened that an important accession had just been made to David's force. On his march with the Philistines northward to Gilboa, he had been joined by some chiefs of the Manassites, through whose territory he was passing. Urgent as must have been the need for them at home, yet David's fascination carried them off, and they now assisted him against the plunderers (1 Chronicles 12:19-21). They overtook the invaders in the desert, and recovered the spoil. These were the gifts with which David was now able for the first time to requite the friendly inhabitants of the scene of his wanderings (1 Samuel 30:26-31). A more lasting memorial was the law which traced its origin to the arrangement made by him, formerly in the attack on Nabal, but now again, more completely, for the equal division of the plunder among the two thirds who followed to the field, and the one third who remained to guard the baggage (1 Samuel 30:25; 25:13). Two days after this victory a Bedouin arrived from the north with the fatal news of the defeat of Gilboa. The reception of the tidings of the death of his rival and of his friend, the solemn mourning, the vent of his indignation against the bearer of the message, the pathetic lamentation that followed, well close the second period of David's life (2 Samuel 1:1-27). B.C. 1053.

III. *David's Reign.* —

(I.) As King of Judah at Hebron, 7.5 years (2 Samuel 2:l-5:5). — Hebron was selected, doubtless, because it was the ancient sacred city of the tribe of Judah, the burial-place of the patriarchs and the inheritance of Caleb. Here David was first formally anointed king-by whom it is not stated; but the expression seems to limit the inauguration to the tribe of Judah, and therefore to exclude any intervention of Abiathar (2 Samuel 2:4). To Judah his dominion was nominally confined. But probably for the first five years of the time the dominion of the house of Saul, whose seat was now at Mahanaim, did not extend to the west of the Jordan, and consequently David would be the only Israelite potentate among the western tribes. He then strengthened himself by a marriage with Maacah, daughter of Talmai,

king of Geshur (2 Samuel 3:3), a petty monarch whose dominions were near the sources of the Jordan, and whose influence at the opposite end of the land must have added a great weight into David's scale. From Abigail, widow of the churlish Nabal, David seems to have received a large private fortune. Concerning his other wives we know nothing in particular, only it is mentioned that he had six sons by six different mothers in Hebron. The chief jealousy was between the two tribes of Benjamin and Judah, as Saul had belonged to the former; and a tournament was turned by mutual ill-will into a battle, in which Abner unwillingly slew young Asahel, brother of Joab. "Long war," after this, was carried on between "the house of Saul and the house of David." We may infer that the rest of Israel took little part in the contest; and although the nominal possession of the kingdom enabled the little tribe of Benjamin to struggle for some time against Judah, the skill and age of Abner could not prevail against the vigor and popular fame of David. Gradually David's power increased, and during the two years which followed the elevation of Ishbosheth, a series of skirmishes took place between the two kingdoms. First came a successful inroad into the territory of Ishbosheth (2 Samuel 2:28). Next occurred the defection of Abner (2 Samuel 3:12). A quarrel between Abner and Ishbosheth decided the former to bring the kingdom over to David (see Ortlob, *De pacto Davidis et Abneri*, Lips. 1709). The latter refused to treat unless, as a preliminary proof of Abner's sincerity, Michal, daughter of Saul, was restored to David. The possession of such a wife was valuable to one who was aspiring to: the kingdom; and although David had now other wives, he appears not to have lost his affection for this his earliest bride. She, too, seems to have acquiesced in his claim as being greater than that of the man on whom her father had arbitrarily bestowed her, and the sincere kindness of her new husband had probably not effaced her former attachment to David, although we afterwards find her betrayed into an unworthy act by her pride of position. After giving her back, Abner proceeded to win the elders of Israel over to David; but Joab discerned that if this should be so brought about, Abner of necessity would displace him from his post of chief captain. He therefore seized the opportunity of murdering him when he had come on a peaceful embassy, and covered the atrocity by pleading the duty of revenging his brother's blood. This deed was perhaps David's first taste of the miseries of royal power. He dared not proceed actively against his ruthless nephew, but he vented his abhorrence in a solemn curse on Joab and his posterity, and followed Abner to the grave with weeping. *SEE ABNER*. Anxious to purge himself of the guilt, he ordered a public

wearing of sackcloth, and refused to touch food all the day. His sincere expressions of grief won the heart of all Israel. The feeble Ishbosheth (q.v.), left alone, was unequal to the government, and shortly suffered the same fate of assassination. David, following the universal policy of sovereigns (Tacit. *Hist*. 1:44), and his own profound sense of the sacredness of royalty, took vengeance on the murderers, and buried Ishbosheth in Abner's tomb at Hebron. During this period, it is not stated against what people his marauding excursions were directed. It is distinctly alleged (2 Samuel 3:22) that his men brought in a great spoil at the very time at which he had a truce with Abner; possibly it may have been won from his old enemies the Amalekites (1 Samuel 30). The throne, so long waiting for him, was now vacant, and the united voice of the whole people at once called him to occupy it. B.C. 1046. A solemn league was made between him and his people (2 Samuel 5:3). For the third time David was anointed king, and a festival of three days celebrated the joyful event (1 Chronicles 12:39). His little band had now swelled into "a great host, like the host of God" (1 Chronicles 12:22). The command of it, which had formerly rested on David alone, he now devolved on his nephew Joab (2 Samuel 2:28). It was formed by contingents from every tribe of Israel. Two are specially mentioned as bringing a weight of authority above the others. The sons of Issachar had "understanding of the times to know what Israel ought to do," and with the adjacent tribes contributed to the common feast the peculiar products of their rich territory (1 Chronicles 12:32, 40). The Levitical tribe, formerly represented in David's being followed only by the solitary fugitive Abiathar, now came in strength, represented by the head of the rival branch of Eleazar, the high-priest, the aged Jehoiada and his youthful and warlike kinsman Zadok (1 Chronicles 12:27, 28; 27:5). The kingdom was not at first a despotic, but a constitutional one; for it is stated, "David made a league with the elders of Israel in Hebron before Jehovah; and they anointed David king over Israel" (2 Samuel 5:3). This is marked out as the era which determined the Philistines to hostility (ver. 17), and may confirm our idea that their policy was to hinder Israel from becoming united under a single king.

Underneath this show of outward prosperity, two cankers, incident to the royal state which David now assumed, had first made themselves apparent at Hebron, and affected all the rest of his career. The first was the formation of a harem, according to the usage of Oriental kings. To the two wives of his wandering life he had now added four, and including Michal,

five (2 Samuel 2:2; 3:2-5, 15). The second was the increasing power of his kinsmen and chief officers, which the king strove to restrain within the limits of right; and thus, of all the incidents of this part of his career, the most plaintive and characteristic is his lamentation over his powerlessness to prevent the murder of Abner (2 Samuel 3:31-36).

(II.) *Reign over all Israel*, 33 years (2 Samuel 5:5, to 1 Kings 2:11). — The reign of David is the great critical era in the history of the Hebrews. It decided that they were to have for nearly five centuries a national monarchy, a fixed line of priesthood, and a solemn religious worship by music and psalms of exquisite beauty; it finally separated Israel from the surrounding heathen, and gave room for producing those noble monuments of sacred writ, to the influence of which over the whole world no end can be seen. His predecessor, Saul, had many successes against the Philistines, but it is clear that he made little impression on their real power; for he died fighting against them, not on their own border, but at the opposite side of his kingdom, in Mount Gilboa. As for all the other enemies on every side" — Moabites, Ammonites, Edomites, and the kings of Zobah — however much he may have "vexed them" (1 Samuel 14:47), they, as well as the Amalekites, remained unsubdued, if weakened. The real work of establishing Israel as lord over the whole soil of Canaan was left for David.

1. *The Foundation of Jerusalem*. — It must have been with no ordinary interest that the surrounding nations watched for the prey on which the Lion of Judah, now about to issue from his native lair, and establish himself in a new home, would make his first spring. One fastness alone in the center of the land had hitherto defied the arms of Israel. On this, with a singular prescience, perceiving that so southerly a position as Hebron was no longer suitable, David fixed as his future capital. By one sudden assault Jebus was taken, and became henceforth known by the names (whether borne by it before or not we cannot tell) of Jerusalem and Zion. B.C. 1044. *SEE JERUSALEM*. Of all the cities of Palestine great in former ages, Jerusalem alone has vindicated by its long permanence the choice of its founder. The importance of the capture was marked at the time. The reward bestowed on the successful scaler of the precipice was the highest place in the army. Joab henceforward became captain of the host (1 Chronicles 11:6). The royal residence was instantly fixed there, fortifications were added by the king and by Joab, and it was known by the special name of the "city of David" (1 Chronicles 11:7; 2 Samuel 5:9).

In the account of this siege, some have imagined the Chronicles to contradict the book of Samuel, but there is no real incompatibility in the two narratives. Joab was, it is true, already David's chief captain; but David was heartily disgusted with him, and may have sought a pretense for superseding him by offering the post to the man who should first scale the wall. Joab would be animated by the desire to retain his office, at least as keenly as others by the desire to get it; and it is credible that he may actually have been the successful hero of that siege also. If this was the case, it will further explain why David, even in the fullness of power, made no further effort to expel him until he had slaughtered Absalom.

The neighboring nations were partly enraged and partly awestruck. The Philistines had already made two ineffectual attacks on the new king (2 Samuel 5:17-20), both near the valley of Rephaim; and these were probably the first battles fought by David after becoming king of all Israel. A retribution on their former victories now took place by the capture and conflagration of their own idols (1 Chronicles 14:12). Tyre, now for the first time appearing in the sacred history, allied herself with Israel; and Hiram sent cedarwood for the buildings of the new capital (2 Samuel 5:11), especially for the palace of David himself (2 Samuel 7:2). That the mechanical arts should have been in a very low state among the Israelites was to be expected, since, before the reign of Saul, even smiths forges were not allowed among them by the Philistines. Nothing, however, could be more profitable for the Phoenicians than the security of cultivation enjoyed by the Israelites in the reigns of David and Solomon. The trade between Tyre and Israel became at once extremely lucrative to both, and the league between the two states was quickly very intimate. Unhallowed and profane as Jebus had been before, it was at once elevated to a sanctity which it has never lost, above any of the ancient sanctuaries of the land. The ark was now removed from its obscurity at Kirjath-jearim with marked solemnity, B.C. 1043. A temporary halt (owing to the death of Uzzah) detained it at Obed-edom's house, after which it againr moved forward with great state to Jerusalem. An assembly of the nation was convened, and (according to 1 Chronicles 13:2; 15:2-27) especially of the Levites. The musical arts, in which David himself excelled, were now developed on a great scale (1 Chronicles 15:16-22; 2 Samuel 6:5). Zadok and Abiathar, the representatives of the two Aaronic families, were both present (1 Chronicles 15:11). Chenaniah presided over the music (1 Chronicles 15:22, 27). Obed-edom followed his sacred charge (1 Chronicles 13:18, 21, 24).

The prophet Nathan appears for the first time as the controlling adviser of the future (2 Samuel 7:3). A sacrifice was offered as soon as a successful start was made (1 Chronicles 15:26; 2 Samuel 6:13). David himself was dressed in the white linen dress of the priestly order, without his royal robes, and played on stringed instruments (1 Chronicles 15:27; 2 Samuel 6:14, 20). As in the prophetic schools where he had himself been brought up (1 Samuel 10:5), and as still in the impressive ceremonial of some Eastern dervishes, and of Seville cathedral (probably derived from the East), a wild dance was part of the religious solemnity. Into this David threw himself with unreserved enthusiasm, and thus conveyed the symbol of the presence of Jehovah into the ancient heathen fortress (see J. E. Muller, *De Davide ante arcam saltante*, in Ugolini *Thes.* 32). *SEE DANCE*. In the same spirit of uniting the sacerdotal with the royal functions, he offered sacrifices on a large scale, and himself gave the benediction to the people (2 Samuel 6:17, 18; 1 Chronicles 16:2). The scene of this inauguration was on the hill which, from David's habitation, was specially known as the "City of David." As if to mark the new era, he had not brought the ancient tabernacle from Gibeon, but had erected a new tent or tabernacle (1 Chronicles 15:1) for the reception of the ark. It was the first beginning of the great design, of which we will speak presently, afterwards carried out by his son, of erecting a permanent temple or palace for the ark, corresponding to the state in which he himself was to dwell. It was the greatest day of David's life. One incident only tarnished its splendor-the reproach of Michal, his wife, as he was finally entering his own palace, to carry to his own household the benediction which he had already pronounced on his people. *SEE MICHAL*. His act of severity towards her was an additional mark of the stress which he himself laid on the solemnity (2 Samuel 6:20-23; 1 Chronicles 15:29).

A large number of psalms, either in their traditional titles, or in the irresistible evidence of their contents, bear traces of this great festival, besides those which may be referred either to this occasion, or to the dedication of Solomon's Temple, or even to the restoration of the sacred services on the return from Babylon. The 15th, 101st; and 118th, by their contents, express the feelings of David on his occupation of his new home. The 68th, at least in part, and the 24th, seem to have been actually composed for the entrance of the ark into the ancient gates of the heathen fortress -and the last words of the second of these two psalms may be regarded as the inauguration of the new name by which God henceforth is

called, The Lord of hosts. Who is this king of glory?" "The Lord of hosts, he is the king of glory" (Psalm 24:10; comp. 2 Samuel 6:2). Fragments of poetry worked up into psalms (Psalm 96:2-13; 105; 106:1, 47, 48) occur in 1 Chronicles 16:8-36, as having been delivered by David "into the hands of Asaph and his brother" after the close of the festival. *SEE PSALMS*.

The priests or Aaronites must, for a long time, have had little occupation in their sacred office; for the ark was at Kirjath-jearim, under the care of a private family. Indeed, during the reign of Saul, we find shew-bread to have been set forth at Nob (1 Samuel 21:4-6) by Ahimelech the priest; and it is possible that many other ceremonies were performed by them, in spite of the absence of the ark. But after the dreadful massacre perpetrated on the priestly order by Saul, few Aaronites are likely to have felt at ease in their vocation. To wear an ephod — the mark of a priest who is asking counsel of Jehovah — had almost become a crime; and even after the death of Saul, it is possible that the Aaronites, like the other Israelites, remained organized as bands of soldiers. At least Jehoiada (who, according to 1 Chronicles 27:5, was high-priest at this time, and joined David at Hebron with 3700 Aaronites) was father of the celebrated warrior Benaiah, afterwards captain of David's body-guard-a man whose qualities were anything but priest-like; and Zadok, afterwards high-priest, who joined David "with twenty-two captains of his father's house" at the same time as Jehoiada, is described as "a young man mighty of valor" (1 Chronicles 12:27, 28). How long Jehoiada retained the place of high-priest is uncertain. It is probable that no definite conception then existed of the need of having one high-priest; and it is certain that David's affection for Abiathar, because of his father's fate, maintained him in chief place through the greater part of his reign. Not until a later time, it would seem, was Zadok elevated to a coordinate position. *SEE ABIATHAR*. Any further remarks concerning the orders and courses of the priests will be better reserved for the article on that subject. It is enough here to add that the cruel slaughter ordered by Saul of the Aaronites of the line of Ithamar, whom Abiathar now represented, naturally gave a great preponderance of numbers and power to the line of Eleazar, to which Zadok belonged. We must also refer to the article LEVITES for further information concerning them. The bringing of the ark from Kirjath-jearim to Jerusalem established the line of high-priests in direct service before it; and from this time we may presume that the ceremonies of the great day of atonement began to be observed. Previously, it would appear, the connection between the

priesthood and the tabernacle had been very loose. The priests fixed their abode at Nob, when the ark was at Kirjath-jearim, a very short distance; yet there is nothing to denote that they at all interfered with Abinadab in his exclusive care of the sacred deposit.

After this event, the king, contrasting his cedar palace with the curtains of the tabernacle, was desirous of building a temple for the ark; such a step, moreover, was likely to prevent any future change of its abode. This design, when imparted to the prophet Nathan, was received by him with warm encouragement. He had to learn, however, that the seemingly obvious fitness of a public measure did not excuse a prophet from the obligation of consulting the Lord before he ventured to utter an authoritative opinion; for the next day he had to return to the king with an intimation that he must abandon the intention of executing this great undertaking. The design is indeed commended; yet as he had been a warrior from his youth, and had shed much human blood, he was pronounced unfit for this sacred work, which was therefore to be reserved for the peaceful reign of his successor. Encouraged by the divine approbation, and by the high promises which were on this occasion given to him, David henceforth made it one of the great objects of his reign to gather means and materials for this important undertaking, the credit of which he is fairly entitled to divide with his son, by whom it was actually executed. *SEE SOLOMON*.

Great as might appear the advantage of establishing the same city as the religious and civil metropolis, the effect was, in one respect, most unfortunate; it offended the powerful and central tribe of Ephraim. They had been accustomed to regard Shiloh as the rightful abode of the ark. Against Kirjath-jearim no envy was felt, especially while the ark and its priests were in obscurity; but when so much honor attended it; when it became a peculiar glory to Judah and Benjamin — tribes already too much favored; when a magnificent edifice was erected to receive it, the seeds were sown of that disaffection which ended in a rending of the tribes apart. Nor was the argument unreasonable that a more central spot was needed for Israel to assemble at year by year.

2. *Foundation of the Court and Empire of Israel* (2 Samuel 8 to 12). — The erection of the new capital at Jerusalem introduces us to a new era in David’s life and in the history of the monarchy. Up to this time h: had been a king, such as Saul had been before him, or as the kings of the

neighboring tribes, each ruling over his territory, unconcerned with any foreign relations except so far as was necessary to defend his own nation. But David, and through him the Israelitish monarchy, now took a wider range. He became a king on the scale of the great Oriental sovereigns of Egypt and Persia, with a regular administration and organization of court and camp; and he also founded an imperial dominion which for the first time realized the prophetic description of the bounds of the chosen people (Genesis 15:18-21). The internal organization now established lasted till the final overthrow of the monarchy. The empire was of much shorter duration, continuing only through the reigns of David and his successor Solomon. But, for the period of its existence, it lent a peculiar character to the sacred history. For once, the kings of Israel were on a level with the great potentates of the world. David was an imperial conqueror, if not of the same magnitude, yet of the same kind as Rameses or Cyrus. “I have made thee a great name like unto the name of the great men that are in the earth” (2 Samuel 7:9). “Thou hast shed blood abundantly, and hast made great wars” (1 Chronicles 22:8). And as, on the one hand, the external relations of life, and the great incidents of war and conquest receive an elevation by their contact with the religious history, so the religious history swells into larger and broader dimensions from its contact with the course of the outer world. The enlargement of territory, the amplification of power and state, leads to a corresponding enlargement and amplification of ideas, of imagery, of sympathies, and thus (humanly speaking) the magnificent foreshadowings of a wider dispensation in the prophetic writings first became possible through the court and empire of David.

a. In the internal organization of the kingdom the first new element that has to be considered is the royal family, the dynasty, of which David was the founder, a position which entitled him to the name of “Patriarch” (Acts 2:29) and (ultimately) of the ancestor of the Messiah. Once settled in Jerusalem, David proceeded to increase the number of his wives, perhaps in part from the same political motive that actuates other Oriental monarchs, viz. in order to take hostages from the chieftains round in the least offensive mode. This explanation Will not apply to the concubines. We know nothing further concerning David’s family relations than the names of eleven sons born in Jerusalem (2 Samuel 5:14,15), of whom four were children of Bathsheba (1 Chronicles 3:5), and therefore much younger than the elder sons.

Picture for Da'vid 1

Of these, Absalom and Adonijah both inherited their father's beauty (2 Samuel 14:25; 1 Kings 1:6), but Solomon alone possessed any of his higher qualities. It was from a union of the children of Solomon and Absalom that the royal line was carried on (1 Kings 15:2). The princes were under the charge of Jehiel (1 Chronicles 27:32), perhaps the Levite (1 Chronicles 15:21; 2 Chronicles 20:14), with the exception of Solomon, who (according at least to one rendering) was under the charge of Nathan (2 Samuel 12:25). David's strong parental affection for all of them is very remarkable (2 Samuel 13:31, 33, 36; 14:33; 18:5, 33; 19:4; 1 Kings 1:6).

b. The military organization, which was, in fact, inherited from Saul, but greatly developed by David, was as follows:

(1.) "The Host," i.e. the whole available military force of Israel, consisting of all males capable of bearing arms, and summoned only for war. This had always existed from the time of the first settlement in Canaan, and had been commanded by the chief or the judge who presided over Israel for the time. Under Saul we first find the recognized post of a captain or commander-in-chief in the person of Abner; and under David this post was given as a reward for the assault on Jerusalem to his nephew Joab (1 Chronicles 11:6; 27:34), who conducted the army to battle in the absence of the king (2 Samuel 12:26). There were 12 divisions of 24,000 each, who were held to be in duty month by month, and over each of them presided an officer selected for this purpose from the other military bodies formed by David (1 Chronicles 27:1-15). Besides this host, the register proceeds to recount twelve princes over the tribes of Israel, who may perhaps be compared to the governors of our own states in their military capacity. The enumeration of these great officers is remarkable, being as follows:

1, Of the Reubenites;
2, of the Simeonites;
3, of the Levites;
4, of the Aaronites;
5, of Judah
6, of Issachar;
7, of Zebulon;
8, of Naphthali;
9, of Ephraim;

10, of Manasseh;
11, of Manasseh beyond the Jordan;
12, of Benjamin;
13, of Dan.

Here the names of Gad and Asher are omitted without explanation. On the other hand, the Levites and Aaronites are recounted, as though they were tribes coordinate with the rest, and Zadok is named as prince of the Aaronites. It is not to be supposed that the Levites or Aaronites were wholly shut out from civil and military duties. It has already been remarked that Zadok (here chief of the Aaronites) was described in the beginning of David's reign as "a mighty man of valor" (1 Chronicles 12:28), and the same appellation is given to the sons of Shemaiah, a Levite (26:6). Benaiah also, now captain of David's body-guard, was son of the late high-priest Jehoiada (27:5, and 12:27). The army was still distinguished from those of surrounding nations by its primitive aspect of a force of infantry without cavalry. The only innovations as yet allowed were the introduction of a very limited number of chariots (2 Samuel 8:4), and of mules for the princes and officers instead of asses (2 Samuel 13:29; 18:9). According to a Mussulman tradition (Koran, 21:80), David invented chain armor. The usual weapons were still spears and shields, as appears from the Psalms. For the general question of the numbers and equipment of the army, *SEE ARMS* and *SEE ARMY*.

(2.) The Bodyguard. This also had existed in the court of Saul, and David himself had probably been its commanding officer (1 Samuel 22:14; Ewald). But it now assumed a peculiar organization. They were, at least in name, foreigners, as having been drawn from the Philistines, probably during David's residence at the court of Gath. They are usually called from this circumstance "Cherethites and Pelethites" (q.v.), but had also a body especially from Gath among them, of whom the name of one, Ittai, is preserved as a faithful servant of David (2 Samuel 15:19). The captain of the force was, however, not only not a foreigner, but an Israelite of the highest distinction and purest descent, who first appears in this capacity, but who outlived David, and became the chief support of the throne of his son, namely, Benaiah, son of-the chief priest Jehoiada, representative of the eldest branch of Aaron's house (2 Samuel 8:18; 15:18; 20:23; 1 Kings 1:38, 44).

(3.) The most peculiar military institution in David's army was that which arose out of the peculiar circumstances of his early life. The nucleus of what afterwards became the only standing army in David's forces was the band of 600 men who had gathered round him in his wanderings. The number of 600 was still preserved, with the name of *Gibborim*, "heroes" or "mighty men." It became yet further subdivided into three large bands of 200 each, and small bands of 20 each. The small bands were commanded by thirty officers, one for each band, who together formed "the thirty," and the three large bands by three officers, who together formed "the three," and the whole by one chief, "the captain of the mighty men" (2 Samuel 23:8-39; 1 Chronicles 11:9-47). There seems to have been a second or alternate set to "the three," and in this grade, as well as among the subaltern — "thirty," one is apparently named as outranking his colleagues. There is considerable difficulty in adjusting their relative position, and two or three names appear to have been omitted. The sixteen additional names given in 1 Chronicles 11 may be those of alternates to "the thirty." Of "the thirty," some few only are known to fame elsewhere. Asahel, David's nephew (1 Chronicles 11:26; 2 Samuel 2:18); Elhanan, the victor of at least one Goliath (1 Chronicles 11:26; 2 Samuel 21:19); Joel, the brother or son (Sept.) of Nathan (1 Chronicles 11:38); Naharai, the armor-bearer of Joab (1 Chronicles 11:39; 2 Samuel 23:37); Eliam, the son of Ahitophel (2 Samuel 23:34); Ira, one of David's priests (1 Chronicles 11:40; 2 Samuel 23:38; 20:26); Uriah the Hittite (1 Chronicles 11:41; 2 Samuel 23:39; 11:3). See Hofmann, *Geschichte der Helden David's* (in his *Exeg. krit. Abhandlungen*, No. 6).

The following is a corrected and classified list of the noted warriors of David's veterans. See each name in its alphabetical place.

Picture for Da'vid 2

c. Side by side with this military organization were established social and moral institutions. Some were entirely for pastoral, agricultural, and financial purposes (1 Chronicles 27:25-31), others for judicial (1 Chronicles 26:29-32). Some few are named as constituting what would now be called the court or council of the king; the councilors, Ahithophel of Giloh and Jonathan the king's nephew (1 Chronicles 27:32, 33); the companion or "friend" Hushai (1 Chronicles 27:33; 2 Samuel 15:37; 16:19); the scribe Sheva, or Seraiah, and at one time Jonathan (2 Samuel 20:25; 1 Chronicles 27:32); Jehoshaphat, the recorder or historian (2

Samuel 20:24); and Adoram the tax collector, both of whom survived him (2 Samuel 20:24; 1 Kings 12:18; 4:3, 6). The cabinet of David (if we may use a modern name) is thus given (1 Chronicles 27:32 -34) with reference to a time which preceded Absalom's revolt:

1, Jonathan, David's uncle, a counsellor, wise man, and scribe;
2, Jehiel, son of Hachmoni, tutor (?) to the king's sons;
3, Ahithophel, the king's counsellor;
4, Hushai, the king's companion;
5, after Ahithophel, Jehoiada, the son of Benaiah;
6, Abiathar the priest. It is added, "and the general of the king's army was Joab."

Each tribe had its own head (1 Chronicles 27:16-22). Of these, the most remarkable were Elihu, David's brother (probably Eliab), prince of Judah (ver. 18), and Jaasiel, the son of Abner, of Benjamin (ver. 21). Twelve royal bailiffs are recited as a part of David's establishment (1 Chronicles 27:25, 31), having the following departments under their charge:

1, The treasures of gold, silver, etc.;
2, the magazines;
3, the tillage (wheat, etc.?);
4, the vineyards;
5, the wine-cellars;
6, the olive and sycamore trees;
7, the oil-cellars;
8, the herds in Sharon;
9, the herds in the valleys;
10, the camels;
11, the asses;
12, the flocks.

The eminently prosperous state in which David left his kingdom to Solomon appears to prove that he was on the whole faithfully served, and that his own excellent intentions, patriotic spirit, and devout piety (measured, as it must be, by the standard of those ages), really made his reign beneficial to his subjects.

d. But the more peculiar of David's institutions were those directly bearing on religion. Two prophets appear as the king's constant advisers. Of these, Gad, who seems to have been the elder, had been David's companion in

exile, and, from his being called “the seer,” belongs probably to the earliest form of the prophetic schools. Nathan, who appears for the first time after the establishment of the kingdom at Jerusalem (2 Samuel 7:2), is distinguished both by his title of” prophet,” and by the nature of the prophecies which he utters (2 Samuel 7:5-17; 12:1-14), as of the purest type of prophetic dispensation, and as the hope of the new generation, which he supports in the person of Solomon (1 Kings 1). Two high-priests — representatives of the two rival houses of Aaron (1 Chronicles 26:3)- here again, as in the case of the two prophets, also appear: one, Abiathar, who attended him at Jerusalem, companion of his exile, and connected with the old time of the judges (1 Chronicles 27:34), joining him after the death of Saul, and becoming afterwards the support of his son; the other Zadok, who ministered at Gibeon (1 Chronicles 16:39), and who was made the head of the Aaronic family (1 Chronicles 27:17). Besides these four great religious functionaries, there were two classes of subordinates — prophets, specially instructed in singing and music, under Asaph, Heman, the grandson of Samuel, and Jeduthun (1 Chronicles 25:1-31); Levites, or attendants on the sanctuary, who again were subdivided into the guardians of the gates and guardians of the treasures (1 Chronicles 26; 1:28) which had been accumulated, since the re-establishment of the nation, by Samuel, Saul, Abner, Joab, and David himself (1 Chronicles 26:26-28).

The collection of those various ministers and representatives of worship round the capital must have givsn a new aspect to the history in David’s time, such as it had not borne under the disconnected period of the judges. But the main peculiarity of the whole must have been that it so well harmonized with the character of him who was its center. As his early martial life still placed him at the head of the military organization which had sprung up around him, so his early education and his natural disposition placed him at the head of his own religious institutions. Himself a prophet, a psalmist, he was one in heart with those whose advice he sought and whose arts he fostered. What was still more remarkable, though not himself a priest, he yet assumed almost all the functions usually ascribed to the priestly office. He wore, as we have seen, the priestly dress, offered the sacrifices, gave the priestly benediction (2 Samuel 6:14, 17, 18); and, as if to include his whole court within the same sacerdotal sanctity, Benaiah, the captain of his guard, ways a priest by descent (1 Chronicles 27:5), and joined in the sacred music (1 Chronicles 16:6); David himself and “the captains of the host” arranged the prophetical duties (1

Chronicles 25:1); and his sons are actually called "priests" (2 Samuel 8:18; 1 Chronicles 18:17, translated "chief," and αὐλάρχαι, "chief rulers"), as well as Ira, of Manasseh (2 Samuel 20:26, translated "chief ruler," but ἱερεύς). Such a union was never seen before or since in the Jewish history. Even Solomon fell below it in some important points.

e. From the internal state of David's kingdom we pass to its external relations. David's further victories are narrated in the following order-Philistines, Moab, Zobah, Edom, Northern League stirred up by the Ammonites, Ammon (see Hase, *De regni David. et Salom. descriptio geogr. hist.*, Norimb. 1739, 1754).

1. The short and dry notice concerning the Philistines just gives us to understand that this is the era of their decisive, though not final subjugation. Their towns were despoiled of their wealth (2 Samuel 8, 12), and doubtless all their arms and munitions of war passed over into the service of the conqueror.

2. The Moabites were a pastoral people, whose general relations with Israel appear to have been peaceful. The slight notice of Saul's hostilities with them (1 Samuel 14:47) is the only breach recorded since the time of Eglon and Ehud. In the book of Ruth we see them as friendly neighbors, and much more recently (1 Samuel 22:3, 4) David committed his parents to the care of the king of Moab. We know no cause, except David's strength, which now drew his arms upon them. A people long accustomed to peace, in conflict with a veteran army, was struck down at once, but the fierceness of his triumph may surprise us. Two thirds of the population (if we rightly interpret the words, 2 Samuel 8:2) were put to the sword; the rest became tributary.

3. Who are meant by the Syrians of Zobah is still a problem. *SEE ZOBAH*. We here follow the belief that it was a power of northern Syria, then aiming at extensive empire, which had not only defeated and humbled the king of Hamath, but had obtained homage beyond the Euphrates. The trans-Jordanic tribes in the time of Saul had founded a little empire for themselves by conquering their eastern neighbors, the Hagarenes, and, perhaps, occasionally overran the district on the side of the Euphrates, which Hadadezer king of Zobah, considered as his own. His efforts "to recover his border at the river Euphrates" first brought him into collision with David, perhaps by an attack which he made on the roaming Eastern tribes. David defeated not merely his

army, but that of Damascus too, which came too late with succor, and put Israelitish garrisons into the towns of the Damascenes (see Michaelis, *Hist. bellorum Dav. c. rege Nesibeno*, in his *Commentatt. Soc. Gott*. 1763, 2:71 sq.). In this career of success, we see, for the first time in history, the uniform superiority over raw troops of a power which is always fighting; whose standing army is ever gaining experience and mutual confidence.

4. Another victory, gained "in the valley of salt," ought, perhaps, to be read, as in 1 Chronicles 18:12, and in the superscription of <1960>Psalm 60, "over the Edomites," not "over the Syrians." The difference of the Hebrew textual letters is very slight, µra and µda. The verse which follows (2 Samuel 8:14) seems to tell the result of this victory, viz. the complete subjugation and garrisoning of Edom, which, like Moab, was incorporated with David's empire. Immediately before this last conquest, as would appear, he wrote the 60th Psalm; and as that Psalm gives no hint of his achievements against the king of Zobah and the Damascenes, this is a strong ground for believing that those successes were not gained till somewhat later in time.

5. After David had become master of all Israel, of the Philistine towns, of Edom, and of Moab, while the Eastern tribes, having conquered the Hagarenes, threatened the Ammonites on the north, as did Moab on the south, the Ammonites were naturally alarmed, and called in the powers of Syria to their help against a foe who was growing dangerous even to them, and whom they had provoked by a gross insult (see Lakemacher, *De barba legatis Dav. abrasa*, in his *Observatt. Philol* 10:145 sq.). The coalition against David is described as consisting of the Syrians of Bethrehob and of Maacah, of Zobah, and of Tob. The last country appears to have been in the district of Trachonitis, the first two immediately on the north of Israel. In this war we may believe that David enjoyed the important alliance of Toi, king of Hamath, who, having suffered from Hadadezer's hostility, courted the friendship of the Israelitish monarch (2 Samuel 8:9, 10). We are barely informed that one division of the Israelites under Alishai was posted against the Ammonites; a second, under Joab, met the confederates from the north, 30,000 strong, and prevented their junction with the Ammonites. In both places the enemy was repelled, though, it would seem, with no decisive result. A second campaign, however, took place. The king of Zobah brought in an army of Mesopotamians, in addition to his former

troops, and David found it necessary to make a levy of all Israel to meet the pressing danger. A pitched battle on a great scale was then fought at Helam — far beyond the limits of the twelve tribes — in which David was victorious. He is said to have slain, according to 2 Samuel 10:18, the men of 700 chariots, and 40,000 horsemen; or, according to 1 Chronicles 19:18, the men of 7000 chariots, and 40,000 footmen. If we had access to the court-records of Hamath, we should probably find that Toi had assembled his whole cavalry to assist David, and that to him was due the important service of disabling or destroying the enemy's horse. Such foreign aid may explain the general result, without our obtruding a miracle, for which the narrative gives us not the least warrant. The Syrians henceforth left the Ammonites to their fate, and the petty chiefs who had been in allegiance to Hadadezer hastened to do homage to David. 6. Early in the next season Joab was sent to take vengeance on the Ammonites in their own home by attacking their chief city, or Rabbah of Ammon. The natural strength of their border could not keep out veteran troops and an experienced leader; and though the siege of the city occupied many months (if, indeed, it was not prolonged into the next year), it was at last taken. It is characteristic of Oriental despotism that Joab, when the city was nearly reduced, sent to invite David to command the final assault in person. David gathered a large force, easily captured the royal town, and despoiled it of all its wealth. His vengeance was as much more dreadful on the unfortunate inhabitants than formerly on the Moabites, as the danger in which the Ammonites had involved Israel had been more imminent, The persons captured in the city were put to death by torture; some of them being sawed in pieces, others chopped up with axes or mangled with harrows, while some were smothered in brick-kilns (2 Samuel 12:31; 1 Chronicles 20:3). This severity was perhaps effectual in quelling future movements of revolt or war; for, until insurrections in Israel embolden them, foreign foes after this remain quiet. Others, however, understand that these prisoners of war were merely put to hard labor with the various instruments named. (See Danz, *De mitigata Davidis in Anmonitas crudelitate*, Jen. 1710; Nimptsch, *De Ammonitis a Dau. absque crudelitate sub jugum missis, Lips*. 1731). The royal: crown, or "crown of Milcom," was placed on David's head (2 Samuel 12:30), and, according to Josephus (*Ant.* 7:5), was always worn by him afterwards. The Hebrew tradition (Jerome, *Qu. Heb. ad* 1 Chronicles 20:2) represents it as having been the diadem

of the Ammonite god Milcom, or Moloch; and that Ittai the Gittite (doing what no Israelite could have done, for fear of pollution) tore it from the idol's head and brought it to David. The general peace which followed was commemorated in the name of "the Peaceful" (Solomon), given to the son born to him at this crisis.

To these wars in general may be ascribed Psalms 9 and 10. To the Edomitish war, both by its title and contents, must be ascribed Psalm 60:6-12 (108:13), describing the assault on Petra. Psalm 18 (repeated in 2 Samuel 22) is ascribed by its title, and appears from some expressions to belong to the day "when the Lord had delivered him out of the hand of all his enemies," as well as "out of the hand of Saul" (2 Samuel 22:1; Psalm 18:1). That "day" may be either at this time or at the end of his life. Psalms 20 and 21 relate to the general union of religious and of military excellencies displayed at this time of his career. (Psalm 21:3," Thou settest a crown of pure gold upon his head," not improbably refers to the golden crown of Ammon, 2 Samuel 12:30.)

3. *David's subsequent History*. — Three great calamities may be selected as marking the beginning, middle, and close of David's otherwise prosperous reign, which appear to be intimated in the question of Gad (2 Samuel 24:13), "a three years' famine, a three months' flight, or a three days' pestilence."

a. Of these, the first (the three years' famine) introduces us to the last notices of David's relations with the house of Saul. There has often arisen a painful suspicion in later times, as there seems to have been at the time (16:7), that the oracle which gave as the cause of the famine Saul's massacre of the Gibeonites may have been connected with the desire to extinguish the last remains of the fallen dynasty. But such an explanation is not needed. The massacre was probably the most recent national crime that had left any deep impression; and the whole tenor of David's conduct towards Saul's family is of an opposite kind. It was then that he took the opportunity of removing the bodies of Saul and Jonathan to their own ancestral sepulchre at Zelah (2 Samuel 21:14); and it was then, or shortly before, that he gave a permanent home and restored all the property of the family to Mephibosheth, the only-surviving son of Jonathan (2 Samuel 9:1-13; 21:7). The seven who perished were two sons of Saul by Rizpah, and five grandsons — sons of Michal and Adriel (2 Samuel 21:8), as stated in the common Hebrew and Greek text, and in our received version; and

Josephus imagines that they were born of her after a second divorce from David. But it is certain, from 1 Samuel 18:19, that Michal is here a mistake for Merab, which name De Wette has introduced into his version. The description of the other bereaved mother, Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah, who took her station upon the rock, and watched the bodies of her sons day and night, lest they should be devoured by beasts of prey or torn by the birds of the air, is deeply affecting. It touched the heart of David when he heard of it. He would not allow public decency to be any further offended to satisfy the resentment of the Gibeonites, but directed the bodies to be taken down and honorably deposited in the family sepulchre .

b. The second group of incidents contains the tragedy of David's life, which grew in all its parts out of the polygamy, with its evil consequences, into which he had plunged on becoming king.

(1.) Underneath the splendor of his last glorious campaign against the Ammonites was a dark story, known probably at that time only to a very few, and even in later times kept as much as possible out of the view of the people, but now recognised as one of the most instructive portions of his career — the double crime of adultery with Bathsheba, and of the virtual murder of Uriah. B.C. 1035. The crimes are undoubtedly those of a common Oriental despot. But the rebuke of Nathan, the sudden revival of the king's conscience, his grief for the sickness of the child, the gathering of his uncles and elder brothers around him, his return of hope and peace, are characteristic of David, and of David only. If we add to these the two psalms, the 32d and the 51st, of which the first by its acknowledged internal evidence, the second by its title, also claim to belong to this crisis of David's life, we shall feel that the instruction drawn from the sin has more than compensated to us at least for the scandal occasioned by it, (See Bebel, *David peccans et poenitens*, Argent. 1703.) But, though the "free spirit" and "clean heart" — of David returned, and although the birth of Solomon was as auspicious as if nothing had occurred to trouble the victorious festival which succeeded it, the clouds from this time gathered over David's fortunes, and henceforward "the sword never departed from his house" (2 Samuel 12:10). The outrage on his daughter Tamar, the murder of his eldest son Amnon, and then the revolt of his best beloved Absalom, brought on the crisis which once more sent him forth a wanderer, as in the days when he fled from Saul; and this, the heaviest trial of his life, was aggravated by the impetuosity of Joab, now, perhaps from his complicity in David's crime, more unmanageable than ever.

(2.) Of all his sons, Absalom had naturally the greatest pretensions, being, by his mother's side, grandson of Talmai, king of Geshur; while, through his personal beauty and winning manners, he was high in popular favor. It is evident, moreover, that he was the darling son of his father. When his own sister Tamar had been dishonored by her half-brother Amnon, the eldest son of David, Absalom slew him in vengeance, but, in fear of his father, then fled to his grandfather at Geshur. B.C. 1033. Joab, discerning David's longings for his son, effected his return after three years; but the conflict in the king's mind is strikingly shown by his allowing Absalom to dwell two full years in Jerusalem before he would see his face. *SEE ABSALOM*.

(3.) The insurrection of Absalom against the king was the next important event, in the course of which there was shown the general tendency of men to look favorably on young and untried princes rather than on those whom they know for better and for worse. B.C. 1023. Absalom erected his royal standard at Hebron first, and was fully prepared to slay his father outright, which might probably have been done if the energetic advice of Ahithophel had been followed. The rebellion was fostered apparently by the growing jealousy of the tribe of Judah at seeing their king absorbed into the whole nation; and if, as appears from 2 Samuel 11:3; 23:34, Ahithophel was the grandfather of Bathsheba, its main supporter was one whom David had provoked by his own crimes.

It was apparently early on the morning of the day after he had received the news of the rebellion at Hebron that the king left the city of Jerusalem on foot. He was accompanied by a vast concourse, in the midst of which he and his body-guard were conspicuous. They started from a house on the outskirts of the city (2 Samuel 15:17, Sept.), and every stage of the mournful procession was marked by some incident which called forth a proof of the deep and lasting affection which the king's peculiar character had the power of inspiring in all who knew him. The first distinct halt was by a solitary olive-tree (2 Samuel 15:18, Sept.) that marked the road to the wilderness of the Jordan. Among his guard of Philistines and his faithful company of 600 he observed Ittai of Gath, and, with the true nobleness of his character, entreated the Philistine chief not to peril his own or his countrymen's lives in the service of a fallen and a stranger sovereign. But Ittai declared his resolution (with a fervor which almost inevitably recalls a like profession made almost on the same spot to the great descendant of David centuries afterwards) to follow him in life and in death. They all

passed over the ravine of the Kedron; and here, when it became apparent that the king was really bent on departure, “the whole land wept with a loud voice” — the mountain and the valley resounded with the wail of the people. At this point they were overtaken by the two priests, Zadok and Abiathar, bringing the ark from its place on the sacred hill, to accompany David in his flight — Abiathar, the elder, going forward up the mountain, as the multitude defiled past him. Again, with a spirit worthy of the king, who was prophet as well as priest, David turned them back. He had no superstitious belief in the ark as a charm; he had too much reverence for it to risk it in his personal peril. And now the whole crowd turned up the mountain pathway; all wailing, all with their heads muffled as they went; the king only distinguished from the rest by his unsandaled feet. At the top of the mountain, consecrated by an altar of worship, they were met by Hushai the Archite, “the friend,” as he was officially called, of the king. The priestly garment, which he wore after the fashion, as it would seem, of David’s chief officers, was torn, and his head was smeared with dust, in the bitterness of his grief. In him David saw his first gleam of hope. A moment before, the tidings had come of the treason of Ahithophel; and, to frustrate his designs, Husbai was sent back, just in time to meet Absalom arriving from Hebron. It was noon when David passed over the mountain top, and now, as Jerusalem was left behind, and the new scene opened before him, two Taew characters appeared, both in connection with the hostile tribe of Benjamin, whose territory they were entering. One was Ziba, servant of Mephibosheth, taking advantage of the civil war to make his own fortunes. At Bahurim, also evidently on the downward pass, came forth one of its inhabitants, Shinmei, in whose furious curses broke out the longsuppressed hatred of the fallen family of Saul, as well perhaps as the popular feeling against the murderer of Uriah. With characteristic replies to both, the king descended to the Jordan valley (2 Samuel 16:14; and comp. 17:22; Joseph. *Ant.* 7:9, 4), and there rested after the long and eventful day at the ford or bridge (*Abara*) of the river. At midnight they were aroused by the arrival of the two sons of the high-priests, and by break of day they had reached the opposite side in safety.

To the dawn of that morning is to be ascribed Psalm 3, and (according to Ewald, though this seems less certain) to the previous evening Psalm 4. Psalm 143, by its title in the Sept., “When his son was pursuing him,” belongs to this time. Also, by long popular belief, the Trans-Jordanic exile of Psalm 42 has been supposed to be David, and the complaints of Psalm

55 and 69 to be leveled against Ahithophel (q.v.), who, on finding his advice disregarded, committed suicide in a fit of offended pride and despair (see Schwarz, *De morte Achitophelis*, Wittenb. 1704).

The history of the remaining period of the rebellion is comparatively brief. Mahanaim was the capital of David's exile, as it had been of the exiled house of Saul (2 Samuel 17:24; 2 Samuel 2:8, 12). Three great chiefs of that pastoral district are specially mentioned as supporting him: one, of great age, not before named. Barzillai the Gileadite; the two others, bound to him by former ties, Shobi, the son of David's ancient friend Nahash, probably put by David in his brother's place (2 Samuel 12:30; 10:2), and Machir, the son of Ammiel, the former protector of the child of David's friend Jonathan (2 Samuel 17:27; 9:4). Strengthened by the warlike Eastern tribes, and surrounded by his experienced captains, the king no longer hesitated to meet Absalom in the field. His forces were arranged under the three great military officers who remained faithful to his fortunes — Joab, captain of the host; Abishai, captain of "the mighty men;" and Ittai, who seems to have taken the place of Benaiah (had he wavered in his allegiance, or was he appointed afterwards?), as captain of the guard (2 Samuel 18:2). On Absalom's side was David's nephew, Amasa (2 Samuel 17:25). The warlike spirit of the old king and of his faithful followers at this extremity of their fortunes is well depicted by Hushai, "chafed in their minds, as a bear robbed of her whelps in the 'field' (or a fierce wild boar in the Jordan valley, Sept.);" the king himself, as of old, lodging not with the people," but "hid in some pit or some other place" (2 Samuel 17:8, 9). The final battle was fought in the "forest of Ephraim," resulting in a decisive victory on the part of David's forces, and terminating in the accident leading to the death of Absalom at the hand of Joab during the retreat. David was waiting the event of the battle in the gateway of Mahanaim. Two messengers, each endeavoring to outstrip the other, were seen running breathless from the field. The first who arrived was Ahimaaz, the son of Zadok, already employed as a messenger on the first day of the king's flight. He had been entreated by Joab not to make himself the bearer of tidings so mournful; and it would seem that when he came to the point his heart failed, and he spoke only of the great confusion in which he had left the army. At this moment the other messenger burst in — a stranger, perhaps an Ethiopian- and abruptly revealed the fatal news (2 Samuel 18:19-32). *SEE CUSHI*. The passionate burst of grief which followed is one of the best proofs of the deep affection of David's character. He wrapped himself up in his

sorrow, and even at the very moment of his triumph he could not forget the hand that had slain his son. He made a solemn vow to supersede Joab by Amasa, and in this was laid the lasting breach between himself and his powerful nephew, which neither the one nor the other ever forgave (2 Samuel 19:13). Perhaps Joab on the former occasion, when he murdered Abner, had blinded the king by pleading revenge for the blood of Asahel, but no such pretense could here avail. The king was now probably brought to his determination partly by his disgust at Joab, partly by his desire to give the insurgents confidence in his amnesty. If Amasa is the same as Amasai, David may likewise have retained a grateful remembrance of the cordial greeting with which he had led a strong band to his assistance at the critical period of his abode in Ziklag (1 Chronicles 12:18); moreover, Amasa, equally with Joab, was David's nephew, their two mothers, Abigail and Zeruiah, being sisters to David by at least one parent (2 Samuel 17:25; 1 Chronicles 2:13, 16). The unscrupulous Joab, however, was not so to be set aside., Before long, catching an opportunity, he assassinated his unsuspecting cousin with his own hand; and David, who had used the instrumentality of Joab to murder Uriah, did not dare to resent the deed (2 Samuel 20:5-12).

The return was marked at every stage by rejoicing and amnesty — Shimei forgiven, Mephibosheth partially reinstated, Barzallai rewarded by the gifts long remembered, to his son Chimham (2 Samuel 19:16-40; 1 Kings 2:7). Judah was first reconciled. The embers of the insurrection still smoldering (2 Samuel 19:41-43) in David's hereditary enemies of the tribe of Benjamin were trampled out by the mixture of boldness and sagacity in Joab, now, after the murder of Amasa, once more in his old position. David again reigned in undisturbed peace at Jerusalem (2 Samuel 20:1-22).

(4.) A quarrel, however, which took place between the men of Judah and those of the other tribes in bringing the king back, had encouraged a Benjamite named Sheba to raise a new insurrection, which spread with wonderful rapidity. "Every man of Israel," are the strong words of the text, "went up from after David, and followed Sheba, the son of Bichri," a man of whom nothing besides is known. This strikingly shows that the later unpatriotic features of David's reign had to a great degree exhausted the enthusiasm once kindled by his devotion and chivalry, and that his throne now rested rather on the rotten foundation of mere military superiority. Amasa was collecting troops as David's general at the time when he was treacherously assassinated by his cousin, who then, with his usual energy,

pursued Sheba, and blockaded him in Beth-maachah before he could collect his partisans. Sheba's head was cut off and thrown over the wall; and so ended the new rising (2 Samuel 20:1-22). Yet this was not the end of trouble, for the intestine war seems to have inspired the Philistines with the hope of throwing off the yoke. Four successive battles are recorded (2 Samuel 21:15-22), in the first of which the aged David was nigh being slain. His faithful officers kept him away from all future risks, and Philistia was once more, and finally, subdued.

c. The closing period of David's life, with the exception of one great calamity, may be considered as a gradual preparation for the reign of his successor. This calamity was the three days' pestilence which visited Jerusalem at the warning of the prophet Gad (see Blessig, *De censu Dav. pesteque hunc secuta*, Argent. 1788; Becker, *Quare Deus Davidem pestilentia puniverit*, Rost. 1767). The occasion which led to this warning was the census of the people taken by Joab at the king's orders (2 Samuel 24:1-9; 1 Chronicles 21:1-7, 27:23, 24); an attempt not unnaturally suggested by the increase of his power, but implying a confidence and pride alien to the spirit inculcated on the kings of the chosen people. Joab's repugnance to the measure was such that he refused altogether to number Levi and Benjamin (1 Chronicles 21:6). The king also scrupled to number those who were under twenty years of age (1 Chronicles 27:23), and the final result was never recorded in the "Chronicles of King David" (1 Chronicles 27:24). The plague, however, and its cessation were commemorated down to the latest times of the Jewish nation. Probably Psalms 30 and 131 have reference to this time. But a more certain memorial was preserved on the exact spot which witnessed the close of the pestilence, or, as it was called, "The Death." Outside the walls of Jerusalem, Araunah or Ornan, a wealthy Jebusite — perhaps even a descendant of the ancient king of Jebus (2 Samuel 24:23) — possessed a threshing-floor; there he and his sons were engaged in threshing the corn gathered in from the harvest (1 Chronicles 21:20). At this spot an awful vision appeared, such as is described in the later days of Jerusalem, of the Angel of the Lord stretching out a drawn sword between earth and sky over the devoted city. The scene of such an apparition at such a moment was at once marked out for a sanctuary. David demanded, and Araunah willingly granted, the site; the altar was erected on the rock of the threshing-floor; the place was called by the name of "Moriah" (2 Chronicles 3:1); and for the first time a holy place, sanctified by a vision of

the Divine presence, was recognized in Jerusalem. It was this spot which afterwards became the altar of the Temple, and therefore the center of the national worship, with but slight interruption, for more than 1000 years, and it is even contended that the same spot is the rock, still regarded with almost idolatrous veneration, in the centre of the Mussulman "Dome of the Rock" (see Prof. Willis in Williams's *Holy City*, 2).

The selection of the site of this altar probably revived the schemes of the king for the building of a permanent edifice to receive the ark, which still remained inside his own palace in its temporary tent. Such schemes, we are told, he had entertained after the capture of Jerusalem, or at the end of his wars. Two reasons were given for their delay: one, that the ancient nomadic form of worship was not yet to be abandoned (2 Samuel 7:6); the other, that David's wars unfitted him to be the founder of a seat of peaceful worship (1 Chronicles 22:8). But a solemn assurance was given that his dynasty should continue "for ever" to prosecute the work (2 Samuel 7:13; 1 Chronicles 22:9,10). Such a founder, and the ancestor of such a dynasty, was Solomon to be, and to him, therefore, the stores and the plans of the future Temple (according to 1 Chronicles 22:2-19; 28:1-29:19) were committed.

d. The last commotion recorded took place when David's end seemed nigh, and Adonijah, one of his elder sons, feared that the influence of Bathsheba might gain the kingdom for her own son Solomon. B.C. 1015. Adonijah's conspiracy was joined by Abiathar, one of the two chief priests, and by the redoubted Joab; upon which David took the decisive measure of raising Solomon at once to the throne. Of two young monarchs, the younger and the less known was easily preferred, when the sanction of the existing government was thrown into his scale; and the cause of Adonijah immediately fell to the ground. Zadok, Nathan, Benaiah, Shimei, and Rei remaining firm, the plot was stifled, and Solomon's inauguration took place under his father's auspices (1 Kings 1:1-53). *SEE ADONIJAH*. Amnesty was proclaimed to the conspirators, and was faithfully observed by Solomon till a later violation of its terms. *SEE SOLOMON*.

4. By this time David's infirmities had grown upon him. The warmth of his exhausted frame was attempted to be restored by the introduction of a young Shunamite, of the name of Abishag (q.v.), mentioned apparently for the sake of an incident which grew up in connection with her out of the later events (1 Kings 1:1 2:17). His last song is preserved (see Pfeiffer,

Erklar. der sogenannten letzten Worte David's, Altdorf, 1774; De Baer, *In ultima verba Davidis*, in the *Bibl. Hag*. 2:439-504; Trendelenburg, *In verba novissima Davidis*, Gotting. 1779) — a striking union of the ideal of a just ruler which he had placed before him, and of the difficulties which he had felt in realizing it (2 Samuel 23:1-7). His last words, as recorded, to his successor are general exhortations to his duty, combined with warnings against Joab and Shimei, and charges to remember the children of Barzillai (1 Kings 2:1-9).

He died B.C. 1013, at the age of seventy (2 Samuel 5:4), and "was buried in the city of David" (1 Kings 2:10). After the return from the captivity. "the sepulchres of David" were still pointed out "between Siloah and the house of the 'mighty men,'" or "the guard-house" (Nehemiah 3:16). His tomb, which became the general sepulchre of the kings of Judah, was point ed out in the latest times of the Jewish people. "His sepulchre is with us unto this day," says Peter at Pentecost (Acts 2:29); and Josephus (*Ant.* 7:15, 3; 13:8, 4; 16:7, 1) states that Solomon, having buried a vast treasure in the tomb, one of its chambers was broken open by Hyrcanus, and another by Herod the Great. It is said to have fallen into ruin in the time of Hadrian (Dio Cassius, 69:14). In Jerome's time a tomb, so called, was the object of pilgrimage (Ep. *ad*. Marcell. 17, 46), but apparently in the neighborhood of Bethlehem. The edifice shown as such from the Crusades to the present day is on the southern hill of modern Jerusalem, commonly called Mount Zion, under the so-called "Coenaculum." For the description of it, see Barclay's *City of the Great King*, p. 209. For the traditions concerning it, see Williams's *Holy City*, 2:509-513. The so-called "tombs of the kings" have of late been claimed as the royal sepulchre by De Saulcy (2. 162-215), who brought to the Louvre (where it may be seen) what he believed to be the lid of David's sarcophagus. But these tombs are outside the walls, and therefore cannot be identified with the tomb of David, which was emphatically within tie walls (see Robinson, 3, p. 252, note).

The *character* of David has been so naturally brought out in the incidents of his life that it need not be here described in detail (see Niemeyer, *Charakt*. 4:125 sq.). In the complexity of its elements, passion, tenderness, generosity, fierceness — the soldier, the shepherd, the poet, the statesman, the priest, the prophet, the king-the romantic friend, the chivalrous leader, the devoted father — there is no character of the O.T. at all to be compared to it. Jacob comes nearest in the variety of elements included

within it. But David's character stands at a higher point of the sacred history, and represents the Jewish people just at the moment of their transition from the lofty virtues of the older system to the fuller civilization and cultivation of the later. In this manner he becomes naturally, if one may say so, the likeness or portrait of the last and grandest development of the nation and of the monarchy in the person and the period of the Messiah. In a sense more than figurative, he is the type and prophecy of Jesus Christ. Christ is not called the son of Abraham, or of Jacob, or of Moses, but he was truly "the son of David."

To his own people, his was the name most dearly cherished after their first ancestor Abraham. "The city of David," "the house of David," "the throne of David," "the seed of David," "the oath sworn unto David" (the pledge of the continuance of his dynasty), are expressions which pervade the whole of the Old Testament and all the figurative language of the New, and they serve to mark the lasting significance of his appearance in history.

His Psalms (whether those actually written by himself be many or few) have been the source of consolation and instruction beyond any other part of the Hebrew Scriptures. In them appear qualities of mind and religious perceptions not before expressed in the sacred writings, but eminently characteristic of David — the love of nature, the sense of sin, and the tender, ardent trust in, and communion with, God. No other part of the Old Testament comes so near to the spirit of the New. The Psalms are the only expressions of devotion which have been equally used through the whole Christian Church — Abyssinian, Greek, Latin, Puritan, Anglican.

The difficulties that attend his character are valuable as proofs of the impartiality of Scripture in recording them, and as indications of the. union of natural power and weakness which his character included. The Rabbis in former times, and critics (like Bayle) in later times, have seized on its dark features and exaggerated them to the utmost. It has often been asked, both by scoffers and the serious, how the man after God's own heart could have murdered Uriah, and seduced Bathsheba, and tortured the Ammonites to death? An extract from one who is not a too-indulgent critic of sacred characters expresses at once the common sense and the religious lesson of the whole matter. "Who is called 'the man after God's own heart?' David, the Hebrew king, had fallen into sins enough-blackest crimes — there was no want of sin. And therefore the unbelievers sneer, and ask, 'Is this your man according to God's heart?' The sneer, I must say, seems to me but a

shallow one. What are faults, what are the outward details of a life, if the inner seeret of it, the remorse, temptations, the often baffled, never ended struggle of it be forgotten? . . . David's life and history, as written for us in those Psalms of his, I consider to be the truest emblem ever given us of a man's moral progress and warfare here below. All earnest souls will' ever discern in it the faithful struggle of an earnest human soul towards what is good and test. Struggle often baffled — sore baffled — driven as into entire wreck; yet a struggle never ended, ever with tears, repentance, true unconquerable purpose begun anew" (Carlyle's *Heroes and Hero-Worship*, p. 72).

See generally Havercamp, *Dav. res gestce vindicatae* (L. B. 1735); Niemeyer, *Ueber Leben und Char. Dav*. (Hal. 1779); Ewald, *Leben Dav*. (Gera, 1795); Hauser, *De Hist. Dav*. (Tub. 1780); Hosmann, *Hist. Sam. Sauli et Dav*. (Kil. 1752); Feuerlein, *Illustria Davidis facta exjurisprud. naturali illustrata* (Alt. 1715); Newton, *David, the King of Israel* (Lond. 1854); Shepherd, *Life of David illustrated by Psalms* (Lond. 1858); A. L. O. E., *Shepherd of Bethlehem* (1861); Hasse, *Idiognomik Davids* (Jen. 1784); Metzger, *Desiderium regis Dav. ad domnum Dei* (Augsb. 1776); Serpilius, *Personalia Davidis* (vol. 9 of his *Personalia*, Leipsic, 1713); Krummacher, *David the King* [from the Germ.] (Edinb. 1867, N. Y. 1868). *SEE PSALMS*.

B. *In phrases*. — The "House of David" (Isaiah 7:2, 13; Jeremiah 21:12; Zechariah 13:1) signifies his family, posterity. "In David," that is, in the *Book of David*, the Psalms (Matthew 22:42-45; Hebrews 4:7; Psalm 95:7). The name "*David*," in Ezekiel 34:23, 24; 37:24; Hcosiah 3:5, denotes the expected Messiah. "The *Son* of David" is often applied to Jesus as a title of the Messiah (Matthew 1:1; 9:27; 12:23; 15:22; 20:30, 31; Mark 10:47, 48), but not in John's writings. So the "Root of David" is used in the same sense (Revelation 5:5; 22:16; Isaiah 11:1, 10). Hence the kingdom or reign of the Messiah is designated by the appellations "the Kingdom of David" (Mark 11:10); "the Throne of David" (Luke 1:32); "the Tabernacle of David" (Acts 15:16; Amos 9:10); "the Key of David" (Revelation 3:7; Isaiah 22:22; Matthew 16:19).

David, City Of.

This name is applied in Scripture to two different places.

1. In (1010)2 Samuel 5, we read that David, having taken Jerusalem, and stormed the citadel on Mount Zion, “dwelt in the fort, and called it the city of David” (1 Chronicles 11:7). After that time the castle and palace of Zion appear to have been called “the City of David,” as contra-distinguished alike from Jerusalem generally, and from Moriah and other sections of it (1 Kings 8:1; 3:1; 2 Chronicles 5:2). In it David and most of his successors on the throne were buried (1 Kings 2:10; 2 Chronicles 9:31, etc.). Mount Zion, or the City of David, is on the south-west side of Jerusalem, opposite Moriah, or the temple-mount, with which it was connected by a bridge spanning the deep valley of Tyropceon. The tomb of David on Zion is to this day one of the most honored sanctuaries of the Mohammedans; and the square keep, called the Castle of David, on the northern end of Zion, is one of the most ancient and interesting relics in the Holy City. *SEE JERUSALEM*.

2. In Luke 2:4 and 11, Bethlehem is called the City of David. Joseph and Mary went from Nazareth “unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem.” This was David’s birthplace, and the home of his youth. We know not at what time the little mountain village began to be called by his name; but there is no trace of such a designation in the O.T. It appears, however, to have been pretty generally used in the time of our Lord. *SEE BETHLEHEM*.

David, Or Dewi

ST., patron saint of Wales, was, according to tradition, the son of the prince of Ceretica (Cardiganshire), and was born about the end of the 5th or beginning of the 6th century. Having resolved on a religious life, he spent, as was customary in those days, a probationary period in solitude, after which he commenced preaching to his countrymen. He built a chapel at Glastonbury, and founded twelve monasteries, the chief of which was at Menevia, in the vale of Ross. At the synod of Brevy, in Cardiganshire, held in 519, David showed himself a strong opponent of the Pelagian heresy. Subsequently he became archbishop of Caerleon-upon-Usk, but transferred his see to Menevia, now called St. David’s, where he died about the year 601. His life was written by Ricemarch, bishop of St. David’s, who died about the year 1099. The *Historia S. Davidis*, by Giraldus Cambrensis, written about 1175, and published in Wharton’s *Anglia Sacra*, is little more than an abridgment of Ricemarch’s work. — Butler, *Lives of Saints*, March 1.

David Christian,

one of the founders of Herrnhut, was born Dec. 31, 1690, at Senftleben, Moravia, and was bred a carpenter. In early manhood he became a Protestant. In 1722 he was sent to find a home for the persecuted Moravians, and secured one from Count Zinzendorf, at Bertholdsdorf, Lusatia. *SEE MORAVIANS*. When the church was organized at Herrnhut (their new abode), David was elected first of the twelve elders. His subsequent life was entirely devoted to missionary and Christian labors. In 1783 he led the first Moravian mission to Greenland. In 1738 Wesley had several interviews with David at Herrnhut. The after labors of David included two additional visits to Greenland, and eleven to Moravia; with others to Denmark, Holland, Wetteravia, Livonia, and England. In the beginning of 1750 he visited all the congregations in Germany, and almost immediately returned to London. In July he re-embarked for Germany, visited the churches in Wetteravia, and assisted at the synod held at Barby. From that period he resided at the church which his hands had founded. The toils of an honored and useful life were unexpectedly closed by his death, after a short illness, February 3, 1751. See Stevens, *History of Methodism*, 1:97; *Wesleyan Magazine*, March, 1852; Wesley, *Works*, 3, 86; v. 284.

David Of Dinanto

(13th century) is said to have been a disciple of Amalrich of Bena (q.v.), who died A.D. 1207. The Council of Paris (A.D. 1209) not only condemned Amalrich, but also David of Dinanto. Thomas Aquinas (*Sent*. 2, Dist. 17, qu. i, art. i) speaks of certain “modern philosophers” as adherents of David, and attributes to him a doctrine in substance pantheistic: “God is the eternal substance; all things are God, and God is everything.” Albertus Magnus speaks of a treatise of his, *De Tomis*. But, in fact, little is really known of David or his writings, except that he was one of the leaders of the pantheistic tendency in the Middle Ages. Neander (*History of Dogmas*, 2:560, Ryland’s translation) gives the chief authorities for what is known of David’s doctrines, viz. Concil. Paris, a. 1209, in Martene *Thesaur*. *Anecdot*. 4:163; Albertus Magnus, *Summa P. 1*. Tract. 4, Quaestio 20, Memb. ii, ed. Lugd. t. xvii, f. 76; Thomas Aquinas, in *Sent*. 1. ii, Dist. xvii, qu. i, art. i, ed. Venet. t. x, p. 235. David “described God as the *principium materiale omnium rerum*, and in reference to the three departments of existence distinguished three principles: matter, the first

indivisible principle of the corporeal world; in reference to the spiritual world — spirit, the invisible νοῦς from which proceeds the soul; and in reference to the ideas of God — the first Indivisible in the eternal substances. Between these three principles no distinction could exist, for otherwise they must be referred back to a higher principle of unity. There are, therefore, three relations of the one divine Being to the corporeal, the spiritual, and the ideal worlds." See Baur, *Vorles. ib. d. Dogmengeschichte*, 1866, vol. ii, p. 328; Gieseler, *Ch. Hist.* vol. ii, § 74; Kroenlein, *de genuina Amalrici a Bena ejusque sectatorum ac Davidis de Dinanto doctrina*, Giess. 1842; Staudenmaier, *Phil. d. Christenthums*, 1:633 sq.; Engelhardt, Amalrich von Bena, *in den kirchenh. Abhandlung. No. 3*; Kroenlein, Amalrich von Bena u. David von Dinanto, in *Stud. u. Krit.* 1847, 1:271 sq.

David

(Maronite archbishop, A.D. 1053) OF MOUNT LIBANUS, wrote an *Epistle* to Arsenius concerning the Melchite and Maronite sects; also a *Treatise* on the opinions of the Eastern Christians, part of which was published by Abraham Ecchelensis (a Roman Maronite), *Antiq. Orient*. p. 459 (London, 1682). In the year 1059, at the request of the abbot Joseph, he translated from Syriac into Arabic the *Constitutiones Ecclesiae Maronitarum*, in seventeen chapters (see Abraham Ecchelensis, *Not. ad Catalog. Hebedjesu*, n. 5). — Clarke, *Succ. of Sacred Literature*, 2:605. *SEE MARONITES*.

David Of Augsburg,

a Franciscan of the 13th century, was a friend of Berthold of Ratisbon, whom he accompanied on his missionary journeys. He died in Augsburg in 1271. Three tractates of his are given in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, vol. 13, viz. *The Novices' Formula for the Reformation of the outer Man, A Formula for the inner Man, and A Mirror of the seven Steps of a Religious.* These tracts have been erroneously ascribed to Bonaventura. Several of his works were written in the German language, and of this class six have been published by Pfeiffer in his *Deutsche Mystiker des Men Jahrhuunderts* (Leipzig, 1845). — Oudin, *Comment. de Script. Eccl.* 3, 447.

David George, Or Joris

SEE JORIS.

David Nicetas

SEE NICETAS.

Davidists

followers of David Joris. *SEE JORIS*.

David's

ST., an episcopal city in Pembrokeshire, Wales. It has been the seat of a bishopric since about 519, when St. David (q.v.) transferred the archbishop's see to St. David's (before called Mynyw, and by the Romans Menevia) from Caerleon. It was in the Middle Ages a large city — the great resort of pilgrims to St. David's shrine; it is now a small village, with only a few good houses besides those of the clergy. It has a fine cathedral, and splendid remains of religious houses, episcopal palace, and St. Mary's College (founded by John of Gaunt), within a high embattled wall nearly a mile in circuit. The cathedral, founded in 1180, on the site of the monastery of St. David, is cruciform. Its dimensions, in the interior, are as follows: length, 290 feet; breadth, 76; nave, 124 choir, 80; transept, 120; central tower, 127 feet high. Among the former bishops may be named Laud, Bull, South, and Horsley. The present incumbent (1868) of the see is Connop Thirlwall, the historian of Greece. The cathedral establishment includes a bishop, a dean, four canons, five vicars choral, and other officers residentiary, with four archdeacons, and 12 prebendaries, or honorary canons, nonresident.

Davidson Robert, D.D.,

an eminent Presbyterian divine and scholar, was born at Elkton, Md., 1750, and graduated at the University of Pennsylvania 1771. In 1773 he was ordained by the Second Presbytery of Philadelphia, and became associate pastor of the First Church and professor of history in the University. During the Revolution he was a zealous Whig, and when the British occupied Philadelphia he retired to Delaware. In 1784 he was appointed vice-president and professor of belles-lettres in Dickinson College, and was also called to be pastor of the First Presbyterian Church in Carlisle. On

leaving Philadelphia, he was made D.D. by the University. The double duties devolving on him at Carlisle were discharged with signal ability, industry, and success. His learning embraced a wide range, including eight languages, theology, and physics. He was especially devoted to astronomy, and invented an ingenious apparatus called a Cosmosphere, presenting the earth and firmament to view on the same axis. He was also a man of elegant tastes, skilled in music and drawing. In 1785 he was appointed by the Old Synod of New York and Philadelphia, along with Drs. Alison and Ewing, on a committee to prepare an improved version of the Psalms to take the place of Rouse. In 1796 he was chosen moderator of the General Assembly, and in 1804 he succeeded Dr. Nisbet in the presidency of the college, which he resigned in 1809, in order to devote himself exclusively to his pastoral duties. He died at Carlisle Dec. 13, 1812. His publications are, *A Dialogue, with two Odes set to Music*, 1775; *An Epitome of Geography*, 1784; *A Dialogue*, in blank verse; *Papers on Astronomy*; *Funeral Eulogium on Washington*, 1799; *The Christian's A, B, C*, 1811; *New metrical Version of the Psalms*, 1812; *Occasional Sermons*. — See Sprague, *Annals*, 3, 322.

Davies Samuel,

a Presbyterian minister, president of the College of New Jersey, was born near Summit Ridge, Newcastle County, Del., Nov. 3, 1723. He was educated at Fogg's Manor School, where he completed his theological studies also, and was licensed July 30, 1746. He was ordained as an evangelist in 1747, undertook a mission to Hanover County, Va., and on his arrival obtained a license from the General Court to officiate at four different places of worship. In 1748 he accepted a call to Hanover, and, having received an extension of his license, he divided his labors between five counties with great success. He subsequently claimed the privilege of the Act of Toleration for Virginia, and received a letter "under authority" in England confirmatory of his views. In 1753 he went to England in behalf of the College of New Jersey, and returned to Virginia in 1755, when the Presbytery of Hanover was founded, chiefly through his instrumentality. In 1759 he became president of New Jersey College, and removed to Princeton, where he died Feb. 4, 1761. It is deserving of record that in a discourse on the occasion of Braddock's defeat he made the following prophetic remark of Washington: "I may point out to the public that heroic youth, colonel Washington, whom I cannot but hope Providence has hitherto preserved in so signal a manner for *some important service to his*

country." "In the pulpit he was at once instructive and persuasive, full of light, and power, and love; and his manner of delivery was worthy of his fine thoughts, splendid diction, and deeply evangelical spirit." His sermons, which are strikingly eloquent, have been often reprinted; the latest editions are those of Albert Barnes, with a life of the author (New York, 1851, 3 vols. 8vo), and that of the Presbyterian Board, with Memoir by Dr. Sprague (Phila. 3 vols. 8vo). — Sprague, *Annals*, 3, 140.

Davis, Charles A.

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born Oct. 7, 1802, and was admitted on trial by the Baltimore Conference in 1824. During his itinerant life he filled many important appointments. He was stationed three times in Baltimore. He served also in Philadelphia, Washington, New York, Montgomery Circuit, Md., Alexandria, D. C., Annapolis, Md., and twice in Winchester, Va. In May, 1832, he was one of the secretaries of the General Conference at its session in Philadelphia. For several years he was clerk in one of the departments of the general government in Washington, where he was received into the Virginia Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, and filled an appointment in Richmond, and also in Portsmouth, Va. While in Portsmouth he received the appointment of chaplain in the navy. When the civil war broke out he remained true to his country, and the Virginia Conference of the M. E. Church South expelled him by resolution. He united with the Virginia and North Carolina Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He died in charge of the Norfolk Naval Hospital, Feb. 20, 1867. — Dr. J. S. Mitchell, in *Christ. Advocate and Journal*.

Davis, John

a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Northumberland County, Va., Oct. 30, 1787, was converted at 19, entered the itinerancy of the Baltimore Conference in 1810, and died in Hillsborough, Va., Aug. 13, 1853. Mr. Davis was a very important and useful minister for more than forty years. As soon as he was converted he began to exhort and preach publicly, and with great effect, even before he had become a member of the Church, and on a circuit in 1818 about one thousand souls were converted by his preaching. In person he was commanding, and his voice was excellent. His mind was well balanced and robust, and his social qualities fine. As a minister and presiding elder he had few equals, and he was always a leader

in the councils of the Church. He was an able agent and trustee of Dickinson College, and a member of every General Conference, save two, from 1816 to the time of his death. — *Minutes of Conferences*, v. 329.

Davis, Noah

a Baptist minister, was born near Salisbury, Worcester County, Mass., — July 28, 1802. After receiving a commercial education, he was licensed to preach July 9, 1820. After a brief ministry in Accomac, he became pastor of the Baptist church in Norfolk, Va. Having by his energy succeeded in procuring the formation of the Baptist General Tract Society in Washington, Feb. 25, 1824, he was, upon his removal soon after to Philadelphia, invited to the management of its concerns. This office he accepted, and filled with great usefulness until his death, July 13, 1830. — Sprague, *Annals*, 6:701.

Davison John, B.D.,

fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, was born at Morpeth in 1777, and matriculated at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1794. He became vicar of Sutterton, Lincolnshire, in 1817, and afterwards rector of Washington; then prebendary of Worcester and rector of Upton – upon Severn in 1826. He died in 1834. His Discourses on Prophecy are valuable for their practical tendency as well as critical research. They are contained in his *Remains and Occasional Publications* (Oxf. 1840, 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 1:877.

Dawes, Sir William, D.D.,

archbishop of York, was born at Lyons, near Braintree, in 1671. He was educated at St. John's College, Oxford, and Catharine Hall, Cambridge; became master of Catharine Hall in 1696, bishop of Chester in 1707, and finally archbishop of York in 1714. He died in 1724. He had a lively imagination, a strong memory, and a sound judgment. He was one of the most popular preachers of his day. Among his writings are *The Anatomy of Atheism* (1693, 4to): — *Duties of the Closet*, etc. (1707, 8vo), etc. A collection of his works was published (Lond. 1733, 3 vols. 8vo), with a preface, giving some account of his life and character. — Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica*, 1:870; *Biographia Britannica*, v. 15,

Dawn

ãvn, *ne'sheph*, the *breathing* or breeze of the cooler part of the day; prop. the *evening* "*twilight*" (as usually rendered), hence the *morning* twilight or "dawning" (Job 7:4; Psalm 119:147: "twilight," 1 Samuel 30:17; 2 Kings 7:5, 7); poet. µyæi[ip][i *aphappa'yim*, *eye-lids* (as elsewhere rendered) of the morn, i.e. day-break (Job 3:9); also hnP; to *turn*, spoken of the change of darkness into light (Judges 19:26); and hl;[; to *ascend*, of the lifting of night's shades (Joshua 6:15). In Greek ἐπιφώσκω, to *grow light* (Matthew 28:1; hence also of the approaching Sabbath, Luke 23:54); and διαυγάζω, to *become lustrous*, as through a crevice (2 Peter 1:19). *SEE DAY*.

Day

(properly µ/y, yzm, ἡμέρα). The variable length of the natural day ("ab exortu ad occasum solis," Censor. *de Die Nat.* 23) at different seasons led in the very earliest times to the adoption of the civil day (or one revolution of the sun). as a standard of time. The commencement of the civil day varied in different nations: the Babylonians (like the people of Nuremberg) reckoned it from sunrise to sunrise (Isidor. *Orig*. v. 30); the Umbrians from noon to noon; the Romans from midnight to midnight (Plin. 2:79); — the Athenians and others from sunset to sunset (Macrob. *Saturn*. 1:3; Gell. 3, 2). *SEE CHRONOLOGY*.

The Hebrews adopted the latter reckoning (Leviticus 23:32, "from even to even shall ye celebrate your Sabbath"), which appears even in Genesis 1:5, "the *evening* and the *morning* were [on] the first day" (a passage which the Jews are said to have quoted to Alexander the Great, Gemara, *Tamid*, 66, 1; Reland, *Ant. Hebr*. 4:15). Some (as in Godwyn's *Moses and Aaron*) argue foolishly, from Matthew 28:1, that they began their *civil* day in the morning; but the expression ἐπιφωσκούσῃ shows that the *natural* day is there intended. Hence the expression "evening-morning" = day (Daniel 8:14, Sept. νυχθήμερον), the Hindoo *ahoratra* (Von Bohlen on Genesis 1:4), the Greek νυχθήμερον (2 Corinthians 11:25). There was a similar custom among the Athenians, Arabians, and ancient Teutons (Tac. *Germ*. 11, nec dierum numerum ut apud nos, sed *noctium* computant . . nox ducere diem videtur") and Celtic nations (Caesar, *Bell. Gall*. 6:18, "ut noctem dies subsequatur"). This mode of reckoning was widely spread; it

is found in the Roman law (Gains, 1:112), in the Niebelungenlied, in the Salic law (*inter decemn noctes*), in our own terms "fortnight," "se'n-*night*" (see Orelli, etc. in loc. Tac.), and even among the Siamese ("they reckon by nights," Bowring, i, 137) and New Zealanders (Taylor's *TeIka-Miaui*, p. 20). No doubt this arose from the general notion "that the first day in Eden was 36 hours long" (Lightfoot's *Works* , 2:334, ed. Pitman; Hesiod, *Theogon*. 123; Aristoph. Av. 693; Wilkinson, *Anc. Eg*. 4:274). Kalisch plausibly refers it to the use of lunar years (Genesis p. 67). Sometimes, however, they reckoned from sunrise (ἡμερονύκτιον, comp. Psalm 1:2; Leviticus 7:15). The less obvious starting-points of noon and midnight, the former adopted by the Etruscans, etc., the latter by the Roman priests, Egyptians (see, however, Lepsius, *Chronol*. p. 130), and others, were chosen either as the culminating points, as it were, of light and darkness, or for astronomical purposes (Ideler, *Hb. d. Chron*. 1:29, 80, 100 sq.; comp. Tacit. *Germ*. 11; Macrob. *Sat*. 33, etc.). To the Hebrews, the moon had distinctly been pointed out as the regulator of time (Psalm 104:19). Nevertheless, it has always been a moot point whether the Hebrews, at all times and in all respects, began their calendar or civil day with the night. (See Felseisen, *De civili Judceorum die*, Lpz. 1702; Federreuther, *De diebus Egyptiacis*, Altd. 1757.) It has been argued that, if this had been the case, the lawgiver could not have designated those very evenings which he wished to belong ritually to the following (15th, 10th) day, as the evenings of the previous (14th, 9th) day (Leviticus 1. c.). Further, that in common Biblical phraseology, the day is frequently mentioned before the night (Psalm 1:2, etc.); and that of the fast days mentioned in Zechariah 8:19, only one begins with the previous evening. Finally — not to mention other objections — it has been alleged that even in ritual points the Bible occasionally reckons the night as following, not as preceding the day (Leviticus 7:15). There seems, in fact, no other way of reconciling these apparent inconsistencies than to assume (comp. Mishnah, *Chulin*, v. 6) that no absolute rule had been laid down with respect to the commencement of the civil day, and that usage varied somewhat with the customs of the people where the Hebrews were for the time sojourning. The prevalent method of computation, however, is evinced by the fact that the Jewish civil day still begins, not with the morning, but the evening — thus the Sabbath commences with the sunset of Friday, and ends with the sunset of Saturday. That this was the case in Judaea in our Savior's day is evident from the evangelists' account of the Passion. In New England the same mode of reckoning the Sabbath was formerly common. *SEE FESTIVAL*.

The Jews are supposed, like the modern Arabs, to have adopted from an early period minute specifications of the parts of the natural day (see *Jour. Sac. Lit.* Jan. 1862, p. 471). Roughly, indeed, they were content to divide it into "morning, evening, and noonday" (Psalm 55:17); but when they wished for greater accuracy they pointed to six unequal parts, each of which was again subdivided. These are held to have been:

(I.) *Ne'sheph*, ãvn, (from ãvn; to *blow*), and *shach'ar*, rjv; or the *dawn*. After their acquaintance with Persia they divided this into (a) the time when the eastern and (b) when the western horizon was illuminated, like the Greek Leucothea — Matuta Ñ and Aurora; or "the gray dawn" (Milton) and the rosy dawn. Hence we find the *dual* Shaharaim as a proper name (1 Chronicles 8:8). The writers of the Jerus. Talmud divide the dawn into *four* parts, of which there was;

1. Aijeleth *ha-shachar* (q.v.), "the gazelle of the morning," a name by which the Arabians call the sun (comp. "eyelids of the dawn," Job 3:9; ἀμέρας βλέφαρον, Soph. *Antig*. 109). This was the time when Christ arose (Mark 16:2; John 20:1; Revelation 22:16; ἡ ἐπιφωσκούση, Matthew 28:1). The other three divisions of the dawn were,

2. "when one can distinguish blue from white" (πρωΐ, σκοτίας ἔτι οὔσης, John 20:1; "obscurum adhuc cceptae lucis," Tacit. H. 4:2). At this time they began to recite the phylacteries.

3. When the east began to grow light (ὄρθρος βαθύς, Luke 24:1).

4. Twilight (λίαν πρωΐ, ἀνατείλαντος τοῦ ἡλίου, Mark 16:2; Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* ad loc.). *SEE DAWN*.

(II.) *Bo'ker*, rqB; sunrise. Some suppose that the Jews, like other Oriental nations, commenced their civil day at this time until the Exodus (Jennings's *Jewish Ant.*). *SEE MORNING*.

(III.) *Chom hay-Yom'*, µ/Yhi µhe; "heat of the day" (Sept. ἕως διεθερμάνθη ἡ ἡμέρα, 1 Samuel 11:11; less exactly elsewhere μεσημβρία), about 9 o'clock in the forenoon.

(IV.) *Tsohora'yim*, µyaeh'x; "the two noons" (Genesis 43:16; Deuteronomy 28:29). *SEE NOON*.

(V.) *Ru'ach hay-Yom'*, µ/Yhi jWr, "the cool (liter. wind) of the day," before sunset (Genesis 3:8); so called by the Persians to this day (Chardin, Voy. 4:8; Jahn, *Bibl. Arch.* § 29). *SEE AFTERNOON*.

(VI.) *E'reb*, br,[, "*evening*." The phrase "between the two evenings" (Exodus 16:12; 30:8), being the time marked for slaying the paschal lamb and offering the evening sacrifice (Exodus 12:6; 29:39), led to a dispute between the Karaites and Samaritans on the one hand, and the Pharisees on the other. The former took it to mean between sunset and full darkness (Deuteronomy 16:6); the Rabbinists explained it as the time between the beginning (δείλη πρωΐα, "little evening") and end of sunset (δ. ὀψία), or real sunset; Josephus, *War*, 6:9, 3; Gesenius, s.v.; Jahn, *Bibl. Archcaeol.* § 101; Bochart, *Hieroz.* 1:558). *SEE EVENING*.

(VII.) *Chatsoth'*, t/xj} (from hxj; "to divide"), *midnight*. In later Hebrew also *mid-day* (Mishna, *Pesach*, 4:1, 5, 6). *SEE MIDNIGHT*.

Since the Sabbath was reckoned from sunset to sunset (Leviticus 23:32), the Sabbatarian Pharisees, in that spirit of scrupulous superstition which so often called forth the rebukes of our Lord, were led to settle the minutest rules for distinguishing the actual instant when the Sabbath began (ὀψία, Matthew 8:16 = ὅτε ἔδυ ὁ ἥλιος, Mark 1:32). They therefore called it the time between the actual sunset and the appearance of three stars (Maimon. in *Shabb.* c. 5; comp Nehemiah 4:21, 22); and the Talmudists decided that "if on the evening of the Sabbath a man did any work after *one* star had appeared, he was forgiven; if after the appearance of *two*, he must offer a sacrifice for a doubtful transgression; if after *three* stars were visible, he must offer a sin-offering;" the order being *reversed* for works done on the evening after the actual Sabbath (Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.* ad Matthew 8:16; Otho, *Lex. Rab.* s.v. Sabbathum). *SEE SUNSET*.

Before the Captivity the Jews divided the night into three watches (Psalm 63:6; 90:4), viz. the first watch, lasting till midnight (Lamentations 2:19, A. V. "the beginning of the watches") =ἀρχὴ νυκτός; the "middle watch" (which proves the statement), lasting till cock-crow (Judges 7:19) = μέσον νυκτῶν; and the morning watch, lasting till sunrise (Exodus 14:24) = ἁμφιλύκη νύξ (Homer, Il. 7:433). These divisions were probably connected with the Levitical duties in the Temple service. The Jews, however, say (in spite of their own definition, "a watch is the third part of the night") that they always had four night-watches (comp. Nehemiah 9:3),

but that the fourth was counted as a part of the morning (Buxtorf's *Lex. Talm.* col. 2454; Carpzov, *Appar. Crit.* p. 347; Reland, *Antiq.* pt. 4, § 18). *SEE WATCH*.

In the N.T. we have allusions to four watches, a division borrowed from the Greeks (Herod. 9:51) and Romans (φυλακή: τὸ τέταρτον μέρος τῆς νυκτός, Suid.). These were, 1. ὀψέ, ὀψία, or ὀψία ρα, from twilight till 9 o'clock (Mark 11:11; John 20:19); 2. (μεσονύκτιον, midnight, from 9 till 12 o'clock (Mark 13:35); 3. ἀλεκτοροφωνία, till 3 in the morning (Mark 13:35; 3 Maccabees 5:23); 4. πρωΐ, till daybreak, the same as πρωΐα (ρα) (John 18:28; Josephus, *Ant.* v. 6, 5; 18:9, 6). *SEE NIGHT*.

The word held to mean "hour" is first found in Daniel 3:6, 15, v. 5 (h [;v; *shaah'*, also "a moment," 4:19). Perhaps the Jews, like the Greeks, learned from the Babylonians the division of the day into twelve parts (Herod. 2:109). In our Lord's time the division was common (John 11:9). It is probable that Ahaz introduced the first sun-dial from Babylon (ὡρολόγιον, t/l [}m; Isaiah 38:8; 2 Kings 20:11), as Anaximenes did the first σκιάθηρον into Greece (Jahn, *Arch.* § 101). Possibly the Jews at a later period adopted the clepsydra (Joseph. *Ant.* 11:6). The third, sixth, and ninth hours were devoted to prayer (Daniel 6:10; Acts 2:15; 3:1, etc.). *SEE HOUR*.

The days of the week had no proper names among the Hebrews, but were distinguished only by their numeral order from the Sabbath (see Lightfoot's *Works* , 2:334, ed. Pitman). *SEE WEEK*.

The expression ἐπιούσιον, rendered "daily" in Matthew 6:11, is a ἅπ. λεγ., and has been much disputed. It is unknown to classical Greek (ἔοικε πεπλάσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν Εὐαγγελιστῶν, Origen, *Orat*. 16). The Vulg. has *supersubstantialem*, a rendering recommended by Abelard to the nuns of the Paraclete. Theophyl. explains it as equivalent to *sufficient* (ὁ ἐπὶ τ οὐσίᾳ καὶ συστάσει ἡμῶν αὐταρκής), and he is followed by most commentators (compare Chrysost. *Hom. in Or. Domin.*, Suid. and Etym. M. s.v.). Salmasius, Grotius, etc. arguing from the rendering R j;m; in the Nazarene Gospel, translate it as though it were equivalent to *to-morrow's* (τῆς ἐπιούσης ἡμέρας, or εἰς αὔριον, *Sixt. Senensis Bibl. Sanct*. p. 444 a). But see the question examined at length (after Tholuck) in Alford's *Greek Test*. ad loc; Schleusner, *Lex*. s.v.; Wetstein, *N.T.* i, p. 461, etc. *SEE DAILY*.

In Ezekiel 4:4-6, a day is put symbolically for a year. Erroneously supposing this statement to be a precedent, many interpreters of the prophecies have taken it for granted that one day stands for a year in the prophetic writings of Daniel and John. Such, however, is not the case; -the word day is to be taken in its literal sense, unless the context expressly intimates the contrary. On the prophetic or year-day system (Leviticus 25:3, 4; Numbers 14:34), see a treatise in Elliot's *Hor. Apoc.* 3, 154, sq., and Prof. Stuart on "The Designations of Time in the Apocalypse," *Bib. Repository*, v. 33-83. *SEE YEAR*.

The ancients superstitiously held that certain days were lucky (*fasti*) and others unlucky (*nefasti*), and the distinction was sometimes indicated by different colors in the calendar ('red-calendar" or rubric). *SEE CALENDAR*.

The duration of the Mosaic or demiurgic days of Genesis 5-31, has been a matter of considerable dispute. The various opinions on this subject, and the difficulties in which most of them are involved, are stated under the head of CREATION *SEE CREATION* . See also the articles *SEE COSMOGONY*; *SEE SABBATH*; *SEE MILLENNIUM*; the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, April, 1865; *Evangelical Quarterly Review*, January, 1868 (art. Geology).

The word *day* is often used by the sacred writers to denote an indefinite time (Genesis 2:4; Isaiah 22:5). The "day of temptation in the wilderness" was forty years (Hebrews 3:8). The "day of the Lord" signifies, generally, a time of calamity and distress (Isaiah 2:12; Joel 2:11). It is also used of a festal day (Hosea 7:5), a birthday (Job 3:1), a day of ruin (Hosea 1:11; Job 18:20; comp. *tempus, tempora reipublicae*, Cic., and *dies Cannensis*), the judgment-day (Joel 1:15; 1 Thessalonians 5:2), the kingdom of Christ (John 8:56; Romans 13:12), and in other senses which are mostly self-explaining (see Wemyss, *Symbol. Dict.* s.v.). In 1 Corinthians 4:3, ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας is rendered 'by man's judgment:" Jerome (*ad Algas. Quaest.* x) considers this a Cilicism (Bochart, *Hieroz.* 2:471). On Romans 13:12, there are two treatises — Kuinol, *Explicatio* (Giess. 1808); Rachm, *De nocte et die* (Tubingen, 1764). *SEE TIME*.

The phrases "LAST DAY" (or *days*), "THAT DAY," are "the general formula of the prophets for an indefinitely left future opened up in perspective" (Stier, *Words of Jesus*, 2:361, Am. ed.), designating the Messianic period, with its introductory age, that of the Maccabees (after the return from

exile), and its consummation in the millennium. *SEE ESCHATOLOGY*. In a more literal and limited sense, the final judgment is designated. *SEE LAST DAY*.

Day Of Atonement

SEE ATONEMENT, DAY OF.

Day's Journey

(µ/y Ërr, µ/y Ël hj]m, ὁδὸς ἡμερησίη, Herod. 4:101), a distance such as (in the East) a person might travel in a single day. *SEE SABBATH-DAY'S JOURNEY*. According to Jonah 3:3, the circuit of Nineveh was three days' journey. This mode of describing distances is also found in Greek, Roman, Arabian, and Persian writers (see Strabo, 17:835; Pliny, v. 4, 9; 6:35; Livy, 25:15; 30:29; Athen. 1:7). It needs scarcely be remarked that in itself (if strictly taken) it would be a very vague and fluctuating measurement, the length of a day's journey depending so much on the peculiar circumstances under which each pedestrian travels (see Casaubon *ad Strab*. 1:35; Ukert, *Geogr. d. Griech. u. Rom.* I, 2:58). But the ancient writers seem to have fixed on the average of what was usually performed by foot-travelers (Herod. 3, 9; 4:9). Herodotus in one place says (iv. 401) a day's journey amounts to 200 stadia (comp. Polyb. 3, 8; Livy, 21:15); in another (v. 53) to 150 (comp. Pausanias, 10:33, 2). According to Vegetius (*Mil*. 1:9), twenty Roman miles, that is, 160 stadia, were reckoned for a day's journey. In the Arabian geographers the length of a day's journey is equally variable; yet among them, as in the East at the present day (Tavernier, 1:48), it may be stated generally at about seven leagues, or from eighteen to twenty English miles, which is probably not far from the distance intended by that expression in Scripture, which occurs chiefly in the Pentateuch (Genesis 30:36; 31:23; Exodus 5:3; 8:27; Numbers 11:31; Deuteronomy 1:2), but also elsewhere (1 Kings 19:4; 2 Kings 3:9), and even in the Apocrypha (1 Maccabees 5:24, 28; 7:45; Tobit 6:1), in the New Test. (Luke 2:44; Acts 1:12), often in Josephus, (*Ant.* 12:4, 6; Ap. 2:9; *Life*, 52), and in the Talmud (see Otho, *Lex. Rabb.* p. 421). *SEE JOURNEY*.

Day Jeremiah, D.D.,

president of Yale College, was born in New Preston, Conn., August 3, 1773, and was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1795.

After some years spent as tutor at Greenfield School, Williams College, and Yale, he was licensed as a minister of the Congregational Church in 1800, and in 1801 he was elected professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in Yale College. His health failing, he spent a year or two in travel and retirement, and did not begin his labors in college until 1803. He held that office until 1817, publishing meanwhile a series of mathematical text-books well-adapted to the wants of the time, and which had great success. On the 22d of April, 1817, he was chosen president of Yale College, and held that office till 1846, when his sense of the infirmities of age induced him to resign, against the judgment and wishes of his colleagues, as his judgment and governing faculties were yet in abundant vigor. Notwithstanding chronic feebleness of constitution, his careful habits of life, formed after physiological study of his own constitution, enabled him to preserve his intellectual vigor, and a fair degree of bodily health, up to the year of his death, which occurred August 22, 1867. Besides his mathematical works, president Day *wrote An Inquiry respecting the self-determining Power of the Will* (1838; 2d ed. 1849), which was substantially a refutation of Cousin's view of the will as given in his Psychology: — *Examination of Edwards on the Will* (1841, 12mo), which is "an abstract of Edwards, made in a lucid and truth-loving spirit." He also contributed numerous articles to reviews and journals. As a college officer, his moral and intellectual qualities combined to make him a model. See an admirable sketch by president Woolsey, *New Englander*, Oct. 1867, art. v.

Daysman

(jÿkæm, *moki'ach*, an *adjudicator*), "an old English term meaning *umpire* or *arbitrator* (Job 9:33). It is derived from day, in the specific sense of a day fixed for a trial (comp. 1 Corinthians 4:3, where ἀνθρωπίνη ἡμέρα lit. *man's day*, and so given in Wycliffe's translation — is rendered 'man's judgment' in the A. V.). Similar expressions occur in German (eine Sache tagen = to bring a matter before a court of justice) and other Teutonic languages." "The primitive meaning of the verb jnÿ;(according to Gesenius, *Thes.* p. 592) is 'to be clear or manifest;' and in Hiphil 'to make manifest;' also 'to convince, to confute, to reprove or rebuke;' by these last two words the word is rendered in nearly every passage of the A. V., including the ten instances of the Hiphil participle jÿkæm. It is not easy to conjecture why in Job 9:33 alone the translators resorted to the not then common word *daysman*. The marginal rendering umpire seems to convey

best the meaning of Job in the passage, ‘some one to compose our differences and command silence when either of us exceeds our bounds’ (Patrick, in loc.). Fürst’s term, *Schiedsmann*, (*Handwirterb*. p. 309), very well expresses this idea of authoritative arbitration. As to the old English noun daysman, Johnson’s definition, surety, is hardly borne out by his solitary quotation from Spenser (*Faerie Queene*, 2:8); arbitrator or umpire would better express the sense. In Holland’s old translation of Livius (p. 137), *Dayesmen* and *Umpiers* are used as synonymes. In the Bible of 1551, 1 Samuel 2:25 is thus employed.” In primitive times such a person appears to have been appointed to prescribe just limits to such as were immoderate in their demands, and interpose his authority with those who exceeded the assigned bounds of their cause. The laying the hand on both may allude to some particular ceremony; but it evidently also refers to the power of coercion which the daysman could exercise over both parties. *SEE MEDIATOR*.

Day-spring

(ר ׁ ח, shach’ar, Job 38:12, elsewhere usually “morning;” ἀνατολή, Luke 1:78, elsewhere “east”), signifies the first streaks of daylight, the dawn, or day-break; and in the former of the above-cited passages it is used in its literal sense. This portion of time was at a later period, in imitation of the Persians, divided into two parts, the first of which began when the eastern, the second when the western division of the horizon was illuminated. *SEE AIJELETH-SHAHAR*. In the latter passage, the. birth of John the Baptist is beautifully compared to the early twilight preceding the rising of the great moral sun, the Messiah (comp. Malachi 4:2; Isaiah 60:1-3; 2 Corinthians 4:6). *SEE DAY*.

Day-star

(Φωσφόρος, light-bearing, whence phosphorus), Lucifer, the morning-star, put (2 Peter 1:19) as the emblem of the dawn of spiritual light and comfort to the benighted and troubled mind. *SEE LUCIFER*.

Deacon

Anglicized from the Gr. διάκονος, Lat. *diaconus* (usually derived from διά and κόνις, q. d. “one dusty from running;” but better from an obsolete διάκω, or διήκω, “to run,” or hasten; kindred with διώκω, to

pursue: hence, strictly, a runner, i.e. messenger, Buttmann, Lexil. 1:218-221), a servant (as often rendered),

1. properly, of those who attend on guests or at a table, a waiter (John 2:5, 9; so Polyb. 31:4, 5; Xenoph. *Mem*. 1:5, 2). Among the Greeks these διάκονοι were a higher class than the δοῦλοι, or slaves (Athen. 10, p. 192 b).

2. Generally, and with the name of the master or person served, a minister (as it is usually rendered in the N.T.) (Matthew 20:26; 23:11; Mark 9:35; 10:43; so Xenoph. *Cyr*. 8:3, 8). Also an attendant of Christ, a disciple (John 12:26), of a king (Matthew 22:13), and hence of God (Romans 13:4).

3. Specially, in relation to the Gospel and the Church, a minister or teacher

> **(a.)** of the person for whom one ministers (1 Corinthians 3:5; 2 Corinthians 3:6; 6:4; 1 Thessalonians 3:2; 2 Corinthians 11:23; Colossians 1:7; Ephesians 6:21: Colossians 4:7; 1:25; and, by antithesis, of Satan, 2 Corinthians 11:15).
>
> **(b.)** Technically, an officer of the primitive Church, a deacon (Philippians 1:1; 1 Timothy 3:8, 12; 4:6; see Acts 6:1-6).

I. *Deacons in the N.T.* —

1. "The office described by this title appears in the N.T. as the correlative of ἐπίσκοπος, bishop or presbyter (q.v.). The two are mentioned together in Philippians 1:1; 1 Timothy 3:2, 8. The union of the two in the Sept. of Isaiah 60:17, may have suggested both as fit titles for the officers of the Christian Church, or have led to the adoption of one after the other had been chosen on independent grounds. The coincidence, at all events, soon attracted notice, and was appealed to by Clement of Rome (1 Corinthians 42) as prophetic. Like most words of similar import, it appears to have been first used in its generic sense, implying subordinate activity (1 Corinthians 3:5) and afterwards to have gained a more defined connotation as applied to a distinct body of men in the Christian society."

2. The origin of the office of deacon in the Church is usually supposed to be described in Acts 6:1-6. The Hellenistic Jews complained that "their widows were neglected in the daily ministrations." This neglect may be ascribed either to "the fact that their widows were not known, being as

foreigners of a somewhat backward spirit, or possibly also to some jealousy existing between the proper Hebrews and their kindred from other lands. At first the apostles themselves, who had the charge also of the common fund (Acts 4:35, 37; 5:2), superintended this service, employing intermediate agents, young men of the congregation probably (Acts 5:6,10), who had given cause for the complaint now mentioned. In proportion, however, as the Church extended, the more impracticable did it become for them to give themselves to such outward concerns without wrong to their proper spiritual work. 'It is not reason,' said the twelve, 'that we should leave the Word of God and serve tables' — that is, superintend the daily love-feasts and the distribution of alms. In order, therefore, that they might give themselves wholly to prayer and the preaching of the Gospel, and to provide against wrong and dissatisfaction by a fixed regulation, they proposed the election of seven men of good report, full of the Holy Ghost and of prudence, for this particular service, and set them apart to it solemnly, after they had been chosen by the people, with prayer and the imposition of hands. In the Acts, indeed, these officers are styled simply οἱ ἑπτά, the seven (21:8), and not deacons that is, servants or helpers; but that this was their character we know, partly from the terms διακονία, διακονεῖν τραπέζαις, used of their office (Acts 6:1, 2), and partly from almost universal exegetical tradition. (The ancient Church even held the sacred number seven in this case of obligatory. force; and at Rome, for example, there were still as late as the third century only seven deacons, although the number of presbyters amounted to forty)" (Schaff, *Apostolic Church*, § 134).

Some writers (e.g. Mosheim, *Comm.*: cent. i, § 37) maintain that the "seven" were appointed, not to care for all the poor at Jerusalem, but only for the widows and poor of the Greeks or foreigners. This view supposes that similar officers had previously existed to discharge these functions for the general Church (so Conybeare and Howson, *Life of St. Paul*, 1:467; Whately, *Kingdom of Christ*; Hinds, *Early Christianity*). Stanley (*Apostolic Age*, p. 62 sq.) supposes that "the seven" were not deacons such as we find in the later period of the apostolic age, "though they may possibly have borne the name, and though there was in some respects a likeness between their respective duties." (Compare, on the other hand, Schaff, *Apostolic Church*, § 134). Dr. W. L. Alexander, in Kitto's *Cyclopedia* (s.v.), asserts that it is not easy to justify the assumption that the "seven" were deacons in the later sense. "Nothing can be drawn from

the meaning of the word διακονία as applied to their functions (ver. 1), or the word διάκονος, as if this title had been originally derived from such a 'serving of tables' as is here referred to, because these words are used in the N.T. with the utmost latitude of meaning, so as to include every kind of service rendered to the Church or cause of God on earth — the service of presbyters (2 Corinthians 11:23; Ephesians 6:21; Colossians 1:7, etc.), of evangelists (1 Thessalonians 3:2), of apostles (Acts 20:24; 21:19; Romans 11:13; 2 Corinthians 6:4, etc.), of prophets (1 Peter 1:12), of angels (Hebrews 1:14), of Christ himself (Romans 15:8), as well as service in temporal matters. Nor can much weight be attached to patristic testimony on this head, because we have no clear declaration in favor of the position assumed earlier than that of the sixth General Council (in Trullo), held A.D. 680; all the earlier witnesses speak of the diaconate in connection with spiritual services or the 'rites' of the Church. If, moreover, this was the institution of a permanent office in the Church, it seems somewhat strange that it should disappear entirely from the history of the Church for many years, and come up again, for the first time, in the form of an incidental notice in an epistle written in the latter half of the first century. Taking the narrative in the Acts in its connection with the history of which it forms a part, the appointment of the seven brethren has all the appearance of a temporary expedient to meet a peculiar emergency."

Some writers maintain that the office of the "seven" corresponded to that of the ˆZ;j¡ *chazzan*, in the Jewish Synagogue, the ὑπηρέτης, or "minister," of the N.T. (Luke 4:20; John 7:32). This is the opinion of Vitringa (*De Syn. Vet*. p. 895 sq.; Bernard's *Condensed Tr*. p. 87 sq.), whose principle, that the order of the Christian churches was constructed on the model of the synagogues, led him to press the analogy between the two in every possible way. But for this opinion there is no solid support. Vitringa's main principle is itself unsound, for nothing can be more evident than that the' apostles proceeded upon no prearranged scheme of Church policy, but instituted offices and appointed usages just as circumstances required; and, as respects the deacon's office, it cannot be shown that one of the duties pertaining to the office of chazzan in the synagogue belonged to it. As Hartmann remarks (*Enge Verbind. des A. T. mit d. N*. p. 281), the chazzan was a mere servant whose functions resembled those of our sexton or church officer (Kitto, *Cyclopedia*, s.v.; see also Neander, *Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, Ryland's translation, 1:34 sq.). *SEE SYNAGOGUE*.

3. But, whatever view may be taken of Acts 6, it appears clear that the later church office (Philippians 1; 1 Timothy 3) developed itself from the office designated in Acts 6, and may be traced back to it. The functions of the deacon were primarily secular, but soon rose into spiritual importance. Hence the "moral qualifications described in 1 Timothy 3 as necessary for the office of deacon are substantially the same as those of the bishop. The deacons, however, were not required to be 'given to hospitality,' nor to be 'apt to teach.' It was enough for them to 'hold the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience.' They were not to gain their living by disreputable occupations (μὴ αἰσχροκερδεῖς). On offering themselves for their work they were to be subject to a strict scrutiny (1 Timothy 3:10), and, if this ended satisfactorily, were to enter on it. It does not appear to have [necessarily] belonged to the office of a deacon to teach publicly in the church. The possession of any special χάρισμα (spiritual endowment) would lead naturally to a higher work and office, but the idea that the diaconate was but a probation through which a man had to pass before he could be an elder or bishop was foreign to the constitution of the Church of the first century. Whatever countenance it may receive from the common patristic interpretation of 1 Timothy 3:13 (comp. Estius and Hammond, ad loc.), there can be little doubt (as all the higher order of expositors have felt, comp. Wiesinger and Ellicott, *ad* loc.) that when Paul speaks of the καλὸς βαθμός, or 'good degree,' which is gained by those who ' do the office of a deacon well,' he refers to the honor which belongs essentially to the lower work, not to that which they were to find in promotion to a higher." On the other side, Dr. Thomas Scott says (*Comment*. on 1 Timothy 3:8-13), "The deacons were primarily appointed to dispense the charity of the Church, and to manage its secular concerns. Yet they preached occasionally, or taught in private, or were readers in the public assemblies, and pastors and evangelists were chosen from among them. This interpretation has been contested, yet it seems to be the apostle's meaning; and, without adverting to modern habits and controversies, it is evident that the due discharge of the primitive office of deacon must tend to qualify men for the ministry."

II. *In the Early Post-Apostolic Church.* — That the duties of the seven deacons were not of an exclusively secular character is clear from the fact that both Philip and Stephen preached, and that one of them also baptized. It is strange, therefore, that the 18th Canon of the Council of Constantinople, in "Trullo," should declare, referring to Acts 6, that the

seven deacons had no spiritual function assigned them. OEcumenius (a celebrated Greek writer of the tenth century) gives his testimony to the same effect (*In Act. Ap*. 6, p. 433). But opposed to this opinion is that of some of the fathers of the Christian Church. Ignatius, a martyr-disciple of St. John, and bishop of Antioch († 115), styles them at once '"ministers of the mysteries of Christ;" adding that they are not ministers of meats and drinks, but of the Church of God (Ignat. *Ep. ad Trall*. n. 2). Again he says (*Ep. ad Trall*. n. 3), "Study to do all things in divine concord, under your bishop presiding in the place of God, and the presbyters in the place of the apostolic senate, and the deacons most dear to me, as those to whom is committed the ministry of Jesus Christ." Tertullian († 220) classes them with bishops and presbyters as guides and leaders to the laity. He asks (Tertull. *De Fuga*, c. ii): "Quum ipsi auctores, id est, ipsi Diaconi, Presbyteri, et Episcopi fuaiunt, quomodo Laicus intelligere poterit? — Cum Duces fugiunt quis de gregario numero sustinebit?" Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, A.D. 250 (while referring their origin to Acts 6), styles them ministers of episcopacy and of the Church (Cypr. *Ep*. 65, al. 3, *ad Rogat*.); at the same time he asserts that they were called *ad altaris ministerium* Ñ to the ministry of the altar. Though Jerome in one place speaks of them (*Ep. ad Evang, et Com*. Ezekiel c. 48) as servants of tables and widows, yet again he ranks them among the guides of the people: still he distinguishes them from the priests of the second order, that is, from the presbyters, by the title of *Servites*. And so, frequently, in the Councils, the names *Sacerdos* and *Levita* are used as the distinguishing titles of presbyter and deacon. The fourth Council of Carthage expressly forbids the deacon to assume any one function peculiar to the priesthood, by declaring, "Diaconus non ad sacerdotium, sed ad ministerium consecratus." (See also 18th Can. Con. Nic.)

His ordination, moreover, differed from that of presbyter both in its form and in the powers which it conferred. For in the ordination of a presbyter, the presbyters who were present were required to join in the imposition of hands with the bishop; but the ordination of a deacon might be performed by the bishop alone, because, as the 4th Canon of the 4th Council of Carthage declares, he was ordained, not to the priesthood, but to the inferior services of the Church. Duties. —

1. The deacon's more ordinary duty was to assist the bishop and presbyter in the service of the sanctuary; especially was he charged with the care of the utensils and ornaments appertaining to the holy table.

2. In the administration of the Eucharist, that it was the deacon's duty to hand the elements to the people, is evident from Justin Martyr (*Apol.* 2, p. 152), and from Cyprian (*Serm.* v, "De Lapsis"). Not, however, that the, deacon had any authority or power to consecrate the elements; for the 15th Can. of the Council of Arles, A.D. 312, forbids this. And the 18th Can. of the Council of Nice orders the deacons not even to administer the Eucharist to priests because of their inferiority.

3. Deacons had power to administer the sacrament of baptism (Tertull. *De Bapt*. c. 17; also Hieron. *Dial. contr. Lucif*. c. 4, p. 139). The Council of Eliberis, Can. 77, plainly acknowledges this right, although the author of the *Apost. Constitutions*, and Epiphanius also, would seem to deny it.

4. The office of the deacon was not to preach so much as to instruct and catechize the catechumens. His part was, when the bishop or presbyter did not preach, to read a homily from one of the fathers. St. Ambrose, bishop of Milan, A.D. 380, says expressly that deacons, in his time, did not preach, though he thinks that they were all originally evangelists, as were Philip and Stephen.

5. It was the deacon's business to receive the offerings of the people, and, having presented them to the bishop or presbyter, to give expression in a *loud voice* to the names of the offerers (see Cypr. *Ep*. 10, al. 16, p. 37 (Hieron. *Com. in Ezek.* 18, p. 537).

6. Deacons were sometimes authorized, as the bishops' special delegates, to give to penitents the solemn imposition of hands, which was the sign of reconciliation (Cypr. *Ep*. 13, al. 18, *ad Eter*.).

7. Deacons had power to suspend the inferior clergy; this, however, was done only when the bishop and presbyter were absent, and the case urgent (*Constit. Apost.* 8:28).

8. The ordinary duty of deacons with regard to general Councils was to act as scribes and disputants according as they were directed by their bishops. In some instances they voted as proxies for bishops who could not attend in person; but in no instance do we find them voting in a general Council by virtue of their office. But in provincial synods the deacons were sometimes allowed to give their voice, as well as the presbyters, in their own name.

9. The *Apostolical Constitutions* (2. 57, p. 875) inform us that one of the subordinate duties ofthe deacon was to provide places in the church for persons as they entered — to rebuke any that might whisper, talk, laugh, etc. during divine service. This was a duty which, however, usually devolved upon the subdeacon.

10. But, besides the above, there were some other offices which the deacon was called upon to fill abroad. One of these was to take care of the necessitous, orphans, widows, martyrs in prison, and all the poor and sick who had any claim upon the public resources of the Church. It was also his especial duty to notice the spiritual, as well as the bodily, wants of the people; and wherever he detected evils which he could not by his own power and authority cure, it was his duty to refer them for redress to the bishop.

In general, the number of deacons varied with the wants of a particular church. Sozomen (7. 19, p. 100) informs us that the Church of Rome, after the apostolic model, never had more than seven deacons. It was not till the close of the third century that deacons were forbidden to marry. The Council of Ancyra, A.D. 344, in its 10th Can., ordains that if a deacon declared at the time of his ordination that he would marry, he should not be deprived of his function if he did marry; but that if he married without having made such a declaration, “he must fall into the rank of laics.”

The *qualifications* required in deacons by the primitive Church were the same that were required in bishops and presbyters; and the characteristics of a deacon, given by St. Paul in his Second Epistle to Timothy, were the rule by which a candidate was judged fit for such an office. The second Council of Carthage, 4th Can., forbids the ordination of a deacon before the age of twenty-five; and both the Civil and Canon Law, as may be seen in Justinian, *Novell*. 123, c. 14, fixed his age to the same period.

The Council of Laodicea, A.D. 381, forbids a deacon to sit in the presence of a presbyter, and the 11th Can. of the first Council of Carthage regulates the number of judges at ecclesiastical trials-three bishops upon a deacon, six upon a presbyter, and twelve upon a bishop. This would mark the rank of each of the parties. Originally the deacons had been the helpers of the presiding elder of a given district. When the two names of the latter title were divided and the bishop presided, whether as primus interpares, or with a more absolute authority over many elders, the deacons appear to have been dependent. directly on him and not on the presbyters, and, as

being his ministers, the ‘eyes and ears of the bishop” (*Const. Apost*. 2:44), were tempted to set themselves up against the elders. Hence the necessity of laws like those of *Conc. Nic*. c. 18; *Conc. Carth*. 4, c. 37, enjoining greater humility, and hence probably the strong language of Ignatius as to the reverence due to deacons (*Ep. ad Trall* c. 3; *ad Smyrn*. c. 8).

III. In the *Modern Church* deacons are found as a distinct order of the clergy.

In the *Roman Catholic* Church there are subdeacons as well as deacons, both in orders. The *subdeacon’s* duties are “to prepare the altar-linen, the sacred vessels, the bread and wine necessary for the holy sacrifice — to minister water to the priest or bishop at the washing of the hands at mass — to read the epistle — to assist at mass in the capacity of a witness, and see that the priest be not disturbed by any one during its celebration.” To the deacon “it belongs constantly to accompany the bishop, to attend him when preaching, to assist him and the priest also during the celebration of the holy mysteries, and at the administration of the sacraments, and to read the Gospel at the sacrifice of the mass.” . . . “To the deacon also, as the agent of the bishop, it belongs to inquire and ascertain who within his diocese lead lives of piety and edification, and who do not; who attend the holy sacrifice of the mass and the instructions of their pastors, and who do not Ñ that thus the bishop, made acquainted by him with these matters, may be enabled to admonish each offender privately, or, should he deem it more conducive to their reformation, to rebuke and correct them publicly. He also calls over the names of catechumens, and presents to the bishops those who are to be promoted to orders. In the absence of the bishop and priest, he is also authorized to expound the Gospel to the people, not, however, from an elevated place, to make it understood that this is not one of his ordinary functions” (Council of Trent, sess. 23, ch. 2). There are eighteen cardinal-deacons in Rome, who have the charge of the temporal interests and the revenues of the church. A person, to be consecrated deacon, must be twenty-three years of age (Council of Trent, sess. 23, c. 17).

In the *Church of England* and in the Episcopal communions in Scotland and North America, a deacon receives ordination by the imposition of hands of a bishop; in consequence of which he can preach, assist in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, and, generally, may perform any sacred office except consecrating the elements and pronouncing absolution. By

the statute 44 George 3, c. 43, it is enacted that no person shall be admitted until he shall have attained the age of twenty-three years complete; but this act is declared not to affect the right of granting facilities, exercised by the archbishops of Canterbury and Armagh respectively, viz. to admit at earlier ages; and by 59 George III, c. 60, sec. 1, the two archbishops of the realm, or the bishop of London, or any bishop authorized by any or either of them, may ordain as deacons any persons whom he or they shall deem duly qualified, especially for the purpose of officiating in his majesty's colonies or foreign possessions. But no person so ordained can afterwards hold any living or other benefice in the United Kingdom without the previous consent in writing, under hand and seal of the bishop in whose diocese such benefice, etc. shall be locally situated; nor without like consent of the archbishop or bishop by whose consent he was originally ordained, or of the successor of such archbishop or bishop, in case of his demise or translation; nor without producing a testimony of his good behavior during his residence abroad from the bishop in whose diocese he has officiated, or (if there be not any such bishop) from the governor in council of the colony wherein he may have resided, or from the colonial secretary of state (sec. 2). At the time when the liturgy of the Church of England was composed, it was the deacon's office, "where provision is so made, to search for the sick, poor, and impotent people of the parish, and to intimate their estates, names, and places where they dwell, unto the curate" (that is, to the rector or vicar having the cure or care of souls), "that by his exhortations they may be relieved with the alms of the parishioners or others" (Rubric in the form of Ordination). This was the more ancient office of a deacon, and this rule was made in England before the establishment of the poor-laws, in pursuance of which that care has now devolved upon the churchwardens and overseers of the poor, which last office was specially created for that purpose.

In the *Methodist Episcpopal Church* the deacons constitute an order in the ministry. They are ordained by the bishop, without the imposition of hands of the elders. According to the ordination service, "it appertaineth to the office of a deacon to assist the elder in divine service. And especially when he ministereth the holy communion, to help him in the distribution thereof, and to read and expound the Holy Scriptures; to instruct the youth, and, in the absence of the elder, to baptize. And furthermore, it is his office to search for the sick, poor, and impotent, that they may be visited and relieved."

In the *Presbyterian Church* of the United States the "Form of Government" states that "the Scriptures clearly point out deacons as distinct officers in the Church, whose business it is to take care of the poor, and to distribute among them the collections which may be raised for their use. To them also may be properly committed the management of the temporal affairs of the Church" (chap. 6). In some Presbyterian congregations, and in the Free Church, there are deacons regularly ordained to have charge of the funds of the Church. In other Presbyterian churches the office is merged in that of ruling elders.

In German Protestant churches the assistant ministers are generally called deacons. If there be two assistants, the first of them is called *archdeacon*. In the German Reformed Church in the United States, the Constitution, ch. 3, art. 2, provides as follows: "The office of the deacons is to collect the alms and other contributions which are designed for the relief of the poor, or the necessities of the congregation; to distribute the alms willingly and conscientiously; and to provide for the support of the ministry of the Gospel." See also the form of ordination in the German Reformed Church.

Among *Congregationalists*, the deacons, besides attending to the temporal concerns of the Church, assist the minister with their advice, take the lead at prayer-meetings when he is absent, etc.

Literature. — Besides the works named in the course of this article, see Neander, *Church History* (Torrey's transl.), 1:184 sq.; Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.* bk. 2, chaps 20; Siegel, *Chr.-kirchl.* Alterthiimer, 1:498 sq.; Sawyer, *Organic Christianity*, chap. 13; Dexter, *On Congregationalism*, p. 134 sq.; Hooker, *Eccles. Polity*, bk. § 78; Howell, *The Deaconship* (Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc.), Philippians 1846, 18mo; Punchard, *Congregationalism*, 1844, part 3.

Deaconess

(ἡ διάκονος; διακόνισσα, diaconissa), the title of an office of women in the early Church; an office supposed by some to have originated under the apostles, by others to be of later origin.

I. *Deaconesses in the Apostolical Church*. — The title (usually rendered *minister* or "deacon") is found in Romans 16:1, associated with a female name (Phoebe, ο υσαν διάκονον), and this has led to the conclusion that there existed in the apostolic age, as there undoubtedly did a little later

(Pliny, *Ep. ad Traj*.), an order of women bearing that title, and exercising, in relation to their own sex, functions which were analogous to those of the deacons. On this hypothesis it has been inferred that the women mentioned in Romans 16:6, 12, belonged to such an order (Herzog, *Real-Encykl.* 3, 368). The rules given as to the conduct of women in 1 Timothy 3:11; Titus 2:3, have in like manner been referred to them (Chrysostom, Theophylact, Hammond, Wiesinger, *ad* loc.). Some writers (e.g. Rothe; Schaff, *Apost. Church*, § 135) suppose that the "widows" of 1 Timothy 5:3-10, were deaconesses. Herzog, on the other hand, holds that the passages in Timothy cannot be applied to "deaconesses." Dr. W. L. Alexander, in Kitto's *Cyclopoedia* (s.v.), maintains that Romans 16:1, does not show that Phoebe held any official relation to the Church; for all that appears, she may have been simply the doorkeeper or cleaner of the place of worship. Plumptre (in Smith's *Dictionary,* s.v. says that "it seems hardly doubtful that writers have transferred to the earliest age of the Church the organization of a later. It was of course natural that the example recorded in Luke 8:2, 3, should be followed by others, even when the Lord was no longer with his disciples. The new life which pervaded the whole Christian society (Acts 2:44, 45; 4:31, 32) would lead women as well as men to devote themselves to labors of love. The strong feeling that the true θρησκεία, or service of Christians, consisted in 'visiting the fatherless and the widow,' would make this the special duty of those who were best fitted to undertake it. The social relations of the sexes in the cities of the empire (comp. Grot. on Romans 16:1) would make it fitting that the agency of women should be employed largely in the direct personal application of Christian truth (Titus 2:3, 4), possibly in the preparation of female catechumens. Even the later organization implies the previous existence of the germs from which it was developed. It may be questioned, however, whether the passages referred to imply a recognized body bearing a distinct name. The 'widows' of 1 Timothy 5:3-10, were clearly, so far as the rule of ver. 9 was acted on, women who were no longer able to discharge the active duties of life, and were therefore maintained by the Church, that they might pass their remaining days in 'prayers night and day.' The conditions of ver. 10 may, however, imply that those only who had been previously active in ministering to the brethren were entitled to such a maintenance." See also Ludlow, *Woman's Work in the Church,* ch. 1 (Lond. 1866).

II. *Deaconesses in the early Church.* — The Apostolical Constitutions distinguish "deaconesses" from "widows" and "virgins," and prescribe their

duties. A form of ordination for deaconesses is also given (bk. 8, c. 19, 20), in which the bishop prays as follows: “Eternal God, Fattier of our Lord Jesus Christ, Creator of man and of woman; thou who didst fill with thy Spirit Miriam, Deborah, Hannah, and Huldah; thou who didst vouchsafe to a woman the birth of thy only-begotten Son; thou who didst, in the tabernacle and in the Temple, place female keepers of thy holy gates-look down now also upon this thy handmaid, and bestow on her the Holy Ghost, that she may worthily perform the work committed to her, to thy honor, and the glory of Christ” (Chase, *Constitutions of the Apostles*, p. 225 (N. Y. 1848).

In the Eastern Church the notices of deaconesses in the first three centuries are few and slight, although Origen († 253) speaks of the ministry of women in the Church as both existing and necessary.

In the Western Church the notices are fuller and more clear. Pliny the younger (about A.D. 104) appears to refer to deaconesses in his letter to Trajan, in speaking of the question by torture of “two maids who were called ministers” (ex duabus ancillis quae ministra dicebantur). Tertullian (220) speaks of them often, and prescribes their qualifications (see below). In the fourth and fifth centuries all the leading Eastern fathers refer to deaconesses; e.g. Basil († 379), Gregory of Nyssa († 396), Chrysostom († 407), Theodoret († 457), Sozomen (cir. 439). Theodoret (*Eccl. Hist.* 3, 14, p. 652) calls Publia, who lived at the time of Julian, ἡ Διάκονος — *deaconess*. Sozomen (4. 14, 59) speaks of a certain deaconess who had been excluded Church fellowship because of having broken her vows.

It was a rule that the deaconesses must be widows. Tertullian (*ad Uxorem*, 1:7; *de Virgin. veland*. c. 9) says, “The discipline of the Church and apostolic usage forbid that any widow be elected unless she have married but one husband.” Virgins, it is true, were sometimes admitted, but this was the exception. The widows must have borne children. This rule arose from the belief that no person but a mother can possess those sympathizing affections which ought to animate the deaconess in her duties. The early Church was very strict in enforcing the rule which prohibits the election of any to be deaconesses who had been twice married, though lawfully and successively, to two husbands, one after the other. Tertullian says, “The apostle requires them to be (*universae*) the wives of one man” (*ad Uxorem*, 4:7). Others, however, give the words of the apostle another meaning. They suppose him to exclude those widows who, having

divorced themselves from their former husbands, had married again (see Suicer, *Thesaurus*, 1:864, 867). It is disputed whether they were ordained by the imposition of hands, but the Apostolical Constitutions (8. 19) declare that such was the case, and the 15th canon of Chalcedon (sess. 15) forbids the ordination of a deaconess under forty. Still they were not consecrated to any ministerial function; so Tertullian, *De Praescript*, 41, "Let no woman speak in the Church, nor teach, nor baptize, nor offer" (that is, administer the Eucharist), "nor arrogate to herself any manly function, lest two should claim the lot of the priestly office." Their duties were to take care of the sick and poor, and to minister to martyrs and confessors in prison, to whom they could more easily gain access than the deacons; to instruct catechumens, and to assist at the baptism of women; to exercise a general oversight over the female members of the Church, and this not only in public, but in private, making occasional reports to the bishops and presbyters. How long this office continued is uncertain. It was not, however, discontinued everywhere at once. It was first abrogated in France by the Council of Orange, A.D. 441. It continued in the Roman Church for some time after this, and gradually disappeared; but in the Greek Church it did not become extinct till the twelfth century.

III. *In the modern Church.* — It must ever be regarded as a misfortune in the Reformation that this early office was not restored. "Is it not remarkable that the office, which is so well adapted to the matronly character of the female sex, should be wholly excluded from our list of assistants in the Church?" (Robinson's *Calmet*, p. 336.) Its restoration was, however; seriously thought of, and even attempted, in the Reformed Church at an early period of the Reformation, namely, when the Netherland "churches under the Cross" were founded through the synod at Wesel and Emden, 1568 and 1571. Its restoration in the Reformed Church was urged on the synod the more as it already actually existed at the time among the Bohemian Brethren and the strict Anabaptists, at least in the large congregations. The subject came before the synod from the congregation at Wesel through the Classis of Wesel. That congregation had decided to restore it Ñ had, in fact, restored it in its bosom, and now asked the indicatores for approval. The Classis of Wesel, before which the matter first came, decided that the restoration of the office as inaugurated in the congregation at Wesel shall stand till the final decision is had, but deferred final action until their next meeting. In 1580 the same classis decided that "if this office, which had fallen into disuse and decay in the Church of God,

is again to be restored, then it shall be established in the same form, and with the same character belonging to it, as described by the apostle Paul, namely, widows, and not married women, shall be chosen for that purpose." Classis favored the restoration of the office, and referred the matter to the next provincial synod, that by its authority it might also be restored in other localities. Accordingly, by the proper course, it came before the General Synod at Middleburg in 1581, which synod unfortunately decided against it "on account of various inconveniences which might arise out of it; but in times of pestilence, and other sicknesses, when any service is required among sick women which would be indelicate to deacons, they ought to attend to this through their wives, or others, whose services it may be proper to engage" (Max Gobel, *Geschichte des christ. Lebens in der rhein-westphälischen Ev. Kirche*, 1:413, 414). Here this interesting movement seems to have ended, as there is no further historical trace of it.

The Puritans in England in the sixteenth century recognized deaconesses, as appears by the following extract from the "Conclusions" drawn up by Cartwright and Travers, and given by Neal, *History of the Puritans*, vol. 1, ch. 6: "Touching deacons of both sorts, viz. men and women, the Church shall be admonished what is required by the apostle, and that thev are not to choose men of custom or course for their riches, but for their faith, zeal, and integrity; and that the Church is to pray in the mean time to be so directed that they may choose them that are meet. Let the names of those that are thus chosen be published by the next Lord's day, and after that their duties to the Church, and the Church's duty towards them; then let them be received into their office with the general prayers of the whole Church."

"The advantages resulting to a Christian community from such an order are too obvious to require Exposition. It has been a serious misfortune to the Church at large that the office has been allowed to fall into disuse; and the wide-spread institution at the present day in the churches of Great Britain and America of ladies' district-visiting societies, Dorcas societies, etc. satisfactorily shows the necessity of practically supplying, to some extent at least, the want of this primitive office. There is a movement going on at present for the introduction of the order of deaconesses into the Church of England" (Chambers, *Encyclopedia,* s.v.). Its prospects of success would be greater but for the monastic tendencies of the so-called "sisterhoods" organized by the Puseyites, e.g. Miss Sellon's. This subject has been lately

revived in the German Reformed Church in America. On Christmas, 1866, Hon. J. Dixon Roman, of Hagerstown, Md., gave to the congregation of that city $5000, and with it sent a proposition to the Consistory that, according to his wish, "three ladies of the congregation shall be chosen and ordained to the order of deaconesses in this congregation, with absolute control of the income of said fund, for the purses and duties as practiced in the early days of the Church." This, and the action of Lebanon Classis, which in 1867 requests the synod "to take into consideration the propriety of restoring the apostolic office of deaconesses," will bring this plain question before the highest judicatory of the Church.

In the Roman Catholic Church there are various sisterhoods answering in some degree to the ancient order of deaconesses, but without ordination; such as the Beguines, the Gray Sisters, the Sisters of Charity, Sisters of Mercy, etc. (see Ludlow, *Woman's Work in the Church*, ch. 3).

The first modern reorganization of the work of deaconesses on a large scale was begun in 1835 by pastor Fliedner, of Kaiserswerth, Prussia. An infirmary was established, to be served by Christian women, unmarried or widows. He required of all who would become deaconesses that they should be "'willing' to 'be servants of Christ alone, to devote their time and faculties entirely and exclusively to him, and not to look fore ward for pecuniary emoluments or honors of the World, nor yet to merit salvation by their works, but to do the work of charity and self-denial out of gratitude to him who hath redeemed their souls, and merited their salvation. After their probationary period they engage themselves to serve at least five years. But even during this time they are allowed to leave if nearer personal or family duties should make them wish for a change of situation." Many women obeyed the call, the infirmary grew rapidly into importance, and auxiliary societies were formed throughout Prussia. The institution spread into other parts of Europe, and there are now orphan-houses and hospitals under its charge at Berlin, Dresden, Frankfort, Worms, Cologne, Elberfeld, London, and other places. The mother institution has (1) a seminary to train young females as teachers for infant and other schools; (2) an orphan asylum; (3) a training-school of nurses, and for visitors to prisons, etc. The whole expense is borne by voluntary subscriptions. A branch was established at Pittsburg, Pa., in 1849 by pastor Fliedner in person. Mrs. Fry, after a visit to Kaiselswertb, established in Bishopsgate, London, an "Institution for Nursing Sisters," which still exists. A deaconesses' institute was organized at Paris in 1851, and others

followed in France and Switzerland (see Ludlow's article in the *Edinburgh Review*, 1848, p. 223). In 1888 the Genesis Conference of the M. E. Church created the order of Deaconesses, who now have "homes" in the larger cities of the U. S. See Howson, *Deaconesses, or the Official Help of Women in Parochial Work* (Lond. 1862); Ludlow, *Woman's Work in the Church*; Jane M. Bancroft, *Deaconesses in Europe and America* (N. Y. 1889); also Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.*bk. 2, ch. 22; Siegel, *Handbuch der christ. Alterthumer*, 1:491 sq.; Augusti, *Handb. der christl. Archaeologie*, vols. 2 and 3; Ferraris, *Prompta Bibliotheca*, 3, 172; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. 25; Neander, *Ch. Hist*, 1:155; 2:158 (Torry's *transl.*); Schaff, *Apostolic History*, § 135; ibid., *History of the Christian Church*, ii, § 52; *Mercersburg Review*, 14:190; *Am. Quart. Ch. Review*, July, 1862, art. 3.

Dead

(properly some form of tWm, θνήσκω). See BURIAL. When a Hebrew died in any house or tent, all the persons and furniture in it contracted a pollution which continued seven days (Numbers 19:14-16). All who touched the body of one who died, or was killed in the open fields; all who touched men's bones, or a grave, were unclean seven days. To cleanse this pollution, they took the ashes of the red heifer, sacrificed by the high-priest on the day of solemn explanation (Numbers 19:1-22); on these they poured water in a vessel, and a person who was clean dipped a bunch of hyssop in the water, and sprinkled with it the furniture, the chamber, and the persons, on the third day and on the seventh day. It was required that the polluted person should previously bathe his whole body, and wash his clothes, after which he was clean. Since the' destruction of the Temple, the Jews have ceased generally to consider themselves as polluted by a dead body. *SEE CORPSE*. On the play upon the two senses of the word in its literal and spiritual application in Matthew 5:22, see the *Dissertatio of Schicht* (Altd. 1770). *SEE DEATH*.

The word rendered "dead" in Job 26:5; Psalm 88:10; Proverbs 2:18; 9:18; 21:16; Isaiah 14:9; 26:14, 19, is µyaPer] rephaim; derived from apr; having, according to Gesenius, the sense of silent, but, according to Fürst, meaning dark; in either case denoting the shades, manes, or disembodied spirits of the under world. *SEE SHEOL*.

Dead, Baptism For.

SEE BAPTISM FOR THE DEAD.

Dead, Baptism Of The.

SEE BAPTISM.

Dead, Burial Of The.

SEE BURIAL; *SEE FUNERAL*.

Dead, Prayers For The,

a custom that arose in the Church at an early period. Tertullian (220) remarks (*De Corona Milit*. c. in) that it is the practice for a widow to pray for the soul of her deceased husband. He also speaks (*De Monogam*. c. x) of "oblations" made for the dead on the anniversary of their martyrdom. Origen († 254) speaks of Christians "making mention of saints in their prayers" (lib. 9, in Romans 12). Arnobius (cir. 300) says that Christians pray for pardon and peace on behalf of the living and the dead (*adv. Gentes*, 4). Cyril of Jerusalem even declares it to be a considerable advantage for the souls of the dead to be prayed for (*Cat. Mystag*. v. 6). The same custom is found in many of the ancient liturgies. Chrysostom († 407) says of the wicked dead, "they are to be succored with prayers, supplications, alms, and oblations." While this was the common practice, it had no reference to the notion of a purgatory. Many of the fathers regarded such prayers as little more than a thanksgiving, a commendation of souls of the deceased to the mercy of God, and a commemoration of their spiritual excellencies. Still there is no doubt that not a few of the fathers believed that the souls of departed believers were not taken at once to heaven, but were in some separate place — Hades or Paradise — out of which the fervent prayers of survivors might help to remove them. So that the idea of purgatory sprang out of such views in no long space of time. Nevertheless, it is not true, as Romanists assert, that prayers for the dead necessarily imply a belief in purgatory. Almost all the English writers on purgatory refute this; e.g. Burnet, *On 39 Articles* art. 22; Stillingfleet, *Defence of Laud*, p. 643; Jeremy Taylor, *Dissuasive from Popery*; Collier, *Eccles. Hist. of Great Britain*, v. 288 sq.

In the Church of England burial service of 1549, under Edward VI, one prayer was, "We commend into thy hands of mercy, most merciful Father,

the soul of this our brother departed . . . that when the judgment shall come, which thou hast committed to thy well-beloved Son, both this our brother and we may be found acceptable in thy sight, and receive thy blessing." "Almighty God, we give thee hearty thanks for this thy servant, whom thou hast delivered from the miseries of this wicked world, from the body of death and all temptation; and, as we trust, hast brought his soul, which he committed into thy holy hands, into sure consolation and rest: Grant, we beseech thee, that at the day of judgment his soul and all the souls of thy elect, departed cut of this life, may with us, and we with them, fully receive thy promises, and be made perfect altogether, through the glorious resurrection of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord." And the next prayer was, "O Lord, with whom do live the spirits of them that be dead, and in whom the souls of them that be elected, after they be delivered from the burden of the flesh, be in joy and felicity, grant unto this thy servant that the sins which he committed in this world be not imputed unto him, but that he, escaping the gates of hell, and pains of eternal darkness, may ever dwell in the region of light, with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the place where there is no weeping, sorrow, nor heaviness; and when that dreadful day of the general resurrection shall come, make him to rise also with the just and righteous, and receive this body again to glory, then made pure and incorruptible." The prayer was ultimately changed into the thanksgiving form in which it now appears in the Prayer-book: "After the offertory in the Eucharist is said, and the oblations of bread and wine, with the alms for the poor, are placed Upon the table, the minister addresses this exhortation to the people: 'Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth.' The latter part of this sentence is wanting in Edward's first book. The words 'militant here in earth,' which were designed expressly to exclude prayer for the dead, were inserted in the second book, in which that part of this prayer, which contained intercession for the dead; was expunged. It was the intention of the divines who made this alteration to denote that prayers are not to be offered up for the dead, whose spiritual welfare is already accomplished; but for those only who are yet 'fighting the good fight of faith,' and are consequently in a capacity of needing our prayers" (Shepherd, cited by Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s.v.). Protestants reject prayers for the dead as having no ground either in Scripture or reason. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccles.*bk. 15, ch. 3, § 15; Riddle, *Christian Antiquities*, p. 277 sq.; Coleman, *Ancient Christianity*, ch. 25; Browne, *On 39 Articles*, art. 22; Palmer, *Orig.*

Liturgicoe, ch. 4, § 10; *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1866, 2:396. *SEE SYNAGOGUE*.

Dead Sea

Picture for Dead Sea

(*mare mortuum*, Justin, 36:3, 6; θάλασσα ἡ νεκρά, Pausan. v. 7, 3; Galen. *Simpl. Med*. 4:20), a name applied since the second century to the *Asphaltic Lake* (ηἈσφαλτῖτις λίμνη, as Josephus, iodorus Siculus, and Ptolemy, v. 16, 3, call it; or simply ηἈσφαλτῖτις, *War*, 4:8, 2; more distinctly λίμνη ἀσφαλτοφόρος, *Ant.* 17:6, 5; Pliny's *Asphaltites lacus*, or simply *Asphaltites*), from its supposed noxious properties. In the Bible it is called *the* SALT SEA (jlMhimy; Genesis 14:3; Numbers 34:12, etc.), the Sea of the Plain, or *Arabah* (hbr;[h;µy; Deuteronomy 3:17; 4:49, etc.), or the Front (Eastern) Sea (ymædeQhimYhi; Ezekiel 47:18; comp. ver. 8; Joel 2:20; Zechariah 14:8). By the Arabs it is termed *Bahr Lut*, "the Sea of Lot" (Abulfeda, *Tab. Syr*. p. 156). It is the remarkable lake or internal sea formed by the filling up of the old basin of the Vale of Siddim (Genesis 14:3), on the south-east border of Palestine (Numbers 34:3, 12; Deuteronomy 3:17; comp. Joshua 12:3), especially in the same quarter of the tribe of Judah (Joshua 15:2, 5) into which the Jordan empties (in, 16), 300 stadia from Jerusalem (Joseph. *Ant.* 15:6, 2). Josephus (*War*, 4:8, 4) gives its length as 580 stadia, or about 38 miles; its breadth as 150 stadia, or about 15 miles; and its circumference as 6 days' journey (see Setzeen in Zach's *Monatl. Corresp*. 18:440; the estimates of Pliny, v. 15, and Diod. Sic. 19:98, are erroneous). It is long and necked or sickle-form at the southern end, with a peninsula at the eastern side. *SEE BAY*. The east and west shores are steep with naked limestone, *SEE ENGEDI*, but the southern shore ends in a marsh. On the south-west is a range of salt hills, and on the southeast a considerable plain. *SEE SALT, VALLEY OF*. The water, which lies far below the level of the Mediterranean, is clear, but uncommonly salt and bitter, and of great density (Joseph. *War*, 4:8, 4; Jul. Afric. in Canisii *Lection. Antiq.* 2:1; Pliny, v. 15). It contains no living creature, neither fish, shells, nor seaplants, and when fishes from the Jordan get into it they die and float upon the surface (Diod. Sic. 2:48; 19:98; Jerome *on Ezekiel* 47:9; Cotovic. *Itin*. p. 312). The shore is covered with a dark offensive mud, upon which a strong saline incrustation forms, and is occasionally interspersed with lumps of bitumen, broken off from the cliffs

or disgorged from the bottom (Burckhardt, 2:664). A pretty thick fog has been observed, especially in the morning, by travelers (Shaw, p. 297; Volney, 1:240), as enveloping the lake (comp. Wild. 10:7; Philo, *Opp.* 21:143); but, situated as it is in a deep caldron-like spot, the air is usually excessively sultry, and so filled with saline effluvia as to banish vegetation (Philo, *Opp.* 2:21); and although it is not so detrimental to animal life (Tacit. *Hist*. v. 6) as has sometimes been represented (Maundrell, p. 116), a solemn stillness reigns around, unbroken by wind, wave, or animated cry.' The marks of volcanic agency are strewn about (Felsecker, Palst. 2:353), which, with the warm springs on the shore, *SEE CALLIRRHOE*, the asphaltic vapors and floating substances (Strabo 16:764), give evidence of the plutonic catastrophe (comp. Genesis 14:10) which covered the guilty cities of this plain (Genesis 19); and it is popularly believed that these ruins may still be discerned beneath its waters (Joseph. *War,* 4:8, 4), though now sunk below their former level (Reland, *Paloest.* p. 254 sq.). *SEE SIDDIM*. It was anciently believed that the immense volume of water poured in by the Jordan found an outlet by subterranean canals into the Mediterranean (Diod. Sic. 19:98); but it is now ascertained that this is impossible, and that evaporation is sufficient to account for the maintenance of the usual height in the lake (Bachiene, I, 1:121). See generally Fabri, *Evagat*. 2:155 sq.; Oedmann, *Samml*. 3, 125; Hamelsveld, 1:447; Busching, *Erdbeschr*. V, 1:322 sq.; Waihner, *De Mari Asphalt*. (Helmst. 1712); Michaelis in his *Comment.* 1758-62 oblat. (Brem. 1774), p. 61 sq.; Mannert, *Geogr.* VI, 1:332; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 16:331 sq.; Schwarz, *Palest.* p. 41; Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:449; Kelly's Syria, p. 393; J. Kempe, *De indole Maris Mortui* (Holm. 1751). *SEE SEA*.

Deaf

(v r ḗ ę, *cheresh'*; κωφός, both, especially the latter, implying dumbness also). Moses extended the protection of a special statute to the deaf mute: "Thou shalt not curse the deaf" (Leviticus 19:14). This enactment not only absolutely prohibited the reviling of these unfortunates, but might also be understood figuratively, as if Moses recommended that kindness and instruction should be shown to them (Isaiah 29:18, 35; Matthew 11:5; Mark 7:32). *SEE DUMB*.

Deal

a word often employed by our translators in the sense of part, with fractional numbers (“tenth deal,” Exodus 29:40, etc.; like “a great deal”), but having no special equivalent in the original. *SEE NUMBER*.

Dealtry William, D.D., F.R.S.,

was born in Yorkshire in 1775, educated in Catharine Hall and Trinity College, Cambridge, where he was second wrangler in 1796 and fellow in 1798. He afterwards became professor of mathematics in the East India College, rector of Clapham in 1813, chancellor and prebendary of Winchester in 1830, and finally archdeacon of Surrey in 1845. He died in 1848. His principal publications are, *A Discourse on the Duty and Policy of propagating Christianity* (Lond. 1813, 8vo); *Sermons* (Lond. 1828, 8vo); *Obligations of the national Church* (Lond. 1838, 8vo); *The Foundation of the Faith* (Lond. 1846, 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclop. Bibliographica*, 1:882.

Dean

(*decanus*, from δέκα, ten), an ecclesiastical title which has had several applications.

(1.) The oldest use of it was to designate an officer in the ancient monasteries, in which every ten monks were subject to one called the decanus, or dean, from his presiding over ten; and every hundred had another officer called centenarius, from his presiding over one hundred. The business of the dean was to exact every man’s daily task, and to bring it to the oeconomus, or steward of the house, who himself gave a monthly account to the father of all. The word dean is occasionally used in early writers for archpresbyter.

(2.) In the Church of England there are two sorts of deans: 1st, the dean of a cathedral, who is an ecclesiastical magistrate, next in degree to the bishop. He is chief of the chapter, and is called a dean (decanus) because he formerly presided over ten prebendaries or canons. He is by law a sole corporation — that is, he represents a whole succession, and is capable of taking an estate as dean and conveying it to his successors. 2d, rural deans, whose office is of ancient date in the Church of England, long prior to the Reformation, and which many of the bishops are now reviving. Their chief

duty is to visit a certain number of parishes, and to report their condition to the bishop. There are two means of creating deans, because there are two foundations of cathedral churches in England, the old and the new. Those of the old foundation are appointed to their dignity much like bishops, the king first issuing his *congi d'elire* to the chapter, the chapter then choosing, and the bishop confirming and giving his mandate to install them.

(3.) The word dean is also applied in England to the chief officers of certain peculiar churches or chapels, as the dean of the king's chapel, the dean of the arches, the dean of St. George's Chapel at Windsor, and the dean of Bocking, in Essex.

(4.) The dean and chapter constitute the governing body of a cathedral. A chapter consists of the dean, with a certain number of canons or prebendaries, heads of the church *capita ecclesiae*. They are the council of the bishop, to assist him with their advice in affairs of religion as well as in the temporal concerns of his see. When the rest of the clergy were settled in the several parishes of each diocese, these were reserved for the celebration of divine service in the bishop's own cathedral; and the chief of them, who presided over the rest, obtained the name of decanus, or dean, being prob. ably at first appointed to superintend ten canons or prebendaries. The dean and chapter are the nominal electors of a bishop.

(5.) The dean of a college faculty is its presiding officer. — Siegel, *Handbuch d. christl. Alterthümer*, 1:485; Hook, *Church Dictionary*, s.v. *SEE CHAPTER*.

Dean Of The Cardinals.

SEE CARDINALS.

Dean Of The Chapel Royal

(Scotland), an office held by three clergymen of the Established Church, to which they are appointed by the crown. The duties are nominal, being limited to an occasional sermon before her majesty when in Scotland, and attendance at the election of the representative peers. Recent appointments, however, have been conferred in connection with chairs in the University of Edinburgh which are not otherwise endowed. The title of dean is somewhat out of place in the Church of Scotland, where the rule of Presbyterian parity is established. It is a remnant of Episcopacy, which the Church courts have never had occasion to challenge, as the deans do not

sit or act in that capacity, and have scarcely any ecclesiastical duties to perform.

Dearth

(usually bf;r; *hunger*; λιμός, *famine*; as both are elsewhere rendered; but in Jeremiah 14:1, rx;Bi *batstso'reth*, restraint, sc. of rain, *drought*, as in Jeremiah 17:8), a *scarcity* of provisions. Although Palestine is a very fruitful land, yet a famine naturally followed a lack of crops, especially when the rain failed (1 Kings 17; Josephus, *Ant.* 15:9, 1), or the country was visited, among the not infrequent land-plagues (2 Samuel 24:13; Psalm 33:19; Ezekiel 36:29; Jeremiah 14:13, 15), with swarms of locusts (q.v.); and we read of dearths in the historical narratives not only in the patriarchal period (Genesis 12:10; 47:4, 13), and the era of the judges (Ruth 1:1), when the soil was not regularly farmed, but also in the time of the kings (2 Samuel 21:1; 1 Kings 18:2; 2 Kings 4:38; Jeremiah 14:1), and, indeed, the destitution sometimes continued more than one year together (2 Samuel 21:1). In such cases the inhabitants availed themselves of supplies from the neighboring Egypt (Genesis 12:10; 42:1 sq.; 43:1 sq.; Josephus, *Ant.* 15:9, 2; 20:2, 6; 5, 2), although this region likewise suffered in like manner whenever the Nile failed to reach its usual overflow (Genesis 41, 43). Under the Roman rule an extensive famine prevailed (Acts 11:12) in the time of the emperor Claudius (q.v.), which occurred during several years in different provinces of the empire, and reached Palestine at the end of the fourth year of his reign (Joseph. *Ant.* 20:2, 6; comp. 3, 15, 3). *SEE AGABUS*. Josephus mentions an earlier famine (*Ant.* 15:9, 1), that took place in the thirteenth year of Herod the Great, which resulted from drought, and was followed by pestilence. *SEE FAMINE*.

Death

(properly, tw;m; θάνατος). No logical definition of death has been generally agreed upon. This point was much contested in the 17th century by the Cartesian and other theologians and philosophers. Since death can be regarded in various points of view, the descriptions of it must necessarily vary. If we consider the state of a dead man as it strikes the senses, death is the cessation of natural life. If we consider the cause of death, we may place it in that permanent and entire cessation of the feeling and motion of the body which results from the destruction of the body. Among theologians, death is commonly said to consist in the separation of

soul and body, implying that the soul still exists when the body perishes. Among the ecclesiastical fathers, Tertullian (*De Anima*, c. 27) calls it "the disunion of the body and soul." Cicero (*Tusc. Dis*. i) defines death to be "the departure of the mind from the body." The passage Hebrews 4:12, is sometimes cited on this subject, but has nothing to do with it. Death does not consist in this separation, but this separation is the consequence of death. As soon as the body loses feeling and motion, it is henceforth useless to the soul, which is therefore separated from it. *SEE DEAD*.

Scriptural representations, names, and modes of speech respecting death. —

(1.) One of the most common in the O.T. is to return to the dust, or to the earth. Hence the phrase *the dust of death*. It is founded on the description in Genesis 2:7, and 3:19, and denotes the dissolution and destruction of the body. Hence the sentiment in Ecclesiastes 12:7, "The dust shall return to the earth as it was, the spirit unto God, who gave it."

(2.) A withdrawing, exhalation, or removal of the breath of life (Psalm 104:29). Hence the common terms to "give up the ghost," etc.

(3.) A removal from the body, a being absent from the body, a departure from it, etc. This description is founded on the comparison of the body to a tent or lodgment in which the soul dwells during this life. Death destroys this tent or house, and commands us to travel on (Job 4:21; Isaiah 38:12; Psalm 53:7). Hence Paul says (2 Corinthians 5:1), "our earthly house of this tabernacle" will be destroyed; and Peter calls death a "putting off of this tabernacle" (2 Peter 1:13, 14). Classical writers speak of the soul in the same manner. So Hippocrates and AEschines. Compare 2 Corinthians 5:8, 9.

(4.) Paul likewise uses the term ἐκδύεσθαι, *to unclothe one's self*, in reference to death (2 Corinthians 5:3, 4), because the body is represented as the garment of the soul, as Plato calls it. The soul, therefore, as long as it is in the body, is clothed, and as soon as it is disembodied is naked.

(5.) The terms which denote sleep are applied frequently in the Bible, as everywhere else, to death (Psalm 76:5; Jeremiah 51:39; John 11:13 sq.). Nor is this language used exclusively for the death of the pious, as some pretend, though this is its prevailing use. Homer calls sleep and death twin

brothers (*Il*. 16:672). The terms likewise which signify to lie down, to rest, also denote death.

(6.) Death is frequently compared with and named from a departure, a going away. Hence verbs of that import signify to die (Job 10:21; Psalm 39:4). The case is the same in the New Testament (Matthew 26:24), and even among the classics. In this connection we may mention the terms ἀναλύειν and ἀνάλυσις (Philippians 1:23; 2 Timothy 4:6), which do not mean *dissolution*, but *discessus* (comp. Luke 12:36).

Death, when personified, is described as a ruler and tyrant, having vast power and a great kingdom, over which he reigns (Job 18:14). But the ancients also represented it under some figures which are not common among us. We represent it as a man with a scythe, or as a skeleton, etc.; but the Jews, before the exile, frequently represented death as a hunter, who lays snares for men (Psalm 18:5, 6; 91:3). After the exile they represented him as a man, or sometimes as an angel (the angel of Death), with a cup of poison, which he reaches to men. *SEE DESTROYER*. From this representation appears to have arisen the phrase, which occurs in the New Testament, to taste death (Matthew 16:28; Hebrews 2:9), which, however, in common speech, signifies merely to die, without reminding one of the origin of the phrase. The case is the same with the phrase to see death (Psalm 89:48; Luke 2:26). See Knapp's *Christian Theology*, by Dr. Wood; Waltirer, *De origine phrasium I videre et gustare mortem*" (Giess. 1745).

The "gates of death" (Job 38:17; Psalm 9:13; 107:18) signify the grave itself; and the "shadow of death" (Jeremiah 2:6) denotes the gloomy silence of the tomb. See Wemyss's *Clavis Symbolica*, s.v.; Zeibich, *De vocibus*, twm;l]xi, σκία θανάτου (Vitemb. 1739).

Death may be considered as the effect of sin (Romans 5:12). In Hebrews 2:14, Satan is said to have the power of death; not that he can, at his pleasure, inflict death on mankind, but as he was the instrument of first bringing death into the world (John 8:44), and as he may be the executioner of God's wrath on impenitent sinners where God permits him. Death is but once (Hebrews 9:27), yet certain (Job 14:1, 2), although uncertain as to the time (Proverbs 27:1); universal (Genesis 3:19); necessary, in order that God's justice may be displayed and his mercy manifested; desirable to the righteous (Luke 2:28-30). The fear of death is

a source of anxiety and alarm to many, and to a guilty conscience it may indeed be terrible; but to a good man it should be obviated by the consideration that death is the termination of every trouble; that it puts him beyond the reach of sin and temptation; that God has promised to be with the righteous, even to the end (Hebrews 13:5); that Jesus Christ has taken away the sting (1 Corinthians 15:55, 56); and that it introduces him to a state of endless felicity (2 Corinthians 5:8).

Death, when applied to the animal nature, properly signifies a dissolution or failure of all its powers and functions; so, when applied to the spiritual nature, or souls of men, it denotes a corresponding disorder therein, a being spiritually dead in trespasses and sins (Romans 8:6; Ephesians 2:1, 3; Colossians 2:13; Jude 1:12).

The term death is metaphorically applied to denote an utter failure of customary functions, so that the thing spoken of can no longer act according to its nature. Thus, in Amos 2:2, “Moab shall die with tumult” — that is, the king and government shall lose their power, and the nation be brought into subjection and slavery. So in Romans 7:8, “Without the law, sin was dead” — that is, without the law, sin does not exert its power; and, on the other hand, it is said (ver. 9), “Sin revived and I died” — “Sin got strength to act, and I lost my power to resist. I was not the same man as before; sin destroyed my power.”

The “second death” (Revelation 2:11) is so called in respect to the natural or temporal as coming after it, and implies everlasting punishment (Revelation 21:8).

Death, Theological Aspects Of.

On this topic we present some views different from those usually entertained, but which modern science appears to justify and even to demand.

“Death may be defined as the termination of life. Beyond question, it had been possible for God, if such had been his pleasure, to have made all creatures under a law of life. Scripture assures us that man at least was at first placed conditionally under this law. There is, however, decisive evidence that, from the beginning, all other terrestrial life was constituted under the law of death. The reproductive and assimilating organs and powers common to all living creatures, and the destructive organs,

instincts, and habits of birds and beasts of prey, unmistakably contemplate, as they provide for, a system or constitution of things in which death should reign. It was long and generally held, indeed, that this law in the natural economy supervened upon the introduction of sin. But this idea, which Scripture does nowhere assert or sanction, is hard to be reconciled with the conclusion which physiology and anatomy have deduced from powers and organs of the animal frame, with the same certainty that any final cause is inferred from any of the works of God. And it must be regarded as conclusively refuted by the discoveries of geology, which demonstrate the prevalence of death in ages long anterior to the creation of man, or, so far as is known, to the existence of sin. The earth's strata are now found to be full of the buried remains of extinct life; and it is made evident by the state in which many of these fossils are found, that then, as now, life was sustained by death. Nor can it well be doubted that this state of things obtained even in the days of man's primeval innocence. If we try, we shall find ourselves baffled in the attempt to conceive how even then death could be strange or unknown. Must not the revolving year have been marked by the opening and the fall of the earth's foliage, the ripening consumption and decay of earth's fruits? Could our first parents drink of the rivers of paradise, or tread its verdant surface, or keep and dress its trees and plants, without in every draught, at every step, by every stroke quenching or cutting down myriads of animalcular or insect as well as vegetable life? Although the flesh of animals was not yet given to man for food, is it supposable that the laws of animal life itself were all the while in abeyance Ñ its instincts restrained, its powers unused, its appropriate pleasure withheld or denied? We know that from the day of man's creation he had given to him the idea of death. It was set before him as the just desert and consequence of disobedience. And whence should he have derived his conception of the import of the threatened evil so readily as from death's visible domain over the fowls of the heaven and the beasts of the field?

"With regard to creatures of mere instinct or animal nature, there can be nothing judicial or of the nature of punishment in their ordination to death. It is beyond question that for man's sake a curse had 'been brought upon the ground,' and the 'whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.' Still man himself is by this means the greatest sufferer; and so far as it affects the other creatures, it can be only a physical evil, equally without moral cause or penal effect, of which, by their nature, they

are unsusceptible. How this appointment is to be reconciled with the benevolence of the Creator is a hard question, which no light yet given to man enables him fully to resolve. So far, however, it may relieve the mystery that, as a general rule, the enjoyments of the inferior creatures greatly exceed their sufferings that death is but little, if at all, the object of their fear, or much even a cause of pain. That the sum of animal enjoyment quenched in death is amply compensated by the law of increase and succession, which both perpetuates life and preserves it in the vigor of its powers and the freshness of its joys, is certain;' also (as bearing on the physical and moral condition of man, to whose behalf, as chief in this lower world, all arrangements and disposals affecting the lower forms of life were subordinated), that their subjection to death has enlarged immensely the extent of man's physical resources, and multiplied manifold the means of his moral development and discipline.

"But man himself is involved in the common doom. It is appointed unto all men once to die. The reigning fact, man's death, seems to force upon us the conclusion that death is a physical necessity, or a universal law extending to all material organizations, however otherwise psychologically distinguished or divinely allied. And this opinion has generally obtained among men of pantheistic and materialistic views in philosophy, and of Pelagian and Socinian views in theology. But surely it is impossible, consistently with God's omnipotency, to allege the necessity or the power of this law, as existing in despite of his pleasure and purpose, to constitute our nature under a law of life. It is more than probable that the other orders of creatures who dwell in life immortal in the, heavenly places are not all spirit, or without their own mode and form of organized existence. We are assured that the bodies of the risen saints are clothed with incorruption and immortality. We know that, even as now constituted, the life of these frail bodies in antediluvian age was prolonged to the verge of a millennium. And why should it be thought impossible for God, if so it had pleased him, to endue them with the powers, or provide for them the means of repairing the wear and waste of life, so as to preserve their powers and sensibilities in unabated vigor and freshness, 'even to length of days forever and ever?' This, Scripture informs us, was in the beginning provisionally ordained. The threatening of death as the penalty of a breach of the covenant is rightly understood to imply the promise of deathless and incorruptible life so long as the covenant should stand. And the tree of life in the midst of the garden, if not by its physical virtue the means of perpetual renovation,

was certainly the sacramental pledge of God's purpose to preserve life inviolate while man was steadfast to the covenant. Thus runs the tenor of the covenant, or the constitution under which man's life was originally given and held 'Thou shalt not eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil, for in the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.' And, in terms equally explicit to the transgression of the law is the entrance and reign of death over man ascribed: 'By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.' Let it be observed that this declares the cause of death as it reigns over all men only. It affirms nothing respecting the cause of death as it reigns over other orders of creatures in the present or in preceding stages of the world's existence. Whether, in any way, they may have been constituted under a law of death by anticipation, and as in keeping with a state of things in which death should reign over man, we do not venture to pronounce. That indirectly, as a consequence of their relation to man as a sinner against God, their sufferings have been increased and their lives shortened, it is impossible to doubt or deny. But if, in this view, sin be the occasion of their death, it cannot be the cause of it. They are incapable of sin, and cannot die judicially for sin. The contrary opinion, which long and generally prevailed, that the creatures were immortal until man sinned, has as little to justify it in Scripture as in science. Death, it is there said, is the law of their being; and the true doctrine of the Scripture is not that they die because man has sinned, but that man, because he has sinned, has forfeited his original and high distinction, and has become like 'the beasts that perish.' It is unnecessary here to multiply Scripture proofs of this awful and humbling truth. Every one is familiar with the frequent and equivalent testimonies that death is 'the fruit,' 'the wages,' the 'end' and consummation of sin; and the circumstances which attend and induce it impressively connect it with sin as its cause. How, if not through guilty forfeiture, should the life of man have been abbreviated in its term so much more than that of many of the inferior creatures, and in so many instances still further shortened by disease and by calamity? To how great extent is it consumed by the fire of evil passion, smitten by the stroke of vengeful violence, taken away by the arm of judicial authority? in all these cases sin visibly working death. And while embittered and burdened by manifold pain and sorrows, how irresistibly does conscience within disquiet and alarm us by the conviction of guilt and the terror of righteous judgment?

“But now what is death, or what does it import as an appointed doom? To answer this question rightly, we require to ascertain the true constitution of our nature. Obviously death must be very different in the view of the materialist, who regards man as only a higher species of animal, whose mental and moral distinctions are the result of a higher physical organization, and in the judgment of those who consider man as the possessor of a soul distinct from the body, the subject and seat of a higher nature. If the body be the whole of man, death is the end of his conscious existence. If he consist of body and spirit, death may prove but his birthday into another and more important state of being. Now this point, which till the present hour has proved too hard for man himself to clear up, Scripture decides conclusively for all who will receive its testimony. Man is both body and spirit, the first placing him in communion with the outward world, the second allying him to God and his spiritual creation. The record of his primeval state exhibits the reality and effect of this complex being. While his earthly paradise yielded its riches and pleasures to every sense and sensibility of his animal nature, his higher life found its appropriate and preeminent occupation and delight in the service and communion of the ‘Father of his spirit.’ These views, as they magnify the life which God gave us, must be felt to complicate the nature and effects of death. How, then, does it affect us? Does it reach the whole man, body and spirit? If so, how are they severally and together affected by it? and in what order, and by what process does it consummate its work?

“**1.** Death extends to the entire man, and to every part of his nature. Against himself the threatening was directed, ‘In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die.’ Beyond doubt the outward man perisheth, and surely the inner man, the subject of that sin of which the body is but the instrument, cannot have escaped the force of the dread sentence. God’s word assures us that the soul that sinneth it shall die. Nay, it speaks of man as already dead who yet lives in the body; dead, therefore, spiritually. On the other hand, it speaks of men now alive through grace who shall never die, while yet the graves are ready for them. Men who walk after the course of the world and live in pleasure are pronounced ‘ dead in sin,’ dead while they live. And while whoso loveth his brother has ‘passed from death unto life, he that hateth his brother abideth in death.’ These Scriptures, while they distinguish between bodily and spiritual death, represent both as included in the sentence, and threatened and executed against the sinner.

"**2.** To what effect, then, does death exert its power upon the body and the spirit severally and together? It is not unimportant to observe that this is not extinction of existence or annihilation either of the one or the other. For a time the body retains its form, and its substance, however changed, is never lost; much more, may it be presumed, shall the spirit survive. Not, indeed, that spirit more than body is immortal independently of God's will, but that, seeing he preserves our inferior part, he will much more preserve the higher and more kindred product of his creative power. The effects of death upon the body itself are a matter of common observation; it quickly turns its comeliness into corruption, and finally reduces its form and structure into shapeless dust. The effect of bodily death on the spirit of the man whose nature is thus divided it may be more difficult to estimate. This may depend in part on the value of the earthly portion he has lost, and partly on the future portion on which he has entered, but it cannot be indifferent either to the child of sorrow or to the subject of grace, more than to the heir of this world, whom it has stripped of his whole inheritance of good. While we look on the deserted and impassive corpse and say, 'It is all over with him now,' the disembodied spirit must still find itself the subject of a maimed and imperfect nature. Consciousness belongs to its nature, and must endure while it has being. Its proper life lies in the harmony and subjection of its powers and dispositions to the nature and will of God; its death in contrariety and enmity to him. This involves the disruption of a holy and dutiful relation to the Father of spirits, and, by inevitable consequence, a deprivation of the fruits of his love and favor, on which life and blessedness depend. 'Your sins have separated between you and God.'

"**3.** It may tend further to clear this subject to notice briefly the order and process through which the work of death is consummated. Though incurred instantaneously on the act of transgression, its effects follow by successive stages, and at several more or less distant intervals. As caused by sin, the spiritual man, as the proper subject and source of the evil, first feels its power. Its very touch intercepts all happy intercourse with a holy God. This was felt and seen on the day that Adam sinned. His fear and flight at the voice of the Lord God in the garden was the unmistakable symptom of a soul already dead in sin, which dared not live with God, while his expulsion from God's presence marked no less clearly that God had ceased to live with him. Thus was executed to the letter the word which God had spoken, 'In the day thou eatest thou shalt surely die.' But

the work of death thus begun does not stop here. The disruption of the creature's relation to God, it may well be conceived, must introduce disorder into all the relations and interests of its being; nor, unless with a view to some ulterior design of signal judgment or of more signal mercy, might its full development and consummation be long delayed. But in subserviency to this end does man live on in the body for a season, though as to God 'he is dead while he liveth.' Yet it is but for a little time. Whatever be the result of this day of forbearance, the work of death goes on; 'the body is dead because of sin' Ñ the mortal crisis which awaits every individual man in his own time. As distinguished from spiritual, it is called temporal death, as superadding exclusion from the things of earth and time to the loss of all happy interest in God. There remains but one further stage ere it reach its complete and final issue, both in the individual and the race. When the designs of the divine administration in our world are finished, the bodies of all who sleep in dust shall be reorganized. There shall be a resurrection of the just and of the unjust. While the just, by faith through grace, shall be raised to life incorruptible and glorious, the unjust, impenitent, and unbelieving shall awake to the resurrection of damnation. The whole man shall go away from the glory and joy of God's presence into everlasting punishment. This is the second death." See also Fletcher, *Works* (N.Y. ed.), 1:158 sq.; Wesley, *Works* (N. York ed.), 1:401; 2:34, 404; Edwards, *Works* (N.Y. 1848, 4 vols. 8vo), 2:372, 390 sq.; Watson, *Institutes*, 2:48, 55; Martensen, *Christian Dogmatics* (Edinb. 1867), § 108-112. *SEE ESCHATOLOGY*.

Death, Brothers of

a name given to the religious of the order of St. Paul, the first hermit, on account of the figure of a death's head which they were always to have with them, in order to keep perpetually before them the thought of death. The order was suppressed by pope Urban VIII.

De'bir

(Heb. *Debir'*, רְבִד or דְּבִר a sanctuary, often applied to the Tabernacle and Temple), the name of two or three places, and also of a man.

1. (דְּבִר but in Judges and Chron. רְבִד; Sept. Δαβίρ [Δεβίρ in Joshua 15:15, 49; 21:15; Judges 1:1, 11] v. r. Δαβείρ; Vulg. Dabir), a town in the mountains of Judah (Joshua 15:49), one of a group of eleven cities to the

west of Hebron (Keil, *Comment.* in loc.), in a parched region (Judges 1:11-15). In the narrative it is mentioned as being the next place which Joshua took after Hebron (10, 38). It was the seat of a Canaanitish king (10, 39; 12:13), and was one of the towns of the Anakim, and from which they were utterly destroyed by Joshua (11, 21). The earlier name of Debir was KIRJATH-SEPHER (Joshua 15:15; Judges 1:11) and KIRJATH-SANNAH (Joshua 15:49). (See these names.) The records of its conquest vary, though not very materially. In Joshua 15:17, and Judges 1:13, a detailed account is given of its capture by Othniel, son of Kenaz, for love of Achsah, the daughter of Caleb, while in the general history of the conquest it is ascribed to the great commander himself (Joshua 10:38, 39, where the name occurs with h, local affixed, *Debi'rah*, hrbæ; and this even with prefixed). It was one of the cities given with their "suburbs" (vrgjmæ) to the priests (Joshua 21:15; 1 Chronicles 6:58). Debir does not appear to have been known to Jerome, nor has it been discovered with certainty in modern times. About three miles to the W. of Hebron is a deep and secluded valley called the Wady Nunkur, enclosed on the north by hills of which one bears a name certainly suggestive of Debir-*Dewir-ban*. (See the narrative of Rosen in the *Zeitsch. d. Morgenl*. 1857, p. 50-64). The subject, and indeed the whole topography of this district, requires further examination: in the mean time it is perhaps some confirmation of Dr. Rosen's suggestion that a village or site on one of these hills is pointed out as called Isaiah the Arabic name for Joshua. Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 86) speaks of a *Wady Dibir* in this direction. Van deVelde (*Memoir*, p. 307) finds Debir at Dilbeh, six miles S.W. of Hebron, where Stewart (*Tent and Khan*, p. 223, 224) mentions a spring brought down from a high to a low level by an aqueduct (comp. "the upper and the nether springs" of Judges 1:14, 15).

2. (rbæ; Sept. ἐπὶ τὸ τέτραρτον τῆς φάραγγος Ἀχώρ; Vulg. *Debera*), a place on the north boundary of Judah, "near the "Valley of Achor" (Joshua 15:7), and therefore somewhere in the complications of hill and ravine behind Jericho. De Saulcy (*Narrat*. 2:25) attaches the name Thour ed-Dabour to the ruined khan on the right of the road from Jerusalem to Jericho, at which travelers usually stop to refresh; but this is not corroborated by any other traveler, unless it be Schwarz (*Palest.* p. 95), and he is disposed to identify this site with this and the foregoing place, nor does the locality agree with the scriptural intimations. The name usually given to it by the Arabs is Khan Hatherurah. A Wady Dabor is marked in Van de Velde's map as lying close to the S. of Neby Musa, at the N.W.

corner of the Dead Sea (see De Saulcy, *Narrat*. 2:53, 54), which probably gives a trace of the ancient town as located on the N.E. of this valley. *SEE TRIBE*.

3. The “border (lWbG]) of Debir” (rBædl æto Debir; Sept. Δεβίρ v. r. Δαβείρ and Δαιβών; Vulg. Dabir) is named as forming part of the boundary of Gad (Joshua 13:26), and as apparently not far from Mahanaim. Reland (Palaest. p. 734) conjectures that the name may be the same as LODEBAR (q.v.), which is written similarly (rb;r]a l or rb;r]/l), and lay in the same vicinity (2 Samuel 9:4, 5). Lying in the grazing country on the high downs east of Jordan, the name is doubtless connected with rbR; *dabar*, the same word which is the root of *Midbar*, the wilderness or pasture (see Gesenius, *Thes. Heb*. p. 318).

4. (rybæd] Sept. Δαρίρ v. r. Δαρείρ and Δαβίν; Vulg. *Dabir*); the king of Eglon, in the low country of Judah; one of the five Canaanitish princes who joined the confederacy summoned by Adonizedek of Jerusalem, and who were defeated, confined in a cave, and at length hanged by Joshua (Joshua 10:3, 23). B.C. 1613.

Deb’ora

[prop. Debo’ra] (Δεββωρά or Δεββώρα, from the Heb. *Deborah*), a woman of Naphtali, mother of Tobiel, the father of Tobit (Tob. 1:8).

Deborah

SEE BEE.

Deb’orah

(Heb. hr;/bR][or “defectively” hr;bæd], Genesis 35:8; Jug. 4:14; v 15], a *bee*, as often [comp. the names Μέλισσα and *Melitilla*]; Sept. Δέβοῤῥα v. r. [in Judg.] Δεββῶρα; Josephus Δεβώρα, *Ant*. v. 5, 2]), the name of two women. *SEE DEBORA*.

1. The nurse of Rebekah (Genesis 35:8). Nurses held a high and honorable place in ancient times, and especially in the East (2 Kings 11:2; Homer, *Od*. 1:429; Virgil, *AEn*. 7:2; “AEneia nutrix;” Ovid, *Met*. 14:441), where they were often the principal members of the family (2 Chronicles 22:11; Jahn, *Bibl. Arch*. § 166). Deborah accompanied Rebekah from the house of

Bethuel (Genesis 24:59), B.C. 2023; but she is only mentioned by name on the occasion of her burial, under the oak-tree of Bethel, which was called in her honor Allon-Bachuth (Genesis 35:8). B.C. 1906. Such spots were usually chosen for the purpose (Genesis 23:17, 18; 1 Samuel 31:13; 2 Kings 21:18, etc.). Many have been puzzled at finding her in Jacob's family; it is unlikely that she was sent to summon Jacob from Haran (as Jarchi suggests), or that she had returned during the lifetime of Rebekah, and was now coming to visit her (as Abarbanel and others say); but she may very well have returned at Rebekah's death, and that she was dead is probable from the omission of her name in Genesis 35:27; and if, according to the Jewish legend, Jacob first heard of his mother's death at this spot, it will be an additional reason for the name of the tree, and may *possibly* be implied in the expression Ër bywi, comforted, A. V. "blessed" (Genesis 35:9; see, too, Ewald, *Gesch.* 1:390).

2. A prophetess, "wife of Lapidoth," who judged Israel (Judges iv, v) in connection with Barak (q.v.). B.C. 1409-1369. Her name may implying whatever, being a mere appellative, derived like Rachel (a lamb), Tamar (a palm), etc., from natural objects; although she was (as Corn. a Lapide quaintly puts it) *suis mellea, hostibus aculeata*. Some, however, see in the name an official title, implying her prophetic authority. A bee was an Egyptian symbol of regal power (comp. Callim. *Jov*. 66, and *Et. Mag*. s.v. ἐσσήν); and among the Greeks the term was applied not only to poets (*more apis matinae*, Horace), and to those peculiarly chaste (as by the Neoplatonists), but especially to the priestesses of Delphi (χρησμὸς ιν ελίσ α ς Δελφίδος, Pind. P. 4:106), Cybele, and Artemis (Creuzer, *Symbolik*, 3, 354, etc.), just as ἐσσήν was to the priests (Liddell and Scott, s.v.). In both these senses the name suits her, since she was essentially a vates or seer, combining the functions of poetry and prophecy (see Stanley, *Jewish Church*, 1:348 sq.).

She lived, probably in a tent, under the palm-tree of Deborah, between Ramah and Bethel in Mount Ephraim (Judges 4:5), which, as palm-trees were rare in Palestine, is mentioned as a well-known and solitary landmark, and was probably the same spot as that called (Judges 20:33) Baal-Tamar, or the sanctuary of the palm (Stanley, *Palest.* p. 145). Von Bohlen (p. 334) thinks that this tree is identical with Allon-Bachuth (Genesis 35:8), the name and locality being nearly the same (Ewald, *Gesch.* 1:391, 405), although it is unhistorical to say that this "may have suggested a name for the nurse" (Haivernick's *Introd. to Pent*. p. 201; Kalisch, *Gen*. ad loc.).

Possibly it is again mentioned as “the oak of Tabor” in 1 Samuel 10:3 (where Thenius would read hr;bED] for r/bT;). At any rate, it was a well-known tree, and she may have chosen it from its previous associations. *SEE OAK*.

She was probably a woman of Ephraim, although, from the expression in Judges 5:15, some suppose her to have belonged to Issachar (Ewald, *Gesch.* 2:489). The expression t/dyPæLi tv,ae is much disputed; it is generally thought to mean “wife of Lapidoth,” as in A. V.; but other versions render it “uxor principis,” or “Foemina Lapidothana” (“that great dame of Lapidoth,” Tennyson), or *mulier splendorum*, i.e. one divinely illuminated, since t/dyPæLi = lightnings. But the most prosaic notion is that of the Rabbis, who take it to mean that she attended to the tabernacle lamps, from dyPæLi, *lappid*, a lamp! The fem. termination is often found in men’s names, as in Shelomith (1 Chronicles 23:9), Koheleth, etc. Lapidoth, then, was probably her husband, and not Barak, as some say. *SEE LAPIDOTH*.

She was not so much a judge (a title which belongs rather to Barak, Hebrews 11:32) as one gifted with prophetic command (Judges 4:6, 14; 5:7), and by virtue of her inspiration “a mother in Israel.” Her sex would give her additional weight from the peculiarity of the circumstance, as in the instances of Miriam, Huldah, Anna, Noadiah (2 Kings 22:14; -Nehemiah 6:14). Her official designation probably means that she was the organ of communication between God and his people, and probably, on account of the influence and authority of her character, was accounted in some sort as the head of the nation, to whom questions of doubt and difficulty were referred for decision. *SEE JUDGE*.

From the intimations which the narrative (especially her song) contains, and from other circumstances, the people would appear to have sunk into a state of total discouragement under the oppression of the Canaanites, so that it was difficult to rouse them from their despondency, and to induce them to make any exertion to burst the fetters of their bondage. From the gratitude which Deborah expresses towards the people for the effort which they finally made, we are warranted in drawing the conclusion that she had long endeavored to instigate them to this step in vain. At length she summoned Barak, the son of Abinoam, from Kedesh, a city of Naphtali, on a mountain not far from Hazor, and made known to him the will of God that he should undertake an enterprise for the deliverance of his country.

But such was his disheartened state of feeling, and, at the same time, such his confidence in the superior character and authority of Deborah, that he assented to go only on the condition that she would accompany him. Jabin's tyranny was peculiarly felt in the northern tribes, who were near his capital and under her jurisdiction, viz. Zebulon, Naphtali, and Issachar; hence, when she summoned Barak to the deliverance, it was on them that the brunt of the battle fell; but they were joined by the adjacent central tribes, Ephraim, Manasseh, and Benjamin, though not by those of the extreme west, south, and east. Under her direction Barak encamped on "the broad summit of Tabor" (Josephus, *War*, 2:20, 6). When asked to accompany him, she answered indignantly, "Thou, O Barak, deliverest up meanly the authority which God hath given thee into the hands of a woman; neither do I reject it" (Joseph. *Ant.* v. 5, 2). The Sept. interpolates the words "because I know not the day when the Lord will escort me by his angel" as a sort of excuse for Barak's request (iv. 8; comp. 14; v. 23). When the small band of ill-armed (Judges 5:8) Israelites saw the dense iron chariots of the enemy, "they were so frightened that they wished to march off at once, had not Deborah detained them, and commanded them to fight the enemy that very day" (Joseph. 1. c.). They did so, but Deborah's prophecy was fulfilled (Judges 4:9), and the enemy's general perished among the "oaks of the wanderers (Zaanaim)," in the tent of the Bedouin Kenite's wife (Judges 4:21) in the northern mountains. For the natural phenomena which aided (Judges 5:20, 21) the victory, and the other details (for which we have ample authority in the twofold narration in prose and poetry), *SEE BARAK*, where we have also entered on the question of the chronology (Ewald, *Gesch.* 2:489-494). B.C. 1409. This great victory, which seems to have been followed up, broke the power of the native princes, and secured to the Israelites a repose of forty years' duration (Judges 5:31). During part of this time Deborah probably continued to exercise her former authority; but nothing more of her history is known. See Thomson, *Land and Book*, 2:150; Hunter, *Sacred Biog.* 4:98; Hughes, *Female Char.* 1:296.

Deborah's title of "prophetess" (hay;ybæn]) includes the notion of inspired poetry, as in Exodus 15:20; and in this sense the glorious triumphal ode (Judges 5) well vindicates her claim to the office. This song, which was composed in consequence of the great victory over Sisera, is said to have been "sung by Deborah and Barak." *SEE JAEL*. It is usually regarded as the composition of Deborah (see Zeltner, *Deboroe inter prophetissas*

eruditio, Alt. 1708), and was probably indited by her to be sung on the return of Barak and his warriors from the pursuit. It belongs indisputably to the first rank of Hebrew poetry, and is one of its most splendid and difficult specimens. “In the ecstasy and energy of inspiration,” says Prof. Robinson (*Bib*. *Repos*. 1831, p. 569), “the prophetess pours out her whole soul in thanksgiving to God for his divine aid, and in gratitude to the people of Israel for their patriotism in rising spontaneously to throw off the yoke of oppression. Her strains are bold, varied, and sublime; she is everywhere full of abrupt and impassioned appeals and personifications; she bursts away from earth to heaven, and again returns to human things; she touches now upon the present, now dwells upon the past, and closes at length with the grand promise and result of all prophecy, and of all the dealings of God’s providence, that the wicked shall be overthrown, while the righteous shall ever triumph in Jehovah’s name.” This ode has often been explained at length, especially by Hollman, *In carmen Deborae* (Lips. 1818); Kron, *Sur le chant de Debora* (Strasb. 1833); Kalkar, *De cantico Deb*. (Copenh. 1833); Kemink, *De carm. Deb*. (Utr. 1840); Meier, *Uebers. u. Erkldr. des Deborah Liedes* (Tubingen, 1859); Herder, *Heb. Poesie*, 2:235; Ewald, *Poet. Biucher*, 1:125 sq.; Gumpach, *Alttest. Stud*. 1-140; Bottger, in Kauffer’s *Bibl. Studien*, pt. 1-3; Robinson, *Bibl. Repos*. 1:568 sq. Other treatises are, in Latin, by Schultens (L. B. 1745; also in his *Syll. Dissertt*. No. 12), Lette (L. B. 1759), Luiderwald (Helmst. 1772), Schnurrer (*Tub*. 1775; also in his *Dissertt*. p. 36 sq.); comp. Origen (*Opp*. 2:470), Jerome (*Opp*. Spur. 3, 745), Muis (Sel. Cent. i), Cocceius (*Opp*. 1:311); in German, by Teller (Halle, 1766), Wenck (Darmst. 1773), Kohler (in Eichhorn’s *Repertor*. 6:163 sq.), — Mendelssohn (in *Sammler*, 1778), Bielcke (Starg. 1750); in English, by Weston (London. 1788), Horsley (*Bib. Crit*. 2:424, 477); in Italian, by Hintz (ed. Brini, Rom. 1792). *SEE JUDGES (BOOK OF)*.

Debt

(yvæ} neshi’, 2 Kings 4:7; haV;mi, *mashshaah’*, Proverbs 22:26; avn;, *noshe’*, a creditor, 1 Samuel 22:2; elsewhere, ry; hand, Nehemiah 10:31; δάνειον, loan, never debt, Matthew 18:27; ὀφειλή, Matthew 18:22, a due, as rendered Romans 13:7; ὀφείλημα, something owed, Matthew 6:12; Romans 4:4). The Mosaic law very strongly recommended willingness to loan (Deuteronomy 15:7 sq.; comp. Psalm 37:26; Matthew 5:42). Interest (Ëv,N, “usury”), however, could only be exacted by

capitalists from foreigners, not at all from Israelites as co-religionists (in Nehemiah 5:11, a percentage is mentioned; but it does not appear whether this was in money, Heineccii *Antiq. Rom*. 2:15, 19, as generally among the Romans, or a yearly rental; comp. Appian, *Civ*. 1:54); also a vendue of loaned natural products (see, however; *Baba Mezia*, v. 1) was forbidden (Exodus 22:25; Leviticus 25:37 sq.; Deuteronomy 23:20). The agrarian regulation of the state, secured each one, in the last resort, from the rapacity of the creditor; probably by this very arrangement moneyed men were restrained from depending upon loaned money for a subsistence, and were. thus induced to turn their attention to agriculture or other useful occupations. See LAND. In this way, however, wholesale business, which was incompatible with the isolation-system of the Jewish law-giver, was rendered rare, or rather impossible (see Michaelis, *Syntagm. commentt*. 2:1 sq.; *Mos. Recht*, 3, 87 sq.; Jahn, *Bibl. Archeol*. II, 2:325 sq.; on the Talmudic prescriptions, see Selden, *Jus. Hebr*. 6:9). Usury incurred the deepest scorn (Proverbs 28:8; Ezekiel 18:8, 13, 17; 22:12; Jeremiah 15:10; Psalm 15:5; 109:11), but no other civil penalty was annexed to it (according to the Talmud, it involved a forfeiture of redress; on the whole subject, see Marezoll, *De usuraria pravitate*, Lips. 1837). Written notes of obligation (χειρόγραφα, signatures; Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, p. 921, finds such evidences of debt in the dyaVmi or dyhVmi, q. d. note of hand, Deuteronomy 15:2: the Talmudic precepts on such paper are given in the Mishna, *Baba Bathra*, c. 10) were, at least in the post-exilian period, regularly in vogue (Tobit 1:17; Josephus, *Ant.* 16:10, 8; *War*, 2:17, 6; comp. 18:6, 3; Luke 16:6 sq.). Distraint was allowed, but under certain restrictions (Exodus 22:16 sq.; Deuteronomy 24:6,10 sq.). See PLEDGE. Severity against debtors being regarded as imperious among the Israelites (comp. Job 22:6; 24:3), especially in the collection of debts, the law scarcely enjoined anything directly on the treatment of bankrupts; it is merely indicated (Leviticus 15:39) that he who was totally insolvent might be sold into temporary bondage in order to satisfy the debt by his wages. (On the rigor towards this class among the Romans, see Heineccius, *Antig. jur. Rom.* 3, 30, 2. They were often subjected to the harshest usage as slaves, Livy, 2:23; 6:36; Gell. 20:1, 19; *Appul. Ital*. 9, p. 40, ed. Schweigh. In Athens, before Solon's time, the creditor could even lay claim to the person of his debtor, Plutarch, *Vit. Sol*. c. 15; later, there prevailed a summary process of seizure, which the creditor himself was authorized to execute [see Schlager, *De delictore, etc*. Helmstadt, 1741]. Yet certain mitigations, not unlike the Mosaic, existed; see Heffter, *Athen.*

Gerichtsverf. p. 455 sq. On the Egyptian legislation, see Diod. Sic. 1:79; Wilkinson, 2:49 sq.) This rule was often still further exercised in practice with such hard-heartedness as to involve wife and children in the poor debtor's fate (2 Kings 4:1; Nehemiah 5:5; Isaiah 1, 1; Matthew 18:25); nay, the sureties likewise were exposed to the same mode of reparation (Proverbs 20:16; 22:26 sq.; 27:13). Debtors were liable to punishment by imprisonment (Matthew 5:26; 18:30), probably a Roman usage. The Talmudic rules concerning debt are mild (*Baba Mezia*, 9:13). On the Sabbatical year (q.v.) all pecuniary obligations were cancelled (Deuteronomy 15:1 sq., 9). *SEE LOAN*; *SEE DEBTOR*; *SEE USURY*; *SEE CREDITOR*, etc.

Debtor

(b/j, chob, debt, Ezekiel 18:7; χρεωφειλέτης, ower of money, Luke 7:41; 16:5;. elsewhere simply ὀφειλέτης. See generally the prop. Hebrew words avn;hw;l; G, Gesenius, *Thes.* eb. p. 920. The Mosaic laws respecting pecuniary obligations differ in many points from those of modern nations, but this is no proof that they were not suitable to the people for whom they were designed, and it is certain that they are pervaded by a spirit of kindness to the debtor to which no parallel is to be found in the codes of antiquity. *SEE LOAN*. Though they at least tacitly allow of the sale of a debtor as a slave (Leviticus 25:39, 40), they also direct that his treatment shall be that of "an hired servant and a sojourner," while the law of the Twelve Tables authorized putting an insolvent debtor to death, and both Grecian and Roman history abound with instances of the disturbances caused in those states by the severity with which this class was dealt with. The laws of Moses are, however, by no means regardless of the rights of creditors, as we find that persons who had property due to them might, if they chose, secure it either by means of a mortgage, or by a pledge, or by a bondsman or surety. The chief provisions in the Scripture on the subject are the following:

1. The creditor, when about to receive a pledge for a debt, was not allowed to enter the debtor's house and take what he pleased, but was to wait before the door till the debtor should deliver up the pledge with which he could most easily dispense (Deuteronomy 24:10, 11; Job 22:6; 24:3, 7, 9).

2. When a mill, or mill-stone, or an upper garment was given as a pledge, it was not to be kept all night. These articles appear to be mentioned as

examples for all other things which the debtor could not without great inconvenience dispense with (Exodus 22:26, 27; Deuteronomy 24:6, 12).

3. The debt which remained unpaid until the seventh or Sabbatic year (during which the soil was to be left without cultivation, and, consequently, a person was not supposed to be in a condition to make payments) could not be exacted during that period (Deuteronomy 15:1-11). But at other times, in case the debt was not paid, the creditors might seize, first, the hereditary land of the debtor, and enjoy its produce until the debt was paid, or at least until the year of jubilee; or, secondly, his houses. These might be sold in perpetuity, except those belonging to the Levites (Leviticus 25:14, 32). Thirdly, in case the house or land was not sufficient to cancel the debt, or if it so happened that the debtor had none, the person of the debtor might be sold, together with his wife and children, if he had any. This is implied in Leviticus 25:39, and this custom is alluded to in Job 24:9. It existed in the time of Elisha (2 Kings 4:1), and on the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity some rich persons exercised this right over their poor debtors (Nehemiah 5:13). Our Lord alludes to the same custom in Matthew 18:25. As the person of the debtor might thus be seized and sold, his cattle and furniture were undoubtedly liable for his debts (Proverbs 22:27). It does not appear that imprisonment for debt existed in the age of Moses, but it seems to have prevailed in the time of our Savior (Matthew 18:34).

4. If a person had become bondsman or surety for another, he was liable to be called upon for payment in the same way with the original debtor. But this practice does not appear to have obtained before the time of Solomon, when it was attended with serious consequences. It seems that the formality observed was for the person who became surety to give his hand to the debtor, and not to the creditor, to intimate that he became, in a legal sense, one with the debtor; for Solomon cautions his son against giving his hand to a stranger, to a person whose circumstances he did not know; and entreats him to go and urge the person to whom he had given his hand, or for whom he had become surety, to pay his own debt (Proverbs 11:15; 17:18; 22:26), *SEE DEBT*.

Decalogue

(Δεκάλογος), the name most usually given by the Greek fathers to the law of the two tables given by God to Moses on Mount Sinai, called in

Scripture “the TEN COMMANDMENTS (t r,c,[}µyrb;D]h'i, the ten words; Sept. οἱ δέκα λόγοι and τὰ δέκα ῥήματα: ‘ Vulg. *decem verba*; Exodus 34:28; Deuteronomy 4:13; 10:4); and embracing what is usually termed “the Moral Law” (Exodus 20:3-17; Deuteronomy 5:7-21). The Decalogue was written on two stone slabs (Exodus 31:18), which, having been broken by Moses (32:19), were renewed by God (34:1, etc.). They are said (Deuteronomy 9:10) to have been written by the finger of God, an expression which always implies an immediate act of the Deity. The Decalogue is five times alluded to in the New Testament, there called ἐντολαί, *commandments*, but only the latter precepts are specifically cited, which refer to our duties to each other (Matthew 5:17, 19, etc.; Mark 10:19; Luke 18:20; Romans 13:9; 7:7, 8; Matthew 5; 1 Timothy 1:9, 10). Those which refer to God are supposed by some to be omitted in these enumerations, from the circumstance of their containing precepts for ceremonial observances (Jeremy Taylor’s *Life of Christ*, and *Ductor Dubitantium*; Rosenmüller’s *Scholia in Exod*.).

The circumstance of these precepts being called the ten words has doubtless led to the belief that the two tables contained ten distinct precepts, five in each table; while some have supposed that they were called by this name to denote their perfection, ten being considered the most perfect of numbers: so Philo-Judaeus (ἡ δεκὰς παντελεία . . . ἀριθμοῦ τέλειον, *De Septen*. c. 9). This distinguished philosopher divides them into two pentads (*De Decalogo*), the first pentad ending with Exodus 20:12, “Honor thy father and thy mother,’ etc. or the fifth commandment of the Greek, Reformed, and Anglican churches; while the more general opinion among Christians is that the first table contained our duty to God, ending with the law to keep the Sabbath holy, and the second our duty to our neighbor. As they are not numerically divided in the Scriptures, so that we cannot positively say which is the first, which the second, etc., it may not prove uninteresting to the student in Biblical literature if we here give a brief account of the different modes of dividing them which have prevailed among Jews and Christians. The case cannot be more clearly stated than in the words of St. Augustine: “It is inquired how the ten commandments are to be divided — whether there are four which relate to God, ending with the precept concerning the Sabbath, and the other six, commencing with ‘Honor thy father and thy mother,’ appertaining to man — or whether the former are three only, and the latter seven? Those who say that the first table contains four, separate the

command, ‘Thou shalt have no other gods but me’ (Exodus 20:3; Deuteronomy 5:7), so as to make another precept of ‘Thou shalt not make to thyself an idol’ (Exodus 20:4; Deuteronomy 5:8), in which images are forbidden to be worshipped. But they wish ‘Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s house’ (Exodus 20:17; Deuteronomy 5:21), and ‘Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife’ (Exodus 20:17; Deuteronomy 5:21), and so on to the end, to be one. But those who say that there are only three in the first table, and seven in the second, make one commandment of the precept of the worship of one God, and nothing beside him (Exodus 20:3; Deuteronomy 5:7), but divide these last into two, so that one of them is ‘Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife,’ and the other, ‘Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s house.’ There is no question among either about the correctness of the number ten, as for this there is the testimony of Scripture” (*Questions on Exodus*, qu. 71, *Works*, 3, 443, Paris, 1679).

1. *The Talmudical Division*, or that contained in the Talmud (*Makkkoth*, 24, a), which is also that of the modern Jews. According to this division, the firse commandment consists of the words “I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage” (Exodus 20:2; Deuteronomy 5:6); the second (Exodus 20:3, 4), “Thou shalt have none other gods beside me; thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image,” etc. to ver. 6; the third, “Thou shalt not take God’s name in vain,” etc.; the fourth, “Remember to keep holy the Sabbath day,” etc.; the fifth, “Honor thy father’ and thy mother,” etc.; the sixth, “Thou shalt not kill;” the seventh, “Thou shalt not commit adultery;” the eighth, “Thou shalt not steal;” the ninth, “Thou shalt not bear false witness,” etc.; and the tenth, “Thou shalt not covet,” etc., to the end. This division is also supported by the Targum of the pseudo-Jonathan, a work of the sixth century, by Aben-Ezra, in his *Commentary*, and by Maimonides (*Sepher Hammizvoth*). It has also been maintained by the learned Lutheran, Peter Martyr (*Loci Communes*, Basle, 1580, loc. 14, p. 684). That this was a very early mode of dividing the Decalogue is further evident from a passage in Cyril of Alexandria’s treatise against Julian, from whom he quotes the following invective: “That Decalogue, the law of Moses, is a wonderful thing: thou shalt not steal; thou shalt not kill; thou shalt not bear false witness. But let each of the precepts which he asserts to have been given by God himself be written down in the identical words, ‘I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt;’ the second follows, ‘Thou shalt have no strange gods beside me; thou shalt not make

to thyself an idol.' He adds the reason, 'for I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children.' 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain. Remember the Sabbath day. Honor thy father and thy mother. Thou shalt not commit adultery. Thou shalt not steal. Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods.' What nation is there, by the gods, if you take away these two, 'Thou shalt not adore other gods,' and 'Remember the Sabbath,' which does not think all the others are to be kept, and which does not punish more or less severely those who violate them?"

2. *The Origenian Division*, or that approved by Origen, which is that in use in the Greek and in all the Reformed churches except the Lutheran. Although Origen was acquainted with the differing opinions which existed in his time in regard to this subject, it is evident from his own words that he knew nothing of that division by which the number ten is completed by making the prohibition against coveting either the house or the wife a distinct commandment. In his eighth Homily on Genesis, after citing the words, "I am the Lord thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt," he adds, "this is not a part of the commandment." The first commandment is, Thou shalt have no other gods but me," and then follows," Thou shalt not make an idol." These together are thought by some to make one commandment; but in this case the number ten will not be completed where, then, will be the truth of the Decalogue? But if it be divided as we have done in the last sentence, the full number will be evident. The first commandment therefore is, "Thou shalt have no other gods but me," and the second, "Thou shalt not make to thyself an idol, nor a likeness," etc. Origen proceeds to make a distinction between gods, idols, and likenesses. Of gods, he says, "it is written, there are gods many and lords many" (1 Corinthians 8:5); but of idols, "an idol is nothing;" an image, he says, of a quadruped, serpent, or bird, in metal, wood, or stone, set up to be worshipped, is not an idol, but a likeness. A picture made with the same view comes under the same denomination. But an idol is a representation of what does not exist, such as the figure of a man with two faces, or with the head of a dog, etc. The likeness must be of something existing in heaven, or in earth, or in the water. It is not easy to decide on the meaning of" things in heaven," unless it refers to the sun, moon, or stars. The design of Moses he conceives to have been to forbid Egyptian idolatry, such as that of Hecate, or other fancied demons (*Opera,* 2:156, De la Rue's ed.).

The pseudo-Athanasius, or the author of the *Synopsis Scripturae*, who is the oracle of the Greek Church, divides the commandments in the same manner. “This book [Exodus] contains these ten commandments, on two tables: first, I am the Lord thy God. Second, Thou shalt not make to thyself an idol, nor any likeness. . . Ninth, Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor. Tenth, Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife, nor any thing that is thy neighbor’s” (Athanasii *Opera*, fol. Paris, 1698).

Gregory Nazianzen, in one of his poems, inscribed “The Decalogue of Moses,” gives the following division (*Opera*, ed. Caillaud, Paris, 1840):

> These ten laws Moses formerly engraved on tables
> Of stone; but do thou engrave them on thy heart.
> Thou shalt not know another God, since worship belongs to me.
> Thou shalt not make a vain statue, a lifeless image.
> Thou shalt not call on the great God in vain.
> Keep all sabbaths, the sublime and the shadowy.
> Happy he who renders to his parents due honor.
> Flee the crime of murder, and of a foreign
> Bed; evil-minded theft and witness
> False, and the desire of another’s, the seed of death.

Jerome took the same view with Origen. In his commentary on Ephesians 6, he thus writes: “‘ Honor thy father and thy mother,’ etc. is the fifth commandment in the Decalogue. How, then, are we to understand the apostle’s meaning in calling it the first, when the first commandment is ‘Thou shalt have no gods but me,’ where some read thus, ‘which is the first commandment with promise,’ as if the *four* previous commandments had no promise annexed, etc.... . But they do not seem to me to have observed with sufficient accuracy that in the *second* commandment there is also a promise: ‘Thou shalt not make to thyself an idol, nor the likeness of any thing in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, or in the water under the earth; thou shalt not adore them, nor sacrifice to them; for I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, visiting the sins... but showing mercy unto thousands...’ (observe these words of promise showing mercy unto thousands, etc.)” (Hieronymi *Opera*, vol. 4, Paris, 1693).

The pseudo-Ambrose also writes to the same effect in his *Commentary on Ephesians*: “How is this the first commandment, when the *first* commandment says, Thou shalt have no other gods but me? Then, Thou shalt not make a likeness of any thing in heaven above, or in the earth

beneath, etc. The *third*, Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; the *fourth*, Keep my sabbaths; the *fifth*, Honor thy father and thy mother. As the first four appertain to God, they are contained in the first table; the others, appertaining to men, are contained in the second, such as that of honoring parents, not committing murder, adultery, theft, false witness, or concupiscence. These six seem to be written in the second table, the first of which is called the first with promise" (Ambrosii *Opera*, vol. ii, Paris edition, Append. p. 248, 249).

To these testimonies from the fathers may be added that of Clemens Alexandrinus (*Stromata*, vi, p. 809); but this writer is so confused and contradictory in reference to the subject, that some have supposed the text to have been corrupted. "The first precept of the Decalogue," he observes, "shows that one God only is to be worshipped, who brought his people out of Egypt... and that men ought to abstain from the idolatry of the creature. The second, that we ought not to transfer his name to creatures; the third signifies that the world was made by God, who has given us the seventh day to rest; the fifth follows, which commands us to honor our parents; then follows the precept about adultery, after this that concerning theft; but the tenth is concerning coveting."

But the strongest evidence in favor of the Origenian division is that of the learned Jews Philo and Josephus, who speak of it as the received division of the Jewish Church. Philo, after mentioning the division into two pentads already referred to, proceeds: "The first pentad is of a higher character than the second; it treats of the monarchy whereby the whole world is governed, of statues and images (ξοάνων καὶ ἀγαλμάτων), and of all corrupt representations in general (ἀφιδρυμάτων); of not taking the name of God in vain; of the religious observance of the seventh day as a day of holy rest; of honoring both parents. So that one table begins with God the father and ruler of all things, and ends with parents who emulate him in perpetuating the human race. But the other pentad contains those commandments which forbid adultery, murder, theft, false-witness, concupiscence" (*De Decalogo*, lib. i). The first precept, he afterwards observes, enjoins the belief and reverent worship of one supreme God, in opposition to those who worship the sun and moon, etc. Then, after condemning the arts of sculpture and painting, as taking off the mind from admiring the natural beauty of the universe, he adds: "As I have said a good deal of the second commandment, I shall now proceed to the next, 'Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain.'... The fourth commandment respects the Sabbath

day, to be devoted to rest, the study of wisdom, and the contemplation of nature, with a revision of our lives during the past week, in order to the correction of our transgressions; the fifth speaks of honoring parents. Here ends the first, or more divine pentad. The second pentad begins with the precept respecting adultery; its second precept is against murder; its third against stealing, the next against false-witness, the last against coveting" (lib. 2). This division seems to have been followed by trenseus: "In quinque libris, etc.; unaquaeque tabula quam accepit a Deo precepta habet quinque." Josephus is, if possible, still more clear than Philo. "The first commandment teaches us that there is but one God, and that we ought to worship him only; the second commands us not to make the image of any living creature, to worship it; the third, that we must not swear by God in a false matter; the fourth, that we must keep the seventh day, by resting from all sorts of work; the fifth, that we must honor our parents; the sixth, that we must abstain from murder; the seventh, that we must not commit adultery; the eighth, that we must not be guilty of theft; the ninth, that we must not bear false-witness; the tenth, that we must not admit the desire of that which is another's" (*Ant.* 3, 5, 5, Whiston's' translation).

This division, which appears to have been forgotten in the Western Church, was revived by Calvin in 1536, and is also received by that section of the Lutherans who followed Bucer, called the Tetrapolitans. It is adopted by Calmet (*Dict. of the Bible*, French ed., art. Loi). It is supported by Zonaras, Nicephorus, and Petrus Mogislaus among the Greeks, and is that followed in the present Russian Church, as well as by the Greeks in general (see the Catechism published by order of Peter the Great, by archbishop Resensky, London, 1753). It is at the same time maintained in this catechism that it is not forbidden to bow before the representations of the saints. This division, which appeared in the Bishops' Book in 1537, was adopted by the Anglican Church at the Reformation (1548), substituting seventh for Sabbath-day in her formularies. The same division was published with approbation by Bonner in his *Homilies* in 1555.

3. We shall next proceed to describe the two Masoretic divisions.

(1.) The first is that in Exodus. We call it the Masoretic division, inasmuch as the commandments in the greater number of manuscripts and printed editions are separated by a p or s, which mark the divisions between the smaller sections in the Hebrew. According to this arrangement, the first two commandments (in the Origenian or Greek division), that is, the

commandment concerning the worship of one God, and that concerning images, make but one; the second is, “Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain;” and so on until we arrive at the two last, the former of which is, “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s house,” and the last or tenth, “Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor’s wife, nor his servant,” etc. to the end. This was the division approved by Luther, and it has been ever since his time received by the Lutheran Church. The correctness of this division has been at all times maintained by the most learned Lutherans, not only from, its agreement with the Hebrew Bibles, but from the internal structure of the commandments, especially from the fact of the first two commandments (according to Origen’s division) forming but one subject. If these form but one commandment, the necessity of dividing the precept, “thou shalt not covet,” etc. into two is obvious. (For a learned defense of this division, see Pfeiffer, *Opera*, vol. 1, loc. 96, p. 125). Pfeiffer considers the accentuation also of the Hebrew as equally decisive in favor of this division, notwithstanding the opposite view is taken by many others, including the learned Buxtorf. This division is also followed in the Trent Catechism, and may therefore be called the Roman Catholic division. The churches of this communion have not, however, been consistent in following uniformly the Tridentine division, having revived, as in England, the second Masoretic division, to which we shall presently allude. In the Trent Catechism the first commandment is, “Ego sum Dominus Deus tuus, qui eduxi to de terra AEgypti, de domo servitutis; non habebis Deos alienos coram me. Non facies tibi sculptile,” etc. “Ego sum Dominus Deus tuus, fortis, zelotes,” etc. to “praecepta mea.” The last two commandments (according to the Roman division) are, however, in the same Catechism, combined in one, thus: “Non concupisces domum proximi tui; nec desiderabis uxorem ejus, non servum, non ancillam, non bovem, non asinum, nec omnia que illius sunt. In his duobus prmeceptis,” etc. It had appeared in the same form in England in Marshall’s and bishop Hilsey’s *Primers*, 1534 and 1539.

Those who follow this division have been accustomed to give the Decalogue very generally in an abridged form: thus the first commandment in the Lutheran Shorter Catechism is simply “Thou shalt have no other gods but me;” the second, “Thou shalt not take the name of thy God in vain;” the third,” Thou shalt sanctify the Sabbath-day” (*Feyertag*). A similar practice is followed by the Roman Catholics, although they, as well as the Lutherans, in their Larger Catechisms (as the Douay) give them at

full length. This practice has given rise to the charge made against those denominations of leaving out the second commandment, whereas it would have been more correct to say that they had mutilated the first, or at least that the form in which they give it has the effect of concealing a most important part of it from such as only had access to their Shorter Catechisms.

(2.) The last division is the second Masoretic, or that of Deuteronomy, sometimes called the Augustinian. This division differs from the former simply in placing the precept "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife" before "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house," etc.; and for this transposition it has the authority of Deuteronomy 5:21. The authority of the Masorites cannot, however, be of sufficient force to supersede the earlier traditions of Philo and Josephus.

This division was that approved by Augustine, who thus expresses himself on the subject: Following to 'what he had said (*ut sup*. p. 538), he observes, "But to me it seems more congruous to divide them into three and seven, inasmuch as to those who diligently lock into the matter, those which appertain to God seem to insinuate the Trinity. And, indeed, the command, 'Thou shalt have no other gods but me,' is more perfectly explained when images are forbidden to be worshipped. Besides, the sin of coveting another man's wife differs so much from coveting his house, that to the house was joined his field, his servant, his maid, his ox, his ass, his cattle, and all that is his. But it seems to divide the coveting of the house from the coveting of the wife when each begins thus: *'Thou shalt not* covet thy neighbor's wife, *thou shalt not* covet thy neighbor's house,' to which it then begins to add the rest. For when he had said 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife,' he did not add the rest to this, saying, nor his house, nor his field, nor his servant, etc. but these seem plainly to be united, which appear to be contained in one precept, and distinct from that wherein the wife is named. But when it is said 'Thou shalt have no other gods but me,' there appears a more diligent following up of this in what is subjoined. For to what pertains, 'Thou shalt not make an idol, nor a likeness; thou shalt not adore nor serve them,' unless to that which had been said, 'Thou shalt have none other gods but me.'" The division of Augustine was followed by Bede and Peter Lombard.

The learned Sonntag has entirely followed Augustine's view of this subject, and has written a dissertation in vindication of this division in the

Theologische Studien und Kritiken (Hamb. 1836-7), to which there was a reply in the same miscellany from Zillig, in vindication of what he terms the Calvinistic division, or that of Origen, which is followed by a rejoinder from Sonntag. Sonntag is so convinced of the necessity of that order of the words, according to which the precept against coveting the wife precedes (as in Deuteronomy) that against coveting the house, etc. that he puts down the order of the words in Exodus as an oversight. The order in the Septuagint version, in Exodus agrees with that in Deuteronomy. The Greek Church follows this order. Sonntag conceives that the Mosaic division of the Decalogue was lost in the period between the exile and the birth of Christ. See Heinze, *De ratione praecepta Decalogi numerandi varia et vera* (Viteb. 1790); Pflicke, *De Decalogo* (Dresden, 1788); Thorntonl, *Lectures on the Commandments* (Lond. 1842). For a list of *Expositions*, sermons, etc., on the Decalogue, see Darling, *Cyclopoedia Bibliographica*, 3, 222 sq. *SEE LAW*.

Decap'olis

(ἡ Δεκάπολις, Mark 5:20, but without the art. in Matthew 4:25, Mark 7:3; i.e. αἱ δέκα πόλεις, the ten cities, as in Josephus, *Life*, 65), a district (hence in Pliny, v. 16, 17, *Decapolitana regio*), or rather certain ten cities (including their adjacent villages or suburbs. Josephus, *Life*, 9), which resembled each other in being inhabited mostly by Gentiles (Lightfoot, *Opp.* 2:417), and in their civic institutions and privileges (Josephus, *Life*, 74). They were situated in the neighborhood of the Sea of Gennesareth (Mark 7:31; comp. Joseph. *War*, 3, 9, 7), near the eastern side of the Jordan, and in what was called the Roman province of Syria (Josephus, *Life*, 65). The name Decapolis does not occur in the Apocrypha, and, according to Mannert, it is only found in writers of the first century; in later times there is scarcely an allusion to it (*Geographie der Griechen und Romer*, VI, 1:244). Immediately after the conquest of Syria by the Romans (B.C. 65), ten cities appear to have been rebuilt, partly colonized, and endowed with peculiar privileges (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:7, 3; 17:11, 4); the country around them was hence called Decapolis. The limits of the territory were not very clearly defined, and probably in the course of time other neighboring cities received similar privileges. This may account for the fact that ancient geographers speak so indefinitely of the province, and do not even agree as to the names of the cities themselves. Pliny (*Hist. Nat.* v. 16), while admitting that there was some variation in the list, enumerates them as follows: Damascus, Philadelphia, Raphana, Scythopolis, Gadara,

Hippos, Dion, Pella, Gelasa (? Gerasa), and Canatha; he adds (v. 18), "The tetrarchies lie between and around these cities. . . . namely, Trachonitis, Panias, Abila," etc. These cities are scattered over a very wide region. If Raphana be, as many suppose, the same as Raphansea of Josephus, it lay near Hamath (Joseph. *War,* 7:5, 1), and from thence to Philadelphia on the south is above 200 miles, and from Scythopolis on the west to Canatha on the east is about 60. Josephus does not enumerate the cities of Decapolis; but it would seem that he excludes Damascus from the number, since he calls Scythopolis the largest of them (*War,* 3:9, 7). He also incidentally includes most of the other cities named: e.g. Philadelphia (*War,* 2:18, 1), Gadara and Hippos (*Life,* 65, 74); while Epiphanius (*Haer.* 1:30, 2) names Pella as belonging to this district, and in Stephen of Byzantium Gerasa appears in the same general connection. Cellarius thinks Caesarea-Philippi and Gergasa ought to be substituted in Pliny's list for Damascus and Raphana (*Notit.* 2:630). Pliny is undoubtedly the only author who extends Decapolis so far north. Ptolemy appears to include Decapolis in the southern part of Coele-Syria (*Geogr.* v. 15); he also (v. 17) makes Capitolias one of the ten; and an old Palmyrene inscription quoted by Reland (*Palaest.* p. 525) includes Abila, a town which, according to Eusebius (*Onom.* s.v. Abila), was 12 Roman miles east of Gadara. Lightfoot (*Hor. Hebr.* p. 563 sq.) enumerates from Talmudical sources (Jerus. Talm. *Demai,* fol. 22, 3), as belonging to Decapolis, besides Scythopolis, Gadara, Hippo, and Pella, the following less-known towns and villages, which, like Scythopolis (q.v.), were generally esteemed as heathen and under Gentile rule: Cephar-Carnaim (µynrq rpk), Cephar-Zemach (rpk jmx), Beth-Gurin (^yrwg tyb), Arbo (wbr[), and Caesarea-Philippi. Brocardus, a writer of the 13th century, even describes Decapolis as extending in breadth from the Sea of Galilee to Sidon, and in length from Tiberias to Damascus, including the following ten chief towns: "Tiberias, Sophet, Cedes Nephtalim, Assor, Caesarea-Philippi, Capernaum; Jonitera, Bethsaida, Corazin, and Bethsan" (*Descr. Terrae Sanctae,* in Le Clerc's ed. of Euseb. *Onomast.* p. 175). Andronichus gives an account of the extent of the Decapolis substantially the same (*Theatr. Terrae Sanctae*). But these statements are justly pronounced by Lightfoot (*Opp.* 2:417 sq.) as pure suppositions. All the cities of Decapolis, with the single exception of Scythopolis, lay on the east of the Jordan; and both Eusebius and Jerome (*Onomast.* s.v. *Decapolis*) say that the district was situated "beyond the Jordan, around Hippos, Pella, and Gadara" — that is, to the east and southeast of the Sea of Galilee. With this also agrees the statement

in Mark 5:20, that the demoniac who was cured at Gadara "began to publish in Decapolis how great things Jesus had done to him." The phraseology in Matthew 4:25; Mark 7:31, implying a situation on the west of the Jordan, must therefore be understood in a popular and general sense of a district but vaguely bounded, and one of whose towns was on that side of the river. In the latter passage indeed the entire difficulty vanishes, if, with the latest critics, we read διὰ Σιδῶνος instead of καὶ Σιδῶνος, and place these words after ἦλθε, thus: "And again departing from the coasts of Tyre, he came through Sidon unto the Sea of Galilee, through the midst of the coasts of Decapolis. In that case our Lord traveled from Tyre northward to Sidon; then he appears to have crossed Lebanon by the great road to Caesarea-Philippi; and from thence he descended through Decapolis to the eastern shore of the lake, where he fed the multitude (comp. Matthew 15:29-38; Mark 8:1-9). It thus appears that "the region of Decapolis" was beyond the Jordan, with the exception of the little territory of Scythopolis close to the western bank, at the southern end of the Sea of Galilee. In addition to Damascus and Scythopolis, whose sites are well known, its chief towns were: Gadara, about six miles southeast of the lake; Pella, on the side of the range of Gilead, opposite Scythopolis; Philadelphia, the ancient Rabboth-Ammon; Gerasa, whose ruins are the most magnificent in all Palestine; and Canatha, the Kenath of the Bible, situated eastward among the mountains of Bashan. Decapolis was not strictly a province, like Galilee, Persea, or Trachonitis. It was rather an assemblage of little principalities, classed together, not because of their geographical position, but because they enjoyed the same privileges, somewhat after the manner of the Hanse Towns in Germany. This region, once so populous and prosperous, from which multitudes flocked to hear the Savior, and through which multitudes followed his footsteps, is now almost without an inhabitant. Six out of the ten cities are completely ruined and deserted. Scythopolis, Gadara, and Canatha have still a few families, living, more like wild beasts than human beings, amid the crumbling ruins of palaces, and in the cavernous recesses of old tombs. Damascus alone continues to flourish, like an oasis in a desert. *SEE PERAEA*.

Dechant, Jacob William,

administer of the German Reformed Church, was born at Kreutznach, in the Palatinate, Germany, Feb. 18, 1784, and emigrated to America in 1805. Having received a good preparatory training in Europe, he studied theology with Dr. Becker, of Baltimore, Md., and was ordained in 1808.

His first pastoral charge consisted of six congregations in Lehigh County, Pa. In 1815 he was sent as a missionary to Ohio, returning after some years to Pennsylvania to take charge of congregations in Berks and Montgomery counties. Here he labored with success till his death. He died suddenly on his way home from Synod, of cholera, Oct. 5, 1832. Three of his sons are now actively engaged in the work of the ministry in the German Reformed Church. He preached only in the German language. A number of prominent German Reformed ministers received their theological training under him.

Decimae

SEE TITHES.

Decision, Valley Of

(/Wr j ḥ, qm,[ẹ*E'mek, he-Charuts'*, vale of the sentence; Sept. ἡ κοιλὰς τῆς δίκης, Vulg. *Vallis concisionis*), a name poetically given to the Valley of JEHOSHAPHAT *SEE JEHOSHAPHAT* (q.v.), as being the ideal scene of the signal inflictions by Jehovah upon Zion's enemies at their restoration (Joel 3:14). In perversion of some such prediction, the Mohammedans still believe that the final judgment will take place on this spot, and have accordingly left a stone in the city wall overhanging the valley, projecting as a seat for their prophet in the capacity of judge.

Decius

Picture for Decius

C. MESSIUS QUINTUS TRAJANUS, a Roman emperor, was born at Bubalia, in Lower Pannonia, towards the close of the second century. Being sent in 249 by the emperor Philippus to restore to subordination the army of Moesia, which was in a state of revolt, the troops proclaimed him emperor against his will, and forced him to march upon Italy. Philippus having been defeated and slain, Decius assumed the government of the empire in the end of the year A.D. 249, but his brief reign was one of restless warring with the Goths, fighting against whom he was killed near Abricium, in the close of the year 251. Decius was an emperor of more than ordinary ability, but his reign was stained by a bloody persecution of the Christians. In point of time this persecution ranks as the seventh, but in point of cruelty it was only equaled by that of Diocletian. *SEE PERSECUTIONS*. For about forty years prior to the accession of Decius the Christians had enjoyed peace,

which only in some parts of the Roman empire was, for a short time, interrupted by a. decree of the emperor Maximin. The effect of this peace upon the religious life of the Church was, in general, not favorable. Cyprian, Origen, and other ecclesiastical writers complain that worldliness, avarice, and other vices had become prevalent, and that marriages of Christians with pagans had become frequent. Soon after his accession to the throne (probably at the beginning of the year 250), Decius issued a severe decree against the Christians. The decree itself is lost, the *Edictum Decii Augusti contra Christianos*, which was published in 1664 at Toulouse by Bernard Medonius from Acts of the Martyrs, being spurious, as has been shown by Tillemont and Mosheim. The contents of the decree are, however, fully noticed by Gregory of Nyssa and other ancient writers. It ordered the civil magistrates to destroy Christianity by threatening Christians with the severest punishments and by using against them tortures of every kind. It was sent to the governors of all the provinces, and most of them hastened to execute it. They promulgated the decree, and demanded that within a certain time every Christian should appear before the civil magistrate, and publicly declare his renunciation of the Christian faith; in the case of refusal, he was to suffer severe punishment, even death. Dionysius of Alexandria and Cyprian have given detailed description, of the persecution in the region of Carthage and Alexandria. Cyprian says that at the first news of the impending persecution a majority of the brethren hastened to renounce the faith, but his account is suspected of exaggeration. That the number of apostates was very large is also reported by Eusebius. Of those who remained faithful, most left the cities and sought refuge in solitude, Among this class were many of the most celebrated bishops, as Cyprian, Dionysius of Alexandria, and Gregory Thaumaturgus. This action was generally approved by the Church. The number of those, however, who neither fled nor apostatized was so great that, as ‘soon as the time appointed for the execution of the decree arrived, the prisons were not sufficient to contain those who were arrested. Decius wished executions to be avoided, but every conceivable torture, if necessary, to be resorted to. Most of the civil magistrates vied with each other in inventing the most cruel tortures; only a few showed a spirit of sympathy and leniency. The number of those who succumbed to the torture (*lapsi*) was very large. Many procured false certificates that they had abjured the faith (*libellatici*). On the other hand, however, the number of those who died or were mutilated for the faith was considerable. In Rome, Antioch, and Jerusalem the several bishops were massacred; Origen,

famous among the early fathers, was subjected to the most acute tortures. All the ancient martyrologies abound in names of those who are reported to have suffered martyrdom under Decius, and Tillemont spent much time and labor to sift the genuine reports from the spurious (*Memoires*, 3, 133-189). Fortunately, the persecution of Decius did not last long. About Easter, 251, Cyprian could return from his concealment. The war which the emperor had to carry on against the Goths, his absence from Rome, the inroads of barbarians into the African provinces, and several insurrections, greatly moderated the persecution at the beginning of the year 251. When Decius, towards the close of the year, fell in a battle against the Goths, the Christians were set at liberty. — Herzog, *Real-Encyklop.* 3, 309; Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchen.-Lex.* 3, 59; Neander, *Church History* (Torrey's transl.), vol. 2.

Deck

i.e. BEDECK (properly hr;[; *adah'*, to adorn, Ezekiel 16:11, 13; 23:40; Job 40:10; Jeremiah 4:30; Hosea 2:13). *SEE ORNAMENT*.

Declamation

a speech made in the tone and manner of an oration, uniting the expression of action to propriety of pronunciation, in order to give the sentiment its full impression on the mind. The word is used also in a disparaging sense, as when it is said such a speech was mere declamation, it implies that it was deficient in point of reasoning, or had more sound than sense. — Buck, *Theol. Dictionary,* s.v. *SEE HOMILETICS*.

Declaratio Thorunensis

a confession of faith of the Reformed churches in Poland, drawn up at Thorn in 1645, for the settlement of disputed questions (*ad liquidationem controversiarum*). It is given in Niemeyer, *Collectio Confessionum*, p. 669 (Lips. 1840).

Decorated Style

SEE ARCHITECTURE.

De Courcy Richard,

a divine of the Church of England, born in Ireland, was educated at Trinity College, Dublin; became curate of Shanbury, Shropshire, in 1770; afterwards vicar of St. Alkmond in 1774, and died in 1803. In his sermons his language is dignified, and his reasoning perspicuous, embellished by apposite allusions, and ornamented by many of the graces of oratory. His principal works are, Sermons, to which is prefixed an essay on the nature, etc. of a pure and undefiled religion (Shrewsbury, 1805, 8vo); *Christ Crucified, the distinguishing Topic of the Gospel* (Lond. 1816, 8vo). — Darling, *Cyclopoedia Bibliographica*, s.v.; Jones, *Christian Biography*, p. 125 (Lond. 1829).

Decree

(properly tD;*dath* [Daniel 2:9, 13, 15, elsewhere "law"], δόγμα [Luke 2:1; Acts 16:4; 17:7, elsewhere "ordinance"], an edict; also rzB; *gazar'* [Esther 2:1, κρίνω [1 Corinthians 7:37, elsewhere usually "judge"], to determine; but represented by several other Heb. words), an official resolution passed by magisterial authority (see Crabbe's *Engl. Synonymes*, s.v.). Among the Orientals the enactments of the kings were proclaimed publicly by criers (Jeremiah 34:8, 9; Jonah 3:5-7), who are designated in Daniel (Daniel 3:4, 5:29) by the term azÞrK; *karoza'*, the herald. They were made known in distant provinces, towns, and cities by messengers sent for that purpose (1 Samuel 11:7; Ezra 1:1; Amos 4:5). The message thus to be communicated in any town or city was publicly announced when the messenger had arrived in the gate of the city, or in some other public place. At Jerusalem it was announced in the Temple, where there were always a great many persons present. It was for the same reason that the prophets were accustomed to utter their prophecies in the Temple. *SEE PROCLAMATION*.

Decrees Of The Council Of The Apostles At Jerusalem

(Acts 15). These related to the following prohibitions, "that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood" (ver. 20); or, as it is repeated (ver. 29), "that ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication." These are declared (ver. 28) to be "necessary" prohibitions. This necessity (as the γάρ, "for," of ver. 21 intimates) lay in

the fact that wherever the Jews resided the law of Moses was read, and thus the ordinances in question were so deeply impressed upon the people's mind that they could. not tolerate the neglect of them by the Gentile Christians. Instead of laying upon the Gentiles the burden of the whole law, and consequently of circumcision, the convention of apostles and elders resolved to enforce upon them only the reception of certain individual precepts of easy observance. The object of this canon was plainly nothing but to meet in some measure the difficulties of the Jewish Christians, and to lead the Gentile Christians to shun whatever might prove offensive to their Jewish brethren, as otherwise, under the existing usages and prejudices of education and caste, it would be impossible for them to associate together in a mixed community and church without scandal. In all this it was clearly indicated that the prohibitions were not absolute; once let the Jewish Christians be more thoroughly freed from the O.T. forms, and the end for which these regulations were made would no longer exist. Now the ground on which these particular points were brought into view is explained by the circumstance that they were wont to be laid upon the proselytes of the Gate in the so-called "seven precepts of Noah" (comp. Buxtorf, *Lex. Rab*. s.v. rGe407 sq.). *SEE PROSELYTE*. This, therefore, is the import of the arrangement, that the Gentile Christians should not be obliged to become "proselytes of righteousness" by circumcision, but only to live as "proselytes of the Gate." Those of the seven precepts of Noah, *SEE NOAH, PRECEPTS OF*, which are here omitted, viz. the ones regarding blasphemy, murder, robbery, and sedition, was of such a kind that it was self-evident to Christians that the like could have no place among them; in the present dinstance it was not so much precepts of a purely moral character that required to be brought forward, as precepts that referred simply to the outward life. *SEE APOSTOLICAL COUNCIL*.

1. That the "pollutions of idols" (ἀλισγήματα τῶν εἰδώλων) are thus to be understood of an outward act, viz. the eating of the flesh of sacrifices, is quite cleat from the analogous expression, "things offered to idols" (εἰδωλόθυτα, idol-sacrifices), in the parallel verse. Tho more particular distinction made by Paul in 1 Corinthians 10, between such flesh of sacrifices as was bought like any other in the shambles and such as was eaten in the temple at an idol festival, is not entered into by the assembly; they interdict in the widest sense all eating of sacrifices because the Jews took offense at it. *SEE ALISGEMA*.

2. The same holds good of the eating of blood, and, which is the same thing, of that which was strangled, in which the blood remained coagulated. The Jews had the utmost abhorrence of blood as food, which was grounded particularly upon Leviticus 17:10, 11, where it is not merely said that Jehovah would set his face against the perpetrator of this act, but the blood is also represented as the support of the soul (comp. Genesis 9:4), that is, of the physical life, and it is placed in connection with the propitiation, which can only be made by the shedding of blood (Hebrews 9:22). This law appears to have been strictly observed by the primitive Church (Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.* v. 1), and even in the Middle Ages the injunction was frequently given by the spiritual authorities to avoid the eating of blood (especially in the Greek Church: see canon 67 of the second Council at Trullo in 692; in the Latin Church, Augustine already took the right view, contr. Faustum, 32:13). *SEE BLOOD*.

3. The mention of *fornication* (πορνεία) appears to be quite foreign to the nature of the other injunctions, and opposed to the above view of these apostolical ordinances. — It blends a purely moral precept with enactments that refer only to matters of outward observance. The conjectural emendation (πορκείας, or χοιρείας, for πορνείας, in both passages) that proposes to refer this clause to the eating of swine's flesh is negatived by the fact that no such abstinence is alluded to in the Noachian precepts; and the forced explanation of the term (πορνεία for θυσία πορνική), as alluding to a sacrifice purchased by the hire of a harlot, is sufficiently refuted by the objection that this would refer to a state of matters so grossly sinful as could not be thought of among Christians. Undoubtedly the only proper course is to bring into view the greater freedom of intercourse between the sexes that prevailed among the Greeks and Romans, which waas an abomination to the more serious Jews, and appeared to them, in fact, a refined species of harlotry. By the word in question, therefore, which comprehends not only gross violations of the seventh commandment, but also more polished sins of this kind, the assembled brethren enjoin upon the heathen Christians greater care and. circumspection in their intercourse with the female sex, that they might give no offense to the Jewish Christians (Olshausen, *Comment.* in loc. 3, 336, Am. ed.). Another reason for the insertion of this rule respecting chastity probably was the shameless violation of purity that every where took place in connection with the pagan festivals, and constituted an additional reason for a total disconnection with all idolatrous rites

(Conybeare and Howson, *St. Paul*, 1:217). See Schaff, *Apost. Church*, § 69; and FORNICATION.

Among special treatises on this subject are the following: Bagge. Περὶ ἀλισγημάτων (Jen. 1748); Benzel, *De decreto apostolico* (Lund. 1738); Dannhauer, Διατύπωσις *concilii Hieros*. (Argent. 1648); Deyling, De πορνείᾳ vetita (in his *Obss. Sacr.* ii, 469 sq.); Doderlein, *De sensu decreti apost*. (Butzov. 1769 sq.); Dorscheus, *De sanguine et suffocato* (Rostock, 1683); Hasaeus, id. (Brem. 1703); Moebius, id. (Lips. 1688); Hannecken, *De sanguine escario* (Giess. 1673); Heidegger, *In concil. Hieros*. (Tigur. 1678); id. *De sanguine et suffocato* (Amst. 1662); Langguth, *De concil. apost. canone* (Erf. 1681); Leonhard, *De decreto coane. Hieros*. (Jen. 1725); Nitzsch, *De decreto apostolico* (Viteb. 1795; also in *Veli thusenii Comment.* 6:385-418); Nosselt, *De conc. Hieros*. (Lips. 1678); Schottgen, *De ritibus in synode Hieros. prohibitis* (Starg. 1723); Velthern, *Hist. conc. Hieros*. (Jen. 1693); Wandalin, *Circa sanguinem escarium* (Viteb. 1678); Carpzov, *De controversiis theologicis* (Lips. 1695); Kripner, *De esca idolis immolatorum* (Jen. 1720); Crusius, *De lege Mosaica inter Christianos* (Lips. 1770); Weemse, *The seven Precepts of Noah* (in his *Exposition*, 2:40); Spencer, *De Legib. Hebr.* i; Barrington, *Works*, 2:265; Nind, *Sermons*, 2:27; Wedgewood, *Decrees of the holy Apostles* (Lond. 1851). *SEE COUNCIL OF APOSTLES*.

Decrees Of God

SEE PREDESTINATION.

Decretals

letters from the popes of Rome deciding points of ecclesiastical law. For the history and collection of the decretals, *SEE CANON LAW*; *SEE CLEMENTINES*. The decretals compose the chief part of the canon law.

Decretals, Pseudo-Isidorian.

By this name a collection of spurious letters of popes is designated. They were first brought into use in the 9th century, in connection with the so-called Spanish collection of canons and decrees. *SEE CANONS*. The author of this collection placed at its head a spurious preface of Isidore Mercator (according to some manuscripts, Peccator), and for this reason they were ascribed, as early as the 9th century, to Isidore of Seville (q.v.).

During the Middle Ages they were generally considered genuine, but in the 15th century doubts of their genuineness were expressed by Nicholas de Cusa, *SEE CUSA*, and others, and in the 16th the Magdeburg centuriators (q.v.) and other Protestant historians so conclusively established their spuriousness that it is now admitted even by Roman Catholic writers. The birth-place, age, author, and motives of these letters are still controverted questions, and have called forth a large number of thorough investigations, by which several important points have been established with a high degree of probability. There is a large number of manuscripts (more than fifty) of this collection extant, and it is believed that a more careful study and comparison of them will lead to new results. The order of the documents, according to *Codex Vaticanus* (No. 630), a manuscript of the 12th century, is as follows: The preface is followed by a letter of Aurelius to Damasus, and the answer of the latter, both spurious; the *Ordo de celebrando concilio*, borrowed from the fourth Council of Toledo; a list of councils and a spurious correspondence between Jerome and Damasus. Then begins Part I, consisting of 50 apostolic canons; 59 spurious letters of the popes, from Clement to Melchiades (in chronological order); a treatise, *De primitiva ecclesia et synodo Niccena*, and the spurious *Donation of Constantine*. Part II begins with a section of the preface of the genuine Spanish collection of canons, and another section of the collection of Quesnel, and contains the Greek, African, Gallic, and Spanish councils, agreeing in all essential points with the Spanish collection. Part III begins likewise with a section of the preface of the genuine collection, which is followed by the decretals of the popes from Sylvester to Gregory II († 731); among them 35 spurious ones. The total number of spurious decretals in the collection is 94. Whether all of them belonged to the original collection, or whether a part were of later manufacture, is still a controverted point. The sources used by the compiler are the works of Cassiodorus and Rufinus, the *Liber Pontficalis*, the *Vulgata*, the works of the fathers, the theological literature up to the 9th century, the genuine decretals and decrees of councils, the so-called *Capitula Angilrami* (q.v.), and the Roman law collection, especially the *Visigothic Breviarium Alaricaanum* (see Knust, *defontibus et consilio Psalm Isidoriane collectionis*, Gottingen, 1832). The opinion of Rosshirt (*Zu den kirchenrechtlichen Quellen des ersten Jahrtausends undzu denpseudoisidorischen Decretalen*, Heidelberg, 1849) that the compilers used many more sources than are now known, and that most of the papal

letters which are now generally considered as spurious were probably taken from other collections, has not met with much approval.

As this collection was used by the popes with great effect to amplify their power over the bishops, it was long a common opinion that the compilers aimed chiefly at confirming and enlarging the papal power; but this opinion is now universally abandoned. Others, especially modern Roman Catholic writers, as Mohler, Walter, and Hefele, attribute to the falsifier the "wish to put an end to the confusion and servitude of the Church, and the uncertainty of law in his times, by introducing a uniform code of ecclesiastical discipline, clothed with the prestige of antiquity." The most common opinion at present is that the compiler wished to free the episcopal power from dependence on the state, and to weaken, for the same purpose, the influence of the metropolitans and provincial synods. With regard to the time of the compilation, it has been established with certainty that it falls between 829 and 857. The author is not yet known. Benedict Levita, Otgar, archbishop of Mainz, and others, have been assumed. W The place where it was compiled was most probably the western part of the Frankish empire. The first mention of the collection is made in the proceedings of the Synod of Chiersy, in 857; and a few years later pope Nicholas I used it efficiently in his controversy with Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims. After the end of the 9th century numerous extracts were made, and they were received into all the large collections of canons, *SEE CANONS*, made during the Middle Ages. As regards the influence of the false decretals, it has been overrated by those who believe that the primacy of the Roman popes is mainly due to this vast fraud; and, on the other hand, it is underrated by the Roman Catholic writers, who maintain that the pseudo-decretals produced no change in the discipline of the Church, and were only an expression of the tendencies of those times, which, without them, would have been developed in the same manner. The truth, as has been already intimated, probably is, that the pseudo-decretals were compiled for the purpose of furthering episcopal tendencies, in opposition to the rights of metropolitans and provincial synods, but that they also greatly contributed to the development of the Roman primacy, and were unscrupulously used by the popes for this purpose.

There are two editions of the false decretals, the first in the Collection of Councils by Merlin (tom. i, Paris, 1523), and the second in Migne's *Patrologia Lat.* tom. 130 (Paris), which is only a reprint of the former. See Ballerini (*Opp. Leon*. tom. 3, p. 215, ss.); Theiner, *De pseudoisidoriana*

canonum collectione (Bresl. 1826); Wasserschleben, *Beitrage zur Geschichte der falschen Decretalen* (Breslau, 1844); Möhler, *aus und iuber Pseudoisidor* (in his *Gesammelte Schriften*, Regensb. 1838, vol. i); Gfrörer, *Pseudoisidor* (in *Frei. burger Zeitschrift. far Theologie*, vol. 17); Weizsacker, *Hincmar und Pseudoisidor* (in *Zeitschrift fair theologische Literatur*, 1858); and the *Manuals of Ecclesiastical Law* by Richter, Walter, Rosshirt, Phillips, and others.

Decuriônes

magistrates in the Roman provinces, who formed a body to represent the Roman Senate in free and corporate towns. Each decurion consisted of ten persons; and their duty was to watch over the interests of their fellow-citizens, and to increase the revenues of the commonwealth. The early Church was compelled to make laws to prevent the ordination of any man of this class as a presbyter or deacon. Instances had occurred in which presbyters had been compelled, after thirty years' service as ministers of Christ, to resume their curial offices. In some cases, after ordination, they were required to serve as flamens, and were crowned as heathen priests, while they exhibited the public games and shows to the people. The law forbidding the ordination of such persons was enacted to prevent this scandal. — Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. 4, ch. 4, § 4.

De'dan

(Heb. *Dedan'*, ˆdD; according to Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 322, from the Arab. signifying sport; according to Fürst, *Hebr. Handw.* p. 288, by reduplication from ˆD; in the sense of deep; in Ezekiel 25:13, with h local or paragogic, *Deda'neh*, hndD; "they of Dedan"), the name of one or two men or tribal progenitors. *SEE DODANIM*.

1. (Sept. Δαδάν, Δαιδάν.) A son of Raamah, son of Cush (Genesis 10:7; 1 Chronicles 1:9, "the sons of Raamah, Sheba, and Dedan"). B.C. considerably post 2513. *SEE CUSH*. His descendants are perhaps mentioned by Isaiah (Isaiah 21:13) and Ezekiel (Ezekiel 27:15, Sept. ῾Ροδίων v. r. Ἀραδίων; 20, Sept. Δαιδάν v. r. Δεδάν; 38:13, Sept. Δαιδάν; 25:13, Sept. Δεδάν or Δαιδάν v. r. διωκόμενοι). See below.

2. (Sept. Δαιδάν, v.r. in Jeremiah 49:8, Δαιδάμ) A son of Jokshan (1 Chronicles 1:32), son of Keturah (Genesis 25:3: "Jokshan begat Sheba and Dedan; and the sons of Dedan were Asshurim, Letushim, and Leummim").

B.C. post 1988. The usual opinion respecting this and the preceding founder of tribes is that the first settled among the sons of Cush, probably on the borders of the Persian Gulf; the second on the Syrian borders, about the territory of Edom (Michaelis, *Spicileg*. 1:201 sq.). But Vater (*Comment.* 1:120; followed by Gesenius, *Thes. Heb.* p. 322) has suggested that the name may apply to one tribe, and this may be adopted as probable on the supposition that the descendants of the Keturahite Dedan intermarried with those of the Cushite Dedan. *SEE ARABIA*. The theory of this mixed descent gains weight from the fact that in each case the brother of Dedan is named Sheba. It may be supposed that the Dedanites were among the chief traders traversing the caravan-route from the head of the Persian Gulf to the south of Palestine, bearing merchandise of India, and possibly of Southern Arabia, and hence the mixture of such a tribe with another of different (and Keturahite) descent presents no impossibility. The passages in the Bible in which Dedan is mentioned (besides the genealogies above referred to) are contained in the prophecies of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, and are in every case obscure. The Edomitish settlers seem to be referred to in Jeremiah 49:8, where Dedan is mentioned in the prophecy against Edom; again in 25:23, with Tema and Buz; in Ezekiel 25:13, with Teman, in the prophecy against Edom; and in Isaiah 21:13 ("The burden upon Arabia. In the forest in Arabia shall ye lodge, O ye traveling companies of Dedanim"), with Tema and Kedar. This last passage is by some understood to refer to caravans of the Cushite Dedan; and although it may only signify the wandering propensities of a nomad tribe; such as the Edomitish portion of Dedan may have been, the supposition that it means merchant-caravans is strengthened by the remarkable words of Ezekiel in the lamentation for Tyre. This chapter (27) twice mentions Dedan; first in ver. 15, where, after enumerating among the traffickers with the merchant-city many Asiatic peoples, it is said, "The children of Dedan were thy merchants, many isles (µyYaa) were the merchandise of thine hand: they brought thee for a present horns of ivory, and ebony." Passing thence to Syria and western and northern peoples, the prophet again (in ver. 20) mentions Dedan in a manner which seems to point to the wide spread and possibly the mixed ancestry of this tribe. Ver. 15 may be presumed to allude especially to the Cushite Dedan (comp. ch. 38:13, where we find Dedan with Sheba and the merchants of Tarshish; apparently, from the context, the Dedan of chap. 27:15); but the passage commencing in v. 20 appears to include the settlers on the borders of Edom (i.e. the Keturahite Dedan). The whole of the passage is as follows: "Dedan [was] thy

merchant in precious clothes for chariots. Arabia, and all the princes of Kedar, they occupied with thee in lambs, and rams, and goats: in these [were they] thy merchants. The merchants of Sheba and Raamah they [were] thy merchants: they occupied in thy fairs with chief of all spices, and with all precious stones, and gold. Haran, and Canneh, and Eden, the merchants of Sheba, Asshur, [and] Chilmad, [were] thy merchants" (Ezekiel 27:20-23). We have here a Dedan connected with Arabia (probably the northwestern part of the peninsula) and Kedar, and also with the father and brother of the Cushite Dedan (Raamah and Sheba), and these latter with Asiatic peoples commonly placed in the regions bordering the head of the Persian gulf. This Dedan, moreover, is a merchant, not in pastoral produce, in sheep and goats, but in "precious clothes," in contradistinction to Arabia and Kedar, like the far-off Eastern nations who came with "spices, and precious stones, and gold," "blue clothes and broidered work," and "chests of rich apparel."

The probable inferences from these mentions of Dedan support the argument first stated, namely,

1. That Dedan, son of Raamah, settled on the shores of the Persian gulf, and his descendants became caravan. merchants between that coast and Palestine.

2. That Jokshan, or a son of Jokshan, by intermarriage with the Cushite Dedan, formed a tribe of the same name, which appears to have had its chief settlement in the bolders of Idumaea, and perhaps to have led a pastoral life.

All traces of the name of Dedan, whether in Idumaea or on the Persian gulf, are lost in the works of Arab geographers and historians. The Greek and Roman geographers, however, throw some light on the eastern settlement; and a native indication of the name is presumed to exist in the island of Dadan, on the borders of the gulf (see Bochart, *Phaleg*, 4:6; Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* 3, 1:146, 153; 2:184, 560, 564, 604, 744; Bisching, *Asia*, p. 562; Wahl, *Descr. Asice*, p. 639; Niebuhr, *Arabien*, p. 308 sq.; Heeren, *Ideen*, I, 2:227, 419; Barbosa, *Ranusio raccolte*, 1:288). The identification must be taken in connection with the recovery of the name of Sheba, the other son of Raamah, on the island of Awal, near the Arabian shore of the same gulf. *SEE RAAMAH*.

Ded'anim

(Heb. *Dedanim'*, µynædD; a patrial from Dedan; Sept. Δαιδάν), the descendants of the Arabian DEDAN *SEE DEDAN* (q.v.), spoken of (Isaiah 21:13) as engaged in commerce. Some, however, following the various rendering of the versions (Michaelis, *Spicileg*. 1:115 sq.), have thought the Rhodians to be meant, and others have even conjectured an allusion to the *Dodona*, a famous oracle of Epirus (Strabo, 7:504-7, ed. Almelon.).

Dedicate

(prop. Ënij ; *chanak'*, to initiate, Deuteronomy 20:5; 1 Kings 8:63; 2 Chronicles 7:5; elsewhere vyDæhi; *hakdish'*, to hallow, and other Heb. terms), a religious ceremony whereby any thing is dedicated or consecrated to the service of God; and it appears to have originated in the desire to commence, with peculiar solemnity, the practical use and application of whatever had been set apart to the divine service. Thus Moses dedicated the tabernacle in the wilderness (Exodus 40; Numbers 7); Solomon his Temple (1 Kings 8); the returned exiles theirs (Ezra 6:16,17); Herod his (Josephus, *Ant*. 15:11, 6). The Maccabees, having cleansed the Temple from its pollutions under Antiochus Epiphanes, again dedicated the altar (1 Maccabees 4:52-59), and an annual festival was established in commemoration of the event. This feast was celebrated not only at Jerusalem, but everywhere throughout the country, in which respect it differed from the feasts of the Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles, which could only be observed at Jerusalem. See below.

Not only were sacred places thus dedicated, but some kind of dedicatory solemnity was observed with respect to cities, walls, gates, and even private houses (Deuteronomy 20:5; Psalm 30, title; Nehemiah 12:27). We may trace the continuance of these usages in the custom of consecrating or dedicating churches and chapels, and in the ceremonies connected with the "opening" of roads, markets, bridges, etc., and with the launching of ships. *SEE CONSECRATION*.

Dedication, The Feast Of The

(τὰ ἐγκαίνια, the renewal, John 10:22 [which the Sept. has in Numbers 7:10]; Vulg. *encania*), the festival instituted to commemorate the purging of the Temple and the rebuilding of the altar after Judas Maccabaeus had

driven out the Syrians, B.C. 164 (1 Maccabees 4:52-59, where it is ὁ ἐγκαινισμὸς τοῦ θυσιατηρίου, the restoration of the altar, because the old and profaned altar was then replaced; but in 2 Maccabees 10:5, ὁ καθαρισμὸς τοῦ ναοῦ, the purification of the Temple: the modern Jews call it simply *chanukah'*, hkwnj[“dedication,” as occurs in Numbers 7:10, 11, 84, 88; 2 Chronicles 7:9; Nehemiah 12:27; Psalm 30, title; Ezra 6:16, 17; Daniel 3:2, 31, as in the Mishna; but Josephus, *Ant.* 12:7, 7, styles it φῶτα, *lights*). The following account of it is chiefly from Rabbinical sources. *SEE ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES*.

Mode in which this Festival was and still is celebrated. — It commenced on the 25th of Chisleu, *SEE CALENDAR, JEWISH*, and lasted eight days, but it did not require attendance at Jerusalem. (Jesus, however, was present there during this season, χειμών, or winter, John 10:20.) It was an occasion of much festivity. — The Jews assembled in the Temple or in the synagogues of the places wherein they resided (*Rosh haShana*, 18:2), carrying branches of trees and palms in their hands, and sang psalms to the God of their salvation. No fast or mourning on account of any calamity or bereavement was permitted to commence during the festival (Mishna, *Taanith*, 2:10; *Moed Katon*, 3, 9); the Temple and all private houses were lighted up within and without by lanterns and torches every evening during the eight days in token of this joy (1 Maccabees 4:52-59; 2 Maccabees 10:6, etc.; Mishna, *Baba Kama*, v. 6), for which reasons Josephus also calls it λύχνων ἀνακαύσεις, the Feast of Lamps (comp. *Ant.* 12:7 7,7 with Apion. 2:39). Maimonides, in discoursing upon this subject, distinctly declares that “the lighting up of the lamps is a commandment from the scribes.” “The order is,” says he, “that every house should light one light, whether the inmates thereof be many or only one. He, however, who honors the injunction has as many lights as there are inmates in the house — he has a light for every man and woman. And he who respects it still more adds a light for every individual every night, so that if a house wherein are ten inmates began with ten lights, it would end with eighty” (Mishna, Torah Hilchoth Megillah VeChanukah, sec. iv, p. 326, b). These lamps must be lighted immediately after sunset by the head of the family, who pronounces the three following benedictions:

1. “Blessed art thou, Lord our God, King of the world, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and enjoined upon us to light the lamps of the Feast of the Dedication.”

2. “Blessed art thou, Lord our God, King of the world, who hast done wonders for our forefathers in those days about this time;” and,

3. “Blessed art thou, Lord our God, King of the world, who hast preserved us in life and health, and hast permitted us to see this day!” The third benediction however, is only pronounced on the first day of this festival. The practice of illumination in connection with this festival is, as we have seen, of very old date, and was most probably suggested by the fact that “the lamps which were upon the candlestick” were lighted by the people at the restoration of the Temple service (1 Maccabees 4:50, 51), as well as by the natural feeling existing among most nations to have illuminations on occasions of great joy. The Egyptians also had a similar festival (Herod. 2:62). Midrashim of very great antiquity, however, give another reason for this custom of lighting lamps. They tell us that “when the Maccabees went into the Temple after vanquishing the enemy, and wanted to light the candlestick, they could not find any oil, except one vial, and it was sealed with the ring of the high-priest, which assured them that it was not polluted, but it was just enough to light one day. Whereupon God, whose glory dwelleth in the heavens, blessed it, so that they were able to feed the lamps therewith for eight days. Wherefore the Maccabees and all the people, like one man, have ordained that these eight days should henceforth be days of joy and rejoicing, like the festivals ordained in the law, and that lamps should be lighted on those days, to make known the wondrous works which the God of the heavens hath wrought for them” (*Megillath Antiochus*, p. 145, ed. Jellinek; Talmud, *Sabbath*, 21, b). Now, whatever we may think about the embellishments of this story, it is not at all unlikely that a vial of oil was actually discovered in the Temple just at a time when it was most wanted, and that this is one of the reasons why the lighting of lamps has been instituted.

At every morning prayer during the whole of this festival, a portion of the 7th chapter of Numbers is read in the synagogue by the prelector, in accordance with a very old custom (Mishna, *Megilla*, 3, 6); thus, on the first day, Numbers 7:1-17, is read after the regular lesson of the Pentateuch, if it is a Sabbath, and the Haphtorah, or the portion from the Prophets, is Zechariah 2; on the second, Numbers 7:18-23, is read, beginning with “On the second day,” etc., and the same Haphtorah; on the third day, Numbers 7:24-29, and the same Haphtorah, and so on. In the Temple at Jerusalem, the “Hallel” was sung every day of the feast. Connected with this festival is the celebration of the exploits performed by

Judith (q.v.) upon Holofernes, because, as some suppose, she was of the stock of the Maccabees. Hence some of the Midrashim which give. the history of Judas Maccabaeus mix up with it the history of Judith.

Modern Jews keep the feast of lights very strictly, but servile work is not forbidden to be done. The feast is observed as one of rejoicing for the wonders which God wrought for them. During the eight days, parents and children amuse themselves in different innocent games, particularly the last night, when neighbors and friends meet together to enjoy themselves. The Karaites, however, do not observe this festival, because it is an uninspired ordinance.

There are four other dedications of the Temple recorded:

1. The dedication of the Solomonic Temple (1 Kings 8:2; 2 Chronicles 5:3), which took place in the seventh month, or in the autumn. B.C. 1003. This was coincident with the *Feast of Tabernacles* (q.v.).

2. The dedication at the time of Hezekiah, when the Temple was purified from the abominations which his father Ahaz introduced into it (2 Chronicles 29). B.C. 726. *SEE HEZEKIAH*.

3. The dedication of Zerubbabel's Temple, built after the captivity (Ezra 6:16), which took place in the month Adar, in the spring. B.C. 517.

4. The dedication of Herod's Temple (Josephus, *Ant.* 15:11, 6). B.C. 22. Some of the fathers have therefore thought that Jesus is said to have gone to the celebration commemorative of the dedication of Solomon's Temple or of Zerubbabel's. The fact, however, that there was *no annual festival to commemorate these dedications*, and that the evangelist John distinctly says that it was in the winter, establishes it beyond doubt that our Lord went to the Feast of the Dedication instituted by Judas Maccabaeus. *SEE TEMPLE*.

Literature. — Maimonides, *Mishna Torah, or Yad HaChazaca; Hilchoth Megilla Ve-Chanukah*, sec. 3 and 4; *Megillath Antiochus*, printed in Bartolocci, *Bibliotheca Magna*, 1:382, etc.*; Midrash, Le-Chanukah*, and *Midrash, Achar le-Chanukah*, published by Dr. Adolph Jellinek in Beth ha-Midrash (Leipzig, 1853), 1:132, etc. This volume also contains (p. 142, etc.) a reprint of Megillath Antiochus. See also the volumes quoted in this article, and in Fabricius, *Bibliog. Antiquar.* p. 419 sq. Likewise Otho, *Lex. Rab.* p. 238 sq.; Lightfoot and Wetstein, *in loc. Job.;* Wahner, *De festo*

Enceniorum (Helmst. 1715); Weber, *De Encenius* (Lips. 1683); Venne, *De jure circa Encoenia* (Erf. 1718); and *the treatises De Encaeniis templorum*, by Dannenberger (Lips. 1754), *Lincke* (Altdorf, 1678), *Lund* (Upsal. 1706), *Reich* (Altdorf, 1713). *SEE FESTIVALS*.

Dedication of Churches

SEE CONSECRATION.

De Dieu

SEE DIEU, DE.

De Dominis

SEE DOMINIS, DE.

Deep

(the representative in the A. V. of several Heb. words, especially µ/hT] *tehom'*, Genesis 1:2, etc. an abyss, often rendered "depth;" ἄβυσσος, Luke 8:31; Romans 10:7, elsewhere "bottomless pit'). The deep, or the great deep, in its literal sense, signifies, chiefly in Scripture —

1. Hell, the place of punishment, the bottomless pit (Luke 8:31; Revelation 9:1; 11:7).

2. The common receptacle of the dead; the grave, the deep or depths of the earth, under which the body is deposited: the state of the soul corresponding thereto, still more unseen, still deeper, still further distant from human inspection, is that remote country, that "bourne from whence no traveler returns" (Romans 10:7).

3. The deepest parts of the sea.(Psalm 49:15; 107:26).

4. The chaos, which, in the beginning of the world, was unformed and vacant (Genesis 1:2). *SEE ABYSS*.

Deer

Picture for Deer

Although this word occurs in the English Bible only in the connection FALLOW DEER *SEE FALLOW DEER* (q.v.), it properly represents

several terms in the original, which are variously translated, and which denote widely different members of the antelope and cervic families. *SEE CHAMOIS*; *SEE GOAT*; *SEE OX*; *SEE PYGARG*; *SEE ROE*, etc. For the proper deer we find the following variations of the same word *ayyal’* (lW;ai, an intensive of lyæ; q. d. a large ram; Sept. ἔλαφος), the male, always rendered “hart” (q.v.), occurs Deuteronomy 12:15, 22; 14:5; 15:22; 1 Kings 4:23; Psalm 42:1; Song of Solomon 2:9, 17; 8:14; Isaiah 35:6; Lamentations 1:6: *ayyalah*/ (hl;Y;ai, Genesis 49:21; 2 Samuel 22:34; Job 39:1; Psalm 18:33; 29:9; Song of Solomon 2:7; 3:5; Habakkuk 3:19), or *ayye’leth* (tl,Y,ai, Proverbs 5:19; Jeremiah 14:5), the female, always rendered “hind” in our version (Sept. στέλεχος). Many recent writers, however, either suppose different species of antelope to be meant, or, with Dr. Shaw, consider the term to be generic for several species of deer taken together. Sir J. G. Wilkinson believes the ayyal to be the Ethiopian oryx, with nearly straight horns. *SEE ANTELOPE*. It should be observed, however, that an Ethiopian species could not well be meant where the clean animals fit for the food of the Hebrews are indicated, nor where allusion is made to suffering from thirst, and to high and rocky places as the refuge of females, or of both, since all the species of oryx inhabit the open plains, and are not remarkable for their desire of drinking; nor can either of these propensities be properly ascribed to the true antelopes, or gazellae, of Arabia and Syria, all being residents of the plain and the desert; like the oryges, often seen at immense distances from water, and unwilling to venture into forests, where their velocity of flight and delicacy of structure impede and destroy them. Taking the older interpretation, and reviewing all the texts where hart and hind are mentioned, we find none where these objections truly apply. Animals of the stag kind prefer the security of forests, are always most robust in rocky mountain covers, and seek water with considerable anxiety; for of all the light-footed ruminants, they alone protrude the tongue when hard pressed in the chase. Now, comparing these qualities with several texts, we find them perfectly appropriate to the species of these genera alone. Ayyal appears to be a mutation of a common name with ἔλαφος; and although no great stress should be laid on names which, more particularly in early times, were used without much attention to specific identity, yet we find the Chaldee *ajal* and Sarmatic *jelen* strictly applied to stag. Hence the difficulty lay in the modern denial that ruminants with branched deciduous horns existed in the south-west of Asia and Egypt; and Cuvier for some time doubted,

notwithstanding Virgil's notice, whether they were found in any part of Africa; nevertheless, though not abundant where water is rare, their existence from Morocco to the Nile, and beyond it, cannot be denied; and it is likely that an Asiatic species still appears sometimes in Syria, and, no doubt, was formerly common there (see the *Penny Cycloepedia*, s.v. Deer).

1. The species usually referred to by the above Heb. terms is probably that now known by the name of Cervus barbarus, or Barbary stag, in size between the red and fallow deer, distinguished by the want of a bisantler, or second branch on the horns, reckoning from below, and by a spotted livery, which is effaced only in the third or fourth year. This species is figured on Egyptian monuments, is still occasionally seen about the natron lakes west of the Nile, and, it seems, has been observed by travelers in the desert east of the Dead Sea, on the route from Cairo towards Damascus. We take this to be the *igial* or *ajal* of the Arabs, the same which they accuse of eating fish — that is, the ceps, lizards, and snakes, a propensity common to other species, and similarly ascribed to the Virginian and Mexican deer.

2. Another species is the Persian stag, or *maral* of the Tahtar nations, and *gewazen* of Armenia, larger than the stag of Europe, clothed with a heavy mane, and likewise destitute of bisantlers. We believe this species to be the *soegur* of Asiatic Turkey, and *mara* of the Arabs, and therefore residing on the borders of the mountain forests of Syria and Palestine. One or both of these species were dedicated to the local *bona dea* on Mount Libanus — a presumptive proof that deer were found in the vicinity.

Of the hind it is unnecessary to say more than that she is the female of the stag, or hart, and that in the manners of these animals the males are always the last to hurry into cover. *SEE STAG*.

Deering

SEE DERING.

Defense

This word, besides its ordinary and proper use, stands in the English Bible as a mistranslation of two Heb. terms.

1. *Matsotr’* r/xm; in connection with µyræoy] streams, rendered in 2 Kings 19:24, “rivers of besieged places,” Sept. ποταμοι συνοχῆς, Vulg. *aquae clausae*; in Isaiah 19:6, “brooks of defense,” Sept. διώρυες τοῦ ποταμοῦ, Vulg. *rivi aggerum*; in Isaiah 37:25, “rivers of the besieged places,” Sept. συναγωγὴ ὕδατος, Vulg. *rivi aggerum*), a proper name for EGYPT, alluding to its canals, i.e. the branches of the Nile. The derivation of the term is obscure; perhaps it is only another application of the Heb. word of the same form, elsewhere signifying (literally straitness, hence) a mound or fortification, and applied to Egypt, especially Lower Egypt, as being strongly fortified, both by nature and art. *SEE MAZOR*.

2. *Be’tser* (rxB, probably something dug out of a mine, occurring only in Job, and rendered in chap. 22:24, “gold,” Sept. πέτρα, Vulg. *silex*; in ver. 25, “defense,” Sept. βοηθὸς ἀπὸ ἐχθρῶν, Vulg. *contra hostes*; in chap. 36:19, ‘gold,” Sept. δυνατὸς ἐν ἀνάγκῃ, Vulg. *tribulatio*), precious ore, i.e. of gold or silver, in its native state; an interpretation evidently required by the corresponding terms in the parallel members of the hemistichs where it occurs. *SEE GOLD*.

Defense of Christianity

SEE APOLOGY.

Defender of the Faith

(*fidei defensor*), a title belonging to the sovereign of England, as Catholicus does to the king of Spain, and Christianissimus to the king of France. It was originally conferred by Leo X on Henry VIII for his work against Martin Luther; and the bull for it bears date quinto idus Octob. 1521. It was afterwards confirmed by Clement VII. On Henry’s suppression of the monasteries, the pope of Rome deprived him of this title, and deposed him from his throne. The English Parliament (35 Henry VIII, ch. 3) confirmed the title, and it has ever since been used by English monarchs.

Defensor matrimonii

an officer of the Roman Church in every diocese, whose duty it is, in cases where a marriage is claimed to be null, to search for and produce the proofs of its validity, and to follow the case into any court to which it may be carried by appeal, with the right of originating such an appeal himself in

cases where, through some defect in the proceedings or in the testimony, a verdict of nullification has been granted upon insufficient grounds. The office was instituted by Benedict XIV by his bulls of Aug. 26, 1741, and Nov. 3, 1741 (Bullar. *Magn. tom*. xvi, p. 41, 48).

Defile

(denoted by several Heb. and Gr. words, especially amf; *tame'*, μιαίνω, denoting filthiness, but spoken chiefly in a figurative or ceremonial sense). Many were the blemishes of person and conduct which, under the Mosaic law, were esteemed defilements; some were voluntary, others involuntary; some originated with the party, others were received by him; some were inevitable and the effect of nature, others the consequences of personal transgression. Under the Gospel, defilements are those of the heart, of the mind, the temper, and the conduct. Moral defilements are as numerous, and as thoroughly prohibited under the Gospel as ever; but ceremonial defilements are superseded as requiring any religious rites, though many of them claim attention as usages of health, decency, and civility (Matthew 15:18; Genesis 49:4; Romans 1, 24; James 3:6; Ezekiel 43:8). *SEE POLLUTION*.

Degerando

SEE GERANDO, DE.

Degradation

in ecclesiastical law, the act of depriving a clergyman of his orders, or the act of deposing an offender from a higher to a lower grade of office. In the case of bishops, this degradation consisted in removal from a larger and more important see to one smaller or less considerable. Presbyters were degraded to the rank of deacons, and deacons to that of subdeacons. This kind of punishment was also inflicted on bishops in Africa by superseding them in their expected succession to the office of archbishop or metropolitan. In later times, degradation implied privation of all authority and station. An instance of ecclesiastical degradation in the eighth century at Constantinople is recorded. The patriarch Constantine was made to ascend the ambo; he was stripped by the bishops of his pallium, and anathematized; he was then made to walk out of the church backwards. When Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, was degraded by order of queen Mary, his persecutors dressed him in episcopal robes made of canvas, put

the mitre on his head, and the pastoral staff in his hand; and in this attire showed him to the people. They then stripped him piece by piece. On the Roman forms of degradation, see Elliott, *Delineation of Romanism*, bk. ii, ch. xv (Lond. edition); see also Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.* bk. xvii, ch. i, ii; *Canon 122 of Church of England*; Augusti, *Christl. Archaeologie*, 3, 401, and the article *SEE DEPOSITION*.

Degree

is the rendering in the A. V. of one Heb. and one, Gr. term (besides being employed as an adjunct in the phrases "man of high [or low] degree," where it has no [other] correspondent in the original) hl;[]m; *maalah'* (2 Kings 20:9, 10, 11 Isaiah 38:8, referring to the graduated scale of the dial [q.v.] of Ahaz, and in the titles of the Psalms entitled "*Song of Degrees*" [see below]; a step, as elsewhere generally rendered); βαθμός (only 1 Timothy 3:13, graduation or *promotion*, etc. of a deacon [q.v.] to a higher office; or perhaps rather a spiritual *stand-point* or condition, see Alford, in loc.), a *step* (as of a staircase or door, Ecclesiasticus 6:36). *SEE STAIRS*.

Degrees, Song Of

(t/l [;Mhi ryvæ, song of the steps; Sept. ᾠδὴ τῶν ἀναβαθμῶν, Vulg. *canticum graduum*), a title given to fifteen Psalms, from 120 to 134 inclusive. Four of them are attributed to David, one is ascribed to the pen of Solomon, and the other ten give no indication of their author. Eichhorn supposes them all to be the work of one and the same bard (*Einl. in das A. T.*), on the view adopted by many that the indications of authorship in these titles are not trustworthy, since they appear to have been added by a later hand, and in any casp "the very same phraseology would be employed to denote a hymn composed in honor of David or of Solomon" (Marks's *Sermons*, 1:208-9). The most generally accredited opinion, however, is that some of these hymns were preserved from a period anterior to the Babylonish captivity; that others were composed in the same spirit by those who returned to Palestine, on the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, and that a few refer even to a later date, but were all incorporated into one collection, because they had one and the same character. This view is adopted by Rosenmüller, Herder, Mendelssohn, Joel Brill; and others. With respect to the term t/l [;Mhi, or "degrees," a great diversity of opinion prevails among Biblical critics.

1. According to some, it refers to the melody to which the Psalm was to be chanted. Bellermann (*Metrik der Hebrier*, p. 190 sq.) calls these Psalms "trochaic songs." Luther translates the words "*Ein Lied im hohern Chor*," thus connecting the Psalm with the manner of its execution; and Michaelis (*in Lowth, De Sacri Poesi*, p. 511) compares hl[m with the Syriac atlkç (*Scala*), which would likewise characterize the metre or the melody (*Assem. Bibl.* 1:62); but Gesenius (*Ephemerid. Hal*. 1812, No. 205) denies to the Hebrews any metrical prosody. *SEE POETRY, HEBREW*. It is thought that the poetry of the Syrians may hereafter throw some light upon this title, as of the eight species of verse which they distinguish, one is called gradus, scala, degrees, like these Psalms, and the name appears to refer to a particular kind of metre (see *Ephem. litt.* Hal. 1815, No. 11); — but what that metre is, and whether it exists in the Psalms bearing this title, we have not yet the means of determining.

2. On slight grounds, also, some refer the name *Shir ham-Maaloth* — song of degrees — to the argument of the Psalms, and translate songs of ascent, or odes of ascension, supposing them to have been sung by the Israelites while returning from exile (Ezra 7:9), or on their annual journeys to Jerusalem in order to celebrate the festivals: hence some understand sacred marches, orpilgrim songs; but this would only apply to two of them (Psalm 122, 126). Such, however, is the opinion of Herder (*Geiste der hebraischer Poesie*), who interprets the title "Hymns for a journey." This view is advocated at length by Hengstenberg (*Comment.* on Psalms, 3:406, Edinb. ed.), and has been adopted by several later critics.

3. Aben Ezra quotes an ancient authority (so Kimchi, Saadias, Jarchi, etc. explain), which maintains that the degrees allude to the fifteen steps which, in the Temple of Jerusalem, led from the court of the women to that of the men, and on each of which steps one of the fifteen songs of degrees was chanted (comp. Talmud, *Middoth*, 2:5; *Succa*, v. 4). Adam Clarke (*Comment.* on Psalm 120) refers to a similar opinion as found in the Apocryphal Gospel of the birth of Mary: "Her parents brought her to the Temple, and set her upon one of the steps. Now there are fifteen steps about the Temple, by which they go up to it, according to the fifteen Psalms of degrees." *SEE TEMPLE*.

4. The most probable interpretation, however, is that adopted by Gesenius (*Thes. Heb.* p. 1031 sq.), that they are so called from a certain rhythm obvious in several of them, by which the sense, as it were, ascends by

degrees or steps, the first or last words of a preceding clause being often repeated at the beginning of the succeeding one (see *Jour. Sac. Lit.* October, 1854, p. 39 sq.). Thus, in Psalm 121:

1. I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills,
From whence cometh *my help*.

2. *My help* cometh from the Lord,
Who made heaven and earth.

3. He will not suffer thy foot to be moved;
Thy *keeper* will not *slumber*.

4 Lo, *not slumber* nor sleep will the *keeper* of Israel.

5. Jehovah is thy *keeper*, etc.

Compare also Psalm 122:2-4; 123:3, 4; 124:15; 126:2, 3; 129:1, 2. To the same class belongs also the song of Deborah (Judges 5:3-30). This view is followed by De Wette (*Einl. in dos A. T.* p. 289) and others. See Tiling, *Disquisitio de inscriptione*, t/l [jMhiryva (Brem. 1765); Clarisse, *Psalmi quisndecim Hammaaloth* (L. B. 1819); Sticht, *De Psalmis Hammaloth* (Altona, 1766). *SEE PSALMS*.

Degrees

(French *degre*, from Lat. *gradus*, a step), titles of rank to which are annexed privileges, conferred upon students in colleges and universities, or upon members thereof, as a testimony of their proficiency in the arts and sciences. The term “Arts,” or “Liberal Arts,” as technically applied to certain studies, came into use during the Middle Ages, and on the establishment of universities, the term “Faculty of Arts” denoted those who devoted themselves to science and philosophy as distinguished from the faculty of theology, and afterwards of medicine and law. The number of” ‘ arts” embraced in the full mediaeval course of learning was seven: Grammar, Logic, Rhetoric (constituting the *Trivium*), Music, Arithmetic, Geometry, and Rhetoric (the *Quadrivium*). The terms master and doctor were originally applied synonymously to any person engaged in teaching. In process of time, the one was restricted to the liberal arts, the other to divinity, law, and medicine. When regulations were established to prevent unqualified persons from teaching, and an initiatory stage of discipline was prescribed, these terms became significant of a certain rank, and of the possession of certain powers, and-were called gradus, “steps” or

"degrees." The passing of the initiatory stage, said to have been first instituted by Gregory IX (1227-41), conferred the title of bachelor (q.v.), and an additional course of discipline and examination was necessary to obtaining that of master. The title of Master of Arts originally implied the right, and even the duty of publicly teaching some of the branches included in the faculty of arts; a custom which is still retained, to some extent, in the German universities, but has fallen into disuse in other countries. The degrees of D.D. (*doctor divinitatis*), S.T.D. (*sacrce theologice doctor*), and LL.D. (*doctor utriusque legum*), are conferred, *honoris causa*, by colleges and universities, upon persons held to be worthy of them, whether members of the said institutions of learning or not. The see of Rome claims a universal academical power, and the Pope confers the doctor's degree at pleasure. See Kirkpatrick, *Historically received Conception of the University*; Newman, *Office and Work of Universities*, p. 241; Tholuck, in Herzog's *Real-Encyklopadie*, 16:722; and the article *SEE DOCTOR*.

Deha'vites

(Chald. *Dehaye'*, ayhD, or *Dehave'*, awhD, Sept. Δαναῖοι, Vulg. *Dievi*), one of the Assyrian tribes from which a colony was led out by Asnapper to repopulate Samaria, and who there joined their neighbors in opposing the reconstruction of the Temple at Jerusalem (Ezra 4:9). These Dahi were probably the Δάοι, Dai (Herod. 1:125), a nomade Persian tribe east of the Caspian Sea (Ammian. *Marc*. 20:8, p. 300, ed. Bip.), in the neighborhood of the Mardians, or Hyrcanians (Strabo, 11:508, 511; Pliny, 6:19; 37:33; Solin. 20), towards Margiana (Ptol. 6:10), under the rule of Darius (Curt. 4:126), and later of Alexander (Curt. 8:14, 5; 9:2, 24) and his successors (Livy, 27:40). This people appears to have been widely diffused, being found as Dahac (Δάαι) both in the country east of the Caspian (Strab. 11:8, 2; Arrian, Exped. Al. 3, 11, etc.), and in the vicinity of the Sea of Azof (Strab. 11:9, 3); and again as *Dihi* (Δῖοι, Thucyd. 2:96), or Daci (Δακοί, Strab., D. Cass., etc.), upon the Danube. Their name perhaps survives in the present district Daghestan. They were an Arian race, and are regarded by some as having their lineal descendants in the modern Danes (see Grimm's *Geschicht. der Deutsch. Sprach*. 1:192-3). The name is derived from the Persian *dah*, "a village;" Dehavites will therefore be equivalent to the Latin "Rustici." Their love of war and plunder induced them to serve as mercenaries under various princes (Arrian, 3, 11; v. 12); and their valor has immortalized them in the pages of Virgil as "indomiti

Dahae" (*AEn*. 8:728). A band of them had doubtless entered the service of the Persian monarch, followed him to Palestine, and received for their reward grants of land in Samaria (Stephanus Byzant. s.v.; Ritter, *Erdkunde*, 7:668; Rawlinson's *Herodotus*, 1:338).

Dehon Theodore, D.D.,

bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of South Carolina, was born in Boston, Mass., in Dec., 1776. His early education was obtained in the public school, where, for some years, he stood at the head of his class. In 1791 he entered Harvard University, where he graduated with the highest honors in 1795. He at once commenced his preparation for the ministry, for which, from early childhood, he had evinced a strong inclination. — In 1797 he was ordained, and soon became the rector of Trinity Church, Newport, R. I., where he remained until 1810, when he was compelled, by failing health, to seek a milder climate. An invitation to the rectorship of St. Michael's Church, Charleston, S. C., was accepted. In this charge, as at Newport, he was loved and revered by all classes. In 1812 he was elected bishop of the diocese of South Carolina, to which office he was solemnly set apart, in Philadelphia, by the venerable Bishop White. He continued in the rectorship of his church, and performed its duties and those of the bishopric, with eminent zeal, discretion, and success, until he fell a victim to yellow fever in August, 1817. At the request of the vestry of St. Michael's, he was buried beneath its chancel. His sermons, in two volumes, have passed through two editions in this country, and through three in England. They are models of practical pulpit discourse. See *Memoir* by Rev. Dr. Gadsden, and Pref. to 2d edit. *Sermons*, vol. i; also Sprague, *Annals*, v. 425.

Dei Gratia

(Lat. by the grace of God) is a formula used by bishops and monarchs. "Felix of Rome (A.D. 356) styled himself episcopus per Dei gratiam. Afterwards it came to be appended by archbishops, bishops, abbots, abbesses, deans, monks, and even chaplains, to their titles in letters and other documents, as an expression of dependence. After the middle of the 13th century, when the sanction of the pope began to be considered necessary to ecclesiastical offices, the higher clergy wrote *Dei et Apostolicae sedis gratis*, 'by the favor of God and the apostolic see.' At a

later period many of them preferred to write *miseratione divin, permissione divina*, and the like; but they still continued to be styled by others Dei gratia. In the British Islands this style was generally dropped about the time of the Reformation, but it was occasionally given to the archbishops of Canterbury and York even after the beginning of the 17th century. Beginning with the times of the Carlovingians, many temporal princes, earls, and barons made use of the formula Dei Gratia; and before the 15th century no idea of independence or of divine right seems to have attached to it. But in 1442, king Charles VII of France forbade its use by the Comte d'Armagnac, and in 1449 obliged the duke of Burgundy to declare that he used it without prejudice to the rights of the French crown. These instances show that it had now begun to be regarded as belonging exclusively to sovereigns who owed no allegiance to any other earthly potentate or power. In this way, what was originally a pious expression of humility came to be looked upon as an assertion of the doctrine of the 'divine right' of kings."

Deip'ra

mother of God, a title applied to Mary, the mother of Christ, at the Council of Nicaea. *SEE THEOTOKOS*.

Deism

(from Deus, God) properly means the belief in the existence of a supreme intelligent First Cause, in opposition to Atheism. It is now, however, applied to that form of infidelity which professes to believe the existence of a personal God, but denies his revelation. The word Deism is, at bottom, the same as Theism (from Θεὸς, God); but a distinction in practical use has arisen between them. Des Prades calls Theism the faith of reason, which precedes all revelation; but, on the other hand, designates by Deism the faith in reason which contests revelation. In more modern times, an arbitrary distinction between the two terms mentioned has been adopted by the usage of scientific language in Germany, according to which Deism is the doctrine of God's relation to the world, which represents God as not only different, but also as separated from the world, therefore as only in an external relation to it; on the other hand, Theism would be the doctrine which represents God as holding an internal and real relation to the world. Kant makes the distinction between a deist and a theist as follows: the deist, he says, believes in a God, but the theist in a living God. "About the

middle of the 16th century the title was arrogantly assumed by those who professed to believe in a God, while they refused to acknowledge any revelation of his will. They set up in opposition to Christianity what they are pleased to call ‘natural religion,’: but never agreed upon the articles of faith which it taught, or the practical duties which it required. Deism, in effect, is a rejection of all known religions, supplying nothing in their place, but leaving the mind to doubt and darkness. But the friends of Christianity have no reason to regret the free and unreserved discussion which their religion has undergone. The cavils and objections of the deists have been fairly heard and fully answered; but, for their opposition we should not have had such a vast mass of Christian evidences as has been collected by the pious and learned; evidences which, while they prove the truths of Christianity, so illustrate its doctrines as to be of lasting service to the cause of genuine religion and the best interests of mankind” (Eden). The ground taken by the: English deists was substantially the naturalistic, viz. that the Gospel history was the product of an invention imposed upon the world by its authors.

Lord Herbert of Cherbury (born 1581, died 1648) has been regarded as the first deistical writer in England, or at least the first who reduced Deism to a system, affirming the sufficiency of reason and natural religion, and rejecting divine revelation as unnecessary and superfluous. His system, taught in his *De Veritate and De Religione Laici*, embraced these five articles:

1, The being of God;
2, that he is to be worshipped;
3, that piety and moral virtue are the chief parts of worship;
4, that God will pardon our faults on repentance; and,
5, that there is a future state of rewards and punishment.

SEE HERBERT OF CHERBURY. Hobbes († 1680), deriving all knowledge from the senses, taught a lower, but more logical form of Deism than Herbert, and one less calculated to do harm, as his system obviously subverts ordinary morality. *SEE HOBBES*. Charles Blount († 1693) published a translation of Philostratus’s *Life of Apollonius Tyanceus*, with the same purpose as that of Hierocles in the 4th century, viz. to contrast the character and history of Christ disadvantageously with that of Apollonius. After his death appeared his *Oracle of Reason* (1695), explaining the “Deists’ Religion.” John Toland († 1722), in his *Christianity*

not Mysterious (1696), asserted the capacity and supremacy of reason (anticipating the modern Rationalism [q.v.]), and also, in his *Amyntor* (1699), — threw doubt upon the Canonl. The theory that Christ was an ordinary man, whose followers elevated him to the imaginary dignity of a divine being, had been started by the early opponents of Christianity — Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian. It was revived by Woolston (t 1733) (q.v.), in his *Six Discourses on the Miracles* (1727), and by Tyndal (q.v.) in his *Christianity as old as the Creation* (1730). Tyndal was followed by Chubb, *True Gospel of Christ* (1748), and other writings, *SEE CHUBB*; and by Morgan, *The Moral Philosopher*, and other works. These views were disseminated among the higher classes in England by Bolingbroke and Shaftesbury, and at a later period, in the form of complete skepticism, by Hume and Gibbon. Among the illiterate, Thomas Paine (q.v.) was the great propagator of Deism. The progress of vulgar Deism among the higher classes was arrested by Butler's immortal Analogy, *SEE BUTLER*, and among the lower, to a large extent, by the rise and progress of Methodism.

In France, the English Deism was adopted and diffused by Voltaire and the Encyclopedists (q.v.); but it soon became frivolous, immoral, and, in fact, atheistic. In Germany, the same seed sprang up in the 18th century in the theories which gave rise to the modern Rationalism (q.v.). "The deistical movement, if viewed as a whole, is obsolete. If the same doubts are now repeated, they do not recur in the same form, but are connected with new forms of philosophy, and altered by contact with more recent criticism. In the present day sceptics would believe less than the deists, or believe more, both in philosophy and in criticism. In philosophy, the fact that the same difficulties occur in natural religion as well as in revealed, would now throw them back from Monotheism into Atheism or Pantheism; while the mysteries of revelation, which by a rough criticism were then denied, would he now conceded and explained away as psychological peculiarities of races or individuals. In criticism, the delicate examination of the sacred literature would now prevent both the revival of the cold, unimaginative want of appreciation of its extreme literary beauty, and the hasty imputation of the charge of literary forgery against the authors of the documents. In the deist controversy, the whole question turned upon the differences and respective degrees of obligation of natural and revealed religion, moral and positive duties; the deist conceding the one, denying the other. The permanent contribution to thought made by the controversy consisted in turning attention from abstract theology to psychological, from

metaphysical disquisitions on the nature of God to ethical consideration of the moral scheme of redemption for man. Theology came forth from the conflict, reconsidered from the psychological point of view, and readjusted to meet the doubts which the new form of philosophy Ñ psychology and ethics — might suggest. The attack of revealed religion by reason awoke the defense, and no period in Church history is so remarkable for works on the Christian evidences — grand monuments of mind and industry. The works of defenders are marked by the adoption of the same basis of reason as their opponents, and hence the topics which they illustrate have a permanent philosophical value, though their special utility as arguments be lessened by the alteration in the point of view now assumed by free thought" (Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought*, lect. 4).

The aim of honest deists has professedly been to maintain the doctrine of a Personal God; and they have asserted and assumed that this doctrine can be better and more surely vindicated apart from what they call the entanglements of Christian faith than in connection with them. But the history of thought, in the last century especially, shows that Deism, or belief in a Personal God apart from Christianity, gives way steadily before the assaults of Pantheism and Positivism. No robust faith has ever sprung out of Deism. The so-called spiritualistic writers of France have contended nobly (e.g. Cousin, Saisset, and others) against Materialism; but their task of upholding Theism in France has devolved now almost wholly upon Christian thinkers.

A succinct account of the English deists and their principles will be found in Van Mildert, *Boyle Lecture*, sermon 10; Lechler, *Geschichte d. englisch. Deismus* (1841). See also Leland, *View of deistical Writers* (new. ed. by Edmonds, Lond. 1837, 8vo); Noack, *Die Freidenker in der Religion* (Bern. 1853-55, 3 vols.; vol. 1 treats of the "English Deists," vol. 2 of the "*French Freethinkers*," vol. 3 of the "*German Enlightenment*"); Farrar, *Critical History of Free Thought* (Oxf. 1863, 8vo; repub. Boston, 1863, 12mo); Hurst, *History of Rationalism*, chap. 19; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, § 238; Dorner, *Geschichte d. protest. Theologie* (1867), p. 487; Liddon, *Bampton Lecture*, 1867. Compare the articles *SEE INFIDELITY*; *SEE RATIONALISM*. For the writers against Deism, *SEE APOLOGETICS*; *SEE APOLOGY*; *SEE EVIDENCES*.

Deity

a name of the Supreme Being, from the Latin Deus, God. It was originally an abstract term, and thence transferred to signify, in a concrete sense, Him whom we call GOD.

Deity Of Jesus Christ

“In the use of this phrase concerning our Lord we mean to assert that he was ‘the very and eternal God.’ It is a more proper expression than ‘the divinity of Christ,’ since this latter does not necessarily imply anything more of our Lord’s nature than that it was godlike, or of heavenly origin whereas the term ‘Deity’ contains in it the notion of essential Godhead. The other expression, however, has prevailed, on account of the word ‘Deity’ having come to be so commonly used as the concrete instead of the abstract sense, to denote a divine Being.” — Eden, *Churchman’s Dictionary*, s.v. *SEE CHRISTOLOGY, TRINITY*.

De’kar

(Heb. *De’ker*, רקד, a thrusting through), the father of Solomon’s purveyor in the second royal district (1 Kings 4:9), from which passage it appears that his son BEN-DEKER (רקדבן; Sept. υἱὸς Δακάρ; Vulg. *Bendecar*) was the royal commissariat officer in the western part of the hill-country of Judah and Benjamin, Shaalbim and Bethshemesh. B.C. ante 1014.

De la Mennais

SEE LA MENNAIS.

Delai’ah

(Heb. DELAYAH’, הילד freed by Jehovah; also in the prolonged form *Delaya’hu,’* והילד 1 Chronicles 24:18; Jeremiah 36:12, 25; comp. ἀπελεύθερος Κυρίου, 1 Corinthians 7:22; also the Phoenician name Δελαιαστάρτος, quoted from Menander by Josephus, Ap. 1:18, and the modern name Godfrey = Gottesfrey), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Δαλαΐας v. r. Ἀβδαλλαί.) The head of the twenty-third division of the priestly order in the arrangement by David (1 Chronicles 24:18). B.C. 1014.

2. (Sept. Δαλαΐας, Γοδολίας.) A son of Shemaiah, and one of the courtiers to whom Jeremiah's first roll of prophecy was read (Jeremiah 36:12): he vainly interceded for its preservation from the flames (ver. 25). B.C. 604.

3. (Sept. Δαλαΐα.) The progenitor or head of one of the parties of exiles that returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel from certain parts of the Assyrian dominions, but who had lost their genealogical records (Ezra 2:60; Nehemiah 7:62). B.C. 536.

4. (Sept. Δαλαΐα.) The son of Mehetabeel, and father of the Shemaiah who counselled Nehemiah to escape into the Temple from the threats of Sanballat (Nehemiah 6:10). B.C. ante 410.

5. (Sept. Δελαΐα v. r. Δαλααΐα) One of the sons of Elioenai, a descendant of the royal line of Judah from Zerubbabel (1 Chronicles 3, 24, where, however, the name is Anglicized DALAIAH). He probably belongs to the tenth generation before Christ (see Strong's HARMONY AND EXPOS. OF THE GOSPELS, p. 17). , B.C. cir. 300.