

MINNI

MINNI (מִנִּי), a land mentioned in Jer. 51:27† [C, chap. 28]; ΠΑΡ ΕΜΟΥ [BKAQ], menni [Vg.], the Mannu of the Assyrians, which was W. of the Lake of Urumiya. Its inhabitants are the Mannai, of whom we read in the inscriptions of Shalmaneser II., Sargon, Esarhaddon, and Ašur-bāni-pal.

See ASHKENAZ, ARARAT, and, for the Assyrian (and Vannic) notices, Schrader, KAT<sup>2</sup> 423; Sayce, RP<sup>2</sup> 1163 ff.; Winckler, GRA 200 241 243 269; AOP<sup>1</sup> 486 ff. On the מִנִּי of Ps. 45:8[9], which Tg. Pesh. render 'Armenia,' see IVORY.

MINNITH (מִנִּית); ΕΝ ΑΡΙΘΜΩ [B], ΕΙΣ ΣΕΜΩΕΙΘ [A], ΣΕΜΕΝΕΙΘ [L; ? CE ΜΕΝΕΙΘ], CE ΕΙΣ ΜΩΙΘ ΕWC THC ΟΔΟΥ ΜΑΝΩΕ [see HP], ΜΑΝΙΑΘΗC [Jos. Ant. v. 710]; ΜΕΝΝΙΘ [Vg.]; 'ascent of Machir' [Pesh.], a locality E. of Jordan mentioned in the account of Jephthah's victory over Ammon (Judg. 11:33; on Ezek. 27:17 see end of CE article). The identification is most uncertain,<sup>1</sup> and one may question the correctness of the reading (see below). The matter cannot be treated without reference to literary criticism (see JEPHTHAH, § 2). It is probable that Holzinger and Budde are correct in their view that the chapter contains the traces of another war where Moab, not Ammon, is the foe. The geographical notices of both defeats survive (doubtless not in their original form) in v. 33, where מִנִּית and עַרְבֹאִיִּם are clearly doublets. The mention of Aroer, however, constitutes a difficulty. It is generally assumed to be the Ammonite city (AROER, 2); but this is unlikely if ABEL-CHEKAMIM is rightly identified, and if Minnith is indeed the maanith which Eusebius (OS<sup>2</sup> 280 44) places 4 m. from Heshbon on the road to Rabbath-Amman. C, however, inserts ἑξήκοντα ἄρην and Budde (KHC, Richter) suggests that from Minnith to Aroer (on the Arnon, cp v. 26) was the extent of the Moabite defeat, and that of the Ammonites was in an easterly direction to Abel-cheramim. This view does not sufficiently allow for the possibility of deeper corruption. One expects the Ammonite defeat to have extended from N. to S., and hence it is possible that מִנִּית has arisen from מִנְתָּה, a parallel form to MAHANAIM (q.v. n. 1, cp We. CH<sup>3</sup> 43 n.). [For another view, that originally Miššur (the N. Arabian Mušri) and Amalek = Jerahmeel, kindred peoples, took the place of Moab and Ammon, see MOAB, § 14 ff.]

Originally, perhaps, the Ammonites were routed 'from Mahanaim to Abel-cheramim'; the extent of the Moabite defeat, on the other hand, must remain unknown. The existence of a Moabite Minnith (cp Bu. Lc.), in spite of the testimony of Eusebius, is doubtful. Minnith, in fact, is nowhere else mentioned, since, although the land of Ammon was rich in cereals (cp the tribute of barley, 2 Ch. 27:5), the mention of 'wheat of Minnith' (Ezek. 27:17) is due to a textual corruption, for which Cornill with an obvious gain in sense reads הַטִּיבִים וְנִכְאֵת ('wheat and spices'); see PANNAG, STORAX. S. A. C.

MINSTREL. I. מִנְגְּלִים, ménaggēn, 2 K. 3:15†; cp מְנַגְּלִים, ménaggēn, Ps. 68:25 [26], RV 'minstrels,' AV 'players on instruments.' See MUSIC.

2. ἀνλητής, Mt. 9:23. See Music, § 4; MOURNING CUSTOMS.

MINT (ΜΗΔΥΚΟΜΟΝ; mentha; Mt. 23:23 Lk. 11:42†) was a well-known garden herb in ancient times (γνώριον βοτάνιον, Diosc. 341). Dioscorides does not think it necessary to describe it. The species chiefly grown in Palestine is the horse-mint, Mentha sylvestris, L. The tithing of mint is not expressly referred to in the Talmud (cp Löw, 259 ff.).

MIPIKAD, THE GATE (שַׁעַר הַמִּפְקֵד), Neh. 3:31. See JERUSALEM, § 24 (10).

MIRACLES. See WONDERS: also GOSPELS, §§ 137 ff., and JOHN (SON OF ZEBEDEE), §§ 20, 25, etc.

MIRAGE (מִרְאָה), Is. 35:7, RV<sup>mg</sup> (Η ΔΥΛΔΡΟC), 49:10, RV<sup>mg</sup> (ΚΑΥCΩΝ).

This well-known phenomenon of dry regions might of course be referred to in these passages (so Ges. and most moderns); but see DESERT, § 2 (8).

<sup>1</sup> See Moore, Judg., ad loc.; Buhl, Pal. 266.

MIRIAM

MIRIAM (מִרְיָם; ΜΑΡΙΑΜ [BAFL], cp Targ. מִרְיָם, etc. and see NAMES, § 6). Possibly from עִמְרָמִית (Che., cp Nu. 3:27); see MOSES, § 2; Bateson Wright, however, connects the name with 'Merari' (Was Israel ever in Egypt? 213; see also MARY, § 1).

1. The sister of Aaron and Moses who accompanied Israel as far as Kadesh, where she died and was buried (Nu. 20:1). If we pass over the inclusion of her name in the Levitical genealogies (Nu. 26:59 [|| Ex. 6:20 MT om. but cp C<sup>BAFL</sup>], 1 Ch. 6:3 [5:29]) Miriam is first mentioned in the older narratives on the occasion of the crossing of the Red Sea. She is styled 'the prophetess' (הַנְּבִיאָה) and appears at the head of a female choir celebrating the recent deliverance (Ex. 15:20 f. E, see POETICAL LITERATURE, § 4, iii.). Although not specifically named, Miriam is no doubt the 'sister' alluded to in the story of the birth of Moses (Ex. 2:13, cp Ps. 4:7), and if v. 1 belongs to the original narrative it is certain that the writer looked upon her (and also Aaron) as the step-sister (and step-brother) of the child. Apart from the notice of her death at Kadesh (Nu. Lc.), she is only once again mentioned in the Hexateuch—viz., Nu. 12:1-15, where with Aaron she rebels against the authority of Moses and is punished with leprosy.

The passage is not free from difficulties.<sup>1</sup> That connected with v. 1 is dealt with elsewhere (see MOSES, § 15). We are indeed reminded of the manner of E; but there is nothing in common with E's doctrine of the universal nature of Yahwe's gift of prophecy as expressed in 11:24-30. The reference to Miriam in Dt. 24:9 is not clear. It is difficult to see how Miriam's punishment was a warning for Israel to observe the orders of the Levites in the case of an outbreak of leprosy. The difficulty in the reference, implying a discrepancy in the traditions, suggests that Nu. Lc. has been pretty thoroughly revised by RP (the seven days' seclusion v. 15 reminds one of the Levitical enactment, Lev. 13:5).<sup>2</sup>

From these few notices we can obtain but a bare idea of the figure of Miriam. She first appears in E (so probably also Aaron), and it is noteworthy that the only reference to her in the prophetic writings is made by a writer who lived about the time of E, and names 'Moses, Aaron, and Miriam' as the forerunners to redeem Israel (Mi. 6:4, see, however, MICAH [BOOK], § 4 f., col. 3073). To about the same age belong the oldest narratives which mention HUR (1), an equally obscure figure, whom tradition connected with Miriam.<sup>3</sup>

It may be asked here whether Aaron and Miriam were not originally represented as members of the family of Jethro? The sudden appearance of Aaron in Horeb (Ex. 4:27 E) seems to suggest that he already lived in the neighbourhood; whilst, on the other hand, the narrative in Ex. 21:10, which seems to treat Miriam as living in Egypt, does not necessarily militate against the view that Aaron and Miriam were brother and sister respectively of Zipporah the wife of Moses. It may also be conjectured that the well-known branch of Levitical Merari derived its name, or traced its descent, from the 'prophetess' Miriam (מִרְיָם, מִרְיָה)? Cp GENEALOGIES, 5:7 [v.], MERARI.

2. Son (or daughter) of Jether (cp JETHER, 1), and BITHIAH (q.v.), named in a Judæan-Calebite genealogy, 1 Ch. 4:17 (so Ki. after C, MT obscure; μαιων [BA], μωωρ and μαρω in a doublet [L]). The coincidence is remarkable; was there a tradition associating Moses and the other characters of the Exodus with the Calebites? Cp MOSES.

It is true the reading 'Miriam' is not convincingly supported by C; but the tradition (accepted and amplified by the Targ.) may not be wholly late. Distinct traces of a Calebite element have been suspected in portions of J E's narrative of the Exodus.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See NUMBERS, § 2.

<sup>2</sup> We cannot be quite certain that Dt. Lc. is original—directions regarding leprosy are wanting in JE. It is just possible that Miriam alone belonged to the original narrative in Nu. 12:1. The exceptional order of the names in Nu. 12:1 may be taken to suggest that Aaron's name has been added. C<sup>1</sup>, on the other hand, following the usual custom, gives Aaron the priority.

<sup>3</sup> His wife (so Jos. Ant. iii. 24), or mother (Targ.).

<sup>4</sup> C<sup>BA</sup> suggests the reading Maon, which Cheyne prefers.

<sup>5</sup> See EXODUS I., § 5 f., KADESH, § 3.

MIRMA

and a close connection between Calebites, Kenites, etc., is borne out by a comparison of the distribution of the proper names (see GENEALOGIES, §§ 1, 7 (v.)). S. A. C.

**MIRMA**, RV *Mirmah* (מִרְמָה), § 74; *μαρμα* [B], *μαρμα* [A], -*μα* [L]), a name in a genealogy of Benjamin (*q.v.*, § 9, ii. β), 1 Ch. 8:10f, probably from 'Jerahmeel' (Che.). See *JQR* 11:108 (§ 6).

**MIRRORS**. Egyptian mirrors consisted of a disc of polished bronze, though the bronze might be covered with a varnish of gold and have a handle of wood, ivory, or bronze, which was often ornamented with a statuette. Such hand-mirrors were indispensable for the toilette of an Egyptian lady, and we find them referred to in Ex. 38:8, as used by the women who performed service in the Tent of Meeting, and, according to a traditional but surely erroneous opinion, in Is. 32:3. In Job 37:18 the sky (firmament) is compared to a metal mirror. In Wisd. 7:26 wisdom is called 'an unspotted mirror of the working of God.' In the Greek Ecclus. 12:11 a 'mirror' is somehow brought into connection with the malice of an enemy.

Whether it is worth while to speculate as to the possible meaning of the Greek translator, may be doubted; see RV, which gives an alternative rendering for the last clause of the verse, and cp Edersheim. The Cairo Hebrew text gives, 'He to him (the enemy) as one that revealeth a mystery' (Schechter and Taylor, 25). In 1 Cor. 13:12 *ἐν αἰνίγματι* ('in a riddle') seems to be a gloss on *ὡς ἐσόπτρου*; see RIDDLE.

In 1 Cor. 13:12 the imperfect spiritual knowledge of the present life is likened to the imperfect representation of objects in an ancient metal mirror ('through a glass' should be 'by means of a mirror'—see below). Not so Ja. 1:23 ff. Here 'the perfect law, the law of liberty' is compared to a bright, polished mirror, which really shows a man what are the points in his outward appearance which need correction. Lastly, in 2 Cor. 3:18 Christians are compared to mirrors, inasmuch as they reflect the glory of Christ. The writer doubtless has in his mind circular discs with ornamental handles such as were known in Greek as well as in Egyptian society.

As to the words and phrases. 1. גִּילְיוֹן, *gillayōn*, Is. 3:23 (AV 'glass,' RV 'handmirror') should probably not be reckoned. Tradition is not consistent. Vg. Tg. favours 'mirrors'; but *ἄσπερος* (διαφανή λακωνικά) suggests 'transparent, gauze-like dresses,' and Peiser, comparing Bab. *gulinu*, holds, perhaps correctly, that some unknown garment is meant (see DRESS, § 1 [2]).

2. מִרְיָה, *mir'eh* (√*ראה*, 'to see') Ex. 38:8 (ἄ κατοπτρον) Job 37:18 (ἄ ορασις).

3. *εσόπτρου*, Ecclus. 12:11; Wisd. 7:26; 1 Cor. 13:12, and Ja. 1:23. The classical Greek word is *κάτοπτρον* (Aesch. Ag. 839). Hence *κατοπτρίζεσθαι* in 2 Cor. 3:18. Compare Mayor on Ja. 1:23 and Spiegel, *HC* on 2 Cor. 3:18; but cp Heinrich's note on the passage, where the older rendering (AV, RVmg.) is supported. Certainly Philo (1:107) uses *κατοπτρίζεσθαι* in the sense of beholding something in a mirror.

**MISAEEL** (מ[ε]יִסְאֵל [BAL]). 1. 1 Esd. 9:44 = Neh. 8:4 *MISHAEL*, 2.

2. Song of Three Children, 65 = Dan. 17, etc. *MISHAEL*, 3.

**MISGAB** (מִשְׁגָּב; τὸ κραταίωμα [N], ἀμαθ [B], *au. το κρ.* [A], *fortis* [Vg.]), according to EV of Jer. 48:1 a chief city of Moab. So Kashi and Kimhi. No such place, however, is known. Moreover, the Hebrew, which has the article, means 'the high fort' (so RVmg.); but if we render thus the fem. verbs are peculiar, and the parallel clauses contain undoubted names of places. Not improbably we should read *v.* 16 thus: 'Woe unto Nebo! it is laid waste; Kiriathaim is put to shame and dismayed.'

The point is that *הבישה המשגב* resembles *השבו בחשבון*. These words which occur in *v.* 2, were probably written too soon by the scribe, and, as usual, not cancelled; corruption naturally followed. *החיה* therefore belongs to *לנברה קריתים*. The suggestion is new, but has many parallels. T. K. C.

**MISHAEL** (מִישְׂאֵל; מ[ε]יִסְאֵל [BKAL], but in Lev. *μισαλαι* [BA]). The name may have been explained 'Who is what God is' (see § 39; Gray, *HPN* 165); cp *MICHAEL*. P's names, however, are so often (in our opinion) distortions of ancient ethnic or tribal names that we may (see below) reasonably assume this

MISREPHOTH-MAIM

to be so here, and even connect the presumed underlying name with the *מש*; see *SALMAH*, and cp *SHALLUM*, *MESHALLEMIAH*, *MESHULLAM*.

1. A Kohathite, son of Uzziel and nephew of Amram (= Jerahmeel), Ex. 6:22 (B<sup>BA</sup> om.) Lev. 10:4 (both P). The name corresponds to the Simeonite name *Shemuel*, b. *Ammihud* (= *Jerahmeel*), Nu. 34:20.

2. One of Ezra's supporters (see EZRA ii., § 13 [c]; cp i. § 8, ii. § 16 [5], ii. § 15 [1] c), Neh. 8:4 = 1 Esd. 9:44, EV *MISAEEL*. The next name is *MALCHIJAH*, originally perhaps a distortion of *Jerahmeel*.

3. One of the companions of Daniel, also called *MESHACH* (*q.v.*), Dan. 1:6 etc. See *DANIEL*.

4. See *MICHAEL*, 8.

T. K. C.

**MISHAL**, AV *Misheal* (מִשְׂאֵל, Josh. 19:26, *μασαλα* [B], *μασαψ* [A], *μασαλ* [L]; 21:30, *βασελλαν* [B],

*μασαλα* [A], *μισαλα* [L]; once *MASHAL*, מִשְׁלַל, 1 Ch. 6:74 [59] *MAACA* [B], *μασαλ* [A<sup>α</sup>], *μασιλ* [L]), a town in Asher, wrongly described in OS (2803613921) as near Carmel, which is excluded by the right translation of Josh. 19:26. Perhaps the *Mi-Sa-a-ra* of the list of Thotmes III., which occurs immediately before 'A-k-sap or Achshaph (*WMM*, *As. u. Eur.* 181; cp *RP*<sup>(2)</sup> 546).

**MISHAM** (מִשְׁמַם; μεσσαμ [B], *μισαλα* [A], *μεσοαμ* [L]), a Benjamite of the b'ne Elpaal (see *BENJAMIN*, § 9, ii. β); 1 Ch. 8:24; perhaps the same as *Meshullam* in *v.* 17. See *JQR* 11:103 [§ 1].

**MISHMA** (מִשְׁמָה; *μασμα* [BAL]). A tribal name, perhaps to be read *משש* (Josh. 15:26), the duplicated *ם* being due to the influence of the name *Mibsam*, which precedes *Mishnia* in all the lists. See *HEMA*. The name *Jebel Misma'* near *Teimá* (see *TEMA*), however, invites comparison (see *Di.*).

1. A son of Ishmael (Gen. 25:14; *μασμαν* [DEL]; 1 Ch. 1:30: *παπα* [B<sup>α</sup>], *παπα* [L]); also

2. A son of Simeon (1 Ch. 4:2). Cp *SIMEON*. T. K. C.

**MISHMANNAH** (מִשְׁמַנָּה), a Gadite warrior; 1 Ch. 12:10 (*μασεμμανη* [B], -*εμαννη* [N], -*ca.* [L], *μασμα* [A], *שנור* [Pesh.]). See *DAVID*, § 11, n.

**MISHNAH**. See *LAW LITERATURE*, § 23, and the Introduction to the present work, p. xxiii.

**MISHNEH** (מִשְׁנֵה; see *COLLEGE*; Ḥ has *μασεν* (*u*) *a* in 2 K.; *μασαναι* [B], *μεσαναι* [A], *μασεννα* [L] in 2 Ch.; *της δευτερας* in Zeph. [cp *τη δευτερωσει* Sym. in 2 Ch.]), a part of Jerusalem, 2 K. 22:14 = 2 Ch. 34:22 Zeph. 1:10, RVmg. So perhaps Neh. 11:9 (Rodiger in *Ges. Theol.*, Buhl), though EV gives 'Judah the son of (has-) Senuah was second over the city' (ם, as in 1 Ch. 15:18 etc.). There is, however, we believe, reason to think that *על-העיר השנה* should be *על-העיר הישנה* (just as *המשנה* elsewhere should be *הישנה*), so that the passage should read 'and Judah, a native of the old city, was over the old city.' See *COLLEGE*, *JERUSALEM*, § 23.

T. K. C.

**MISHRAITES** (מִשְׁרָעִי; *ημασαρειμ* [B], -*n* [A], *μασαρεθι* [L]), a post-exilic family of Kirjath-jearim; 1 Ch. 2:53f. See *SHOBAL*.

**MISPAR** (מִסְפָּר), Ezra 22 RV, AV *MIZPAR* = Neh. 7:7 *Mispereth*. See *MIZPAR*.

**MISREPHOTH-MAIM** (מִשְׁרֵפֹת מַיִם), a point in Sidonian territory to which Joshua chased the Canaanites after the battle of Merom. Josh. 11:8 ([JE]; *μασερων* [B], *μασερωθ-μαειμ* [A], -*μαιθ* [F<sup>vid</sup>], *μασερωθ-μαιν* [L]), and which a later writer regarded as the ideal western boundary of the northern hill-country, and apparently as the limit of the Sidonian territory (Josh. 13:6 [D<sup>α</sup>], *μασεροθμεμφωνμαιμ* [B], *μασερωθ-μα[ε]ιμ* [AL]). Guérin identified it with 'Ain Mušerfe, at the S. foot of the Rās en-Nākūra, N. of Achzib (see *LADDER OF TYRE*); but this is too far from Sidon. Apparently the place was well-known;

## MITE

we have therefore to see if we cannot emend the text so as to justify this impression. In Josh. 134 we have elsewhere (see MEARAH) found mention of 'Zarephath which belongs to the Zidonians.' The same name is probably intended here. We may either read צרפתיים<sup>1</sup> for צרפתיים, or follow Sym. (μαστρεφωθ τῆς ἀπὸ θαλάσσης<sup>2</sup>) in reading, for צרפתיים, 'westward,' corresponding to מִן הַיָּם, 'eastward.' In the latter case the name of the place is Misrephoth, or rather Masrephoth. The former view is preferable (cp ZAREPHATH). We may illustrate by Judg. 517, where the true reading probably is,

Asher dwelt toward the coast of the sea  
And abode by the Zarephathites.<sup>3</sup>

We need not therefore compare Ar. *muṣrafun*, 'a lofty place' (Di.), nor explain צרפתיים, 'hot springs' (Kimhi.)

It should be noted, however, that the original story of the war with Jahin may have placed the scene of it in the S. of Palestine (see SHIMRON); צִידוֹן = 'Zidon,' and מִסְּסוּר 'Missur' are sometimes confounded (cp ZAREPHATH), so that a southern Zarephath may originally have been meant in Josh. 118.

T. K. C.

MITE (ΛΕΙΠΤΟΝ), Mk. 1242 Lk. 1239 2127. See PENNY, §§ 2-4.

ΜΙΘΗCΑΗ, RV Mithkah (מִתְקָה); ΜΑΤΕΚΚΑ [B].

ΜΑΘ. [AF], ΜΑΤΤΕΚΑ [L], a stage in the wandering in the wilderness, Nu. 3328 f. See WILDERNESS OF WANDERING.

MITHNITE, an improbable gentilic in 1 Ch. 1143. See JOSHAPHAT, I.

MITHREDATH (מִתְרַדַּת), 'from [or, to] Mithra [the sun-god] given?' cp Mithrabouzanēs [see SHETHARBOZNAI], and in Aram. מִתְרַדַּת, מִתְרַדַּת, מִתְרַדַּת, מִתְרַדַּת [BA]; cp Herod. 110 ΜΙΤΡΑΔΑΤΗΣ and ΜΙΘΡΑΔΑΤΕC borne by Pontic kings; ΜΙΘΡΙΔΑΤΗΣ [L] so Jos. Ant. xi. 13).

1. The treasurer (מְרַדַּת) of Cyrus who handed over the temple treasures to SHESHBAZZAR (Ezra 18, מִתְרַדַּת [Ba.bA])=1 Esd. 211, Mithradates, RV Mithradates (מִתְרַדַּת [BA]).

2. A Persian official, temp. Artaxerxes, mentioned with BISHIAM, and others, Ezra 47=1 Esd. 216 EV as above (מִתְרַדַּת [B<sup>a</sup>A], מִתְרַדַּת [Ba.bA<sup>2</sup>vid.]).

MITRE. It will be convenient under this heading to notice the priestly head-dresses of the Hebrews,

1. **Hebrew terms.** postponing to TURBAN [g.v.] further remarks concerning the head-dresses worn by other classes. In Judith 415 'mitre' (κίδαρις) is used of the head-covering worn by all priests in common; but in 1 Macc. 1020 it is called simply 'crown' (στέφανος); according to the older Hebrew usage the *misnépheth* (מִצְנֶפֶת) of the high priest is carefully distinguished from the *migbā'āh* (מִגְבְּעָה) of the ordinary priests, a distinction which is followed in EV.<sup>4</sup>

These two words (both only in P or Ezek.) are practically the only terms which need consideration; on the occasional employment of *phē'er* (פָּאֵר) and *šāniph* (שָׁנִיף), see TURBAN.

1. מִגְבְּעָה, *migbā'āh* (Ex. 2840 299 3928 [with פָּאֵר])<sup>5</sup> Lev. 813, κίδαρις [BAFL], AV 'bonnet,' RV 'head-tire,' the head-dress worn by the sons of Aaron. It was very probably of a conical shape (cp מִגְבְּעָה, 'cup,' also מִגְבְּעָה, 'helmet'), and resembled, we may suppose, the well-known conical cap of the Assyrians and Babylonians,<sup>6</sup> and

2. מִצְנֶפֶת, *misnépheth* (Ex. 28439 Lev. 164 Ezek. 2126 [31]), κίδαρις (Ex. 2837 296 3928731 Lev. 89, μίτρα), EV 'mitre,' the head-covering of the high priest (see also Ezek., *l.c.*, where AV 'diadem'). RV mg. prefers 'turban,' which is supported by the verb צָנַן, 'to wind in a coil'; cp צָנַן, and see TURBAN.

<sup>1</sup> צרפתיים (צרפתיים) may be a repeated fragment of צרפתיים.

<sup>2</sup> In Josh. 136, however, Symm. reads ὑδάτων.

<sup>3</sup> For מִסְּסוּר read צרפתיים (Crit. Bib.).

<sup>4</sup> So at Hierapolis in Syria a *πίλος* was worn by the ordinary priests; but the head of the high priest *τιάρη χρυσοῦ ἀναδέσται* (Lucian, *de Syv. Dea*, 42).

<sup>5</sup> It seems to have transposed מִצְנֶפֶת and מִגְבְּעָה. The pl. κίδαρις naturally refers to the ordinary head-dress (of which there were many) rather than to that of the high priest (cp Sinker in Smith's *Dict. Christ. Ant.*, s.v. 'Mitre').

<sup>6</sup> Cp also the old Italian *Pileus*, etc., and see Di.-Rys. on Ex. 283740.

<sup>7</sup> See n. 2 above.

## MITRE

The distinction referred to above does not appear to have held good in the time of Josephus, who applies the

term *μασναεφθης* (= *misnépheth*) to the head-dress of all priests (cp also *Yōmā, of Josephus*, 7ε). In his day it appears that they wore (upon the occasion of sacrifices) a circular cap (*πίλος*), not conical in shape (*ἄκωνος*), covering only about half of the head, and somewhat resembling a crown (*στεφάνη*). It was made of thick linen swathes doubled round many times and sewed together, surrounded by a linen cover to hide the seams of the swathes, and sat so close that it would not fall off when the body was bent down (*Ant.* iii. 73).

The high priest, too, wears a cap (*πίλος*), which was the same in construction and figure with that of the common priest; but above it there was another, with swathes of blue, embroidered, and round it was a golden crown (*στέφανος*), polished, of three rows (*στέφανος χρυσοῦς . . . ἐπὶ τριστῆριαν*), one above another, out of which rose a cup of gold, which resembled the calyx of the herb *σάκχαρον* (the Greek *hyoscyamus*; see Löw, no. 326). After a laborious description, in which he compares the shape of the herb to a poppy (cp *turban*, Ital. *tulipano*, Eng. tulip), Josephus goes on to add that of this (*ἐκ τούτου*) a crown (*στέφανος*) was made reaching from the nape of the neck to the temples. This *ἐπιελάς* ('for so the calyx may be called'), however, did not cover the forehead (*Ant.* iii. 76).

In his earlier work (*BJ* v. 57) Josephus gives an account of the high priest's head-covering, which can scarcely be reconciled with the preceding. In *BJ* (*l.c.*) the high priest wears a linen *τιάρη*, tied with a blue band, which was encircled by a golden fillet (*στέφανος*), upon which were engraved the 'sacred characters' (*ἑρὰ γράμματα*), consisting of four 'vowels' (*φωνήεντα*). In *Ant.* (*l.c.*), on the other hand, the divine name is engraved upon a golden plate (*τελαμών*, Lat. vers. *lamina*; cp below), which was set upon the forehead (*ἱεροῖς γράμμασι τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν προσηγορίαν ἐπιτετυμηένος ἐστὶ*).<sup>1</sup>

To this we may add the description of Jerome (*Ep. Zxiv., ad Fabiolam*): *Quartum genus est vestimenti, rotundum pileolum, quale pictum in Ulyxi conspicimus, quasi sphaera media sit divisa, et jaxs una ponatur in capite: hoc Graeci et nostri τῆραν, nonnulli galatrum vocant, Hebraei Misnépheth - non habet acumen in summo, nec totum usque ad eam caput legit; sed tertiam partem a fronte inobertiam relinquit calque ita in occipitis vitta constrictum est: ut non facile labatur ex capite. The lamina aurea is placed super pileolum . . . ut in fronte vitta hiacynthina constringatur.*

From the description of Jos. in *BJ*, it seems not improbable that we have to think of a head-covering the lower part of which is encircled by a fillet or diadem thus closely resembling the royal Persian *Khshatram*. This was a cap not conical in shape, which, swelling slightly as it ascended, terminated in a ring or circle projecting beyond the lines of the sides. Round it, probably near the bottom, was worn a fillet or band—the diadem proper—blue spotted with white (Rawlinson, *Anc. Mon.* 3204 n. with illustration); see DIADEM. The crown with three rows in Jos. *Ant.* (*l.c.*) does not seem to admit of any explanation at present, though Babylonian seals may be suggestive. Golden crowns, however, were worn by the *sacerdotes provinciales* (Terullian, *de Idolatr.* 18), and in Grecian states the superior priests are called *στεφανηφόροι* (cp Di.-Rys., *l.c.*).

When we turn to P's account of the high priest's *misnépheth* in Ex. 2836-38, it seems that it was made of fine linen, and probably was folded many times round the head (according to the description). Talm. it contained 16cubits). Its distinctive feature was the *šif* (שִׁיף), the golden plate (*πέταλος, lamina* [Vg.]), with its sacred inscription, 'holy to Yahweh'<sup>2</sup> (קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה), which was fastened upon the forehead.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The crown survived till the days of Origen, Reland, *de Spol. Templi*, 132. Cp Jos. Ant. viii. 38: ἡ δὲ στεφάνη εἰς τὸν θεὸν Μωυσῆς ἐγράψε μία ἡ καὶ διέμενεν ἀχρι τῆσθε τῆς ἡμέρας.

<sup>2</sup> [Or, perhaps, 'taboo, devoted to Yahweh,' cp CLEAN, § 1.1]

<sup>3</sup> So, according to the Boraitha *Kidd. 66a*, King Jannai (? Jannæus) was advised שבין ענין (the Pharisees) להקם להם (quoted from *REJ* 85 [1897] 218).

MITRE

We know nothing of the size of the high priest's frontlet, nor is it clear how it was attached to the turban. There was a blue thread which went round the plate and was knotted behind; but the texts leave it uncertain whether the thread passed on the inside or outside of the plate (cp Ex. 28:36 f. with 39:31). It seems the more probable that it passed on the inside, as otherwise the inscription would have been partially covered. It is likely that the frontlet did not reach to the lower edge of the turban, and that it extended lengthwise only from temple to temple.

When Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 76) speaks of the 'sacred letters' with which the *ḥiṣ* was inscribed, he refers probably to the archaic characters, such as were employed to write down the divine name even in post-biblical times (e.g., in the recovered fragment of Aquila;<sup>1</sup> Burkitt, *Fragments of Aquila*).

The symbolical meanings given to this frontlet need not be recapitulated (cp, e.g., Philo, *Vit. Mos.* 673a); that it was originally understood in a mystic sense appears from Ex. 28:38. It may be of interest to add that, according to the Talmud, it was two fingers in breadth.

The *ḥiṣ* is otherwise called *nēzer* (נֵזֶר), crown, or diadem (see CROWN, § 2), cp the renderings of *ḥiṣ* in the Pesh. and Ar. versions, which may, however, have been influenced by a recollection of the Gk. *στεφανηφόρος*; see above, § 2 (end).

The precise meaning of *ḥiṣ* is uncertain. The view (a) that it was a burnished metal plate, though commonly

accepted, is devoid of philological support; a more plausible meaning would be 'flower' or 'bud' (cp Is. 40:6 f. *Ecclus.* 43:19, see FRINGES, LOCKS), which suggests (6) a flower-like ornamentation, and (c), a garland, and so a fillet or diadem. In favour of 6 (which was the view, long ago, of Bishop Horsley), we have the description of Josephus (*Ant.* iii. 76, above § 2), and, on the analogy of the suggested origin of the golden CANDLESTICK (*q.v.*, § 3, col. 647), it would be tempting to find in the symbol a survival of nature-worship. As regards the third view (c)—which virtually identifies the *ḥiṣ* with the *nēzer*—the chief support is to be found in such a passage as Is. 28:1 (probably of the end of the 8th cent. B.C.), where *ḥiṣ* stands in parallelism with *ḥiṣ* (עֲטָרָה), 'crown,' and apparently denotes a chaplet or garland.<sup>2</sup> On this view, the *miṣnēpheth* was probably encircled with a fillet or diadem—the evolution from garland to diadem is easy—agreeing with the representation in Jos. *Bf.* v. 57, and with the Persian custom already referred to (§ 2). Finally, early tradition supports the conventional view a, and if it be accepted, it may be plausibly held that the inscribed plate worn upon the forehead is a direct descendant of primitive flesh-cuttings, and a simple variation of the *ḥiṣ* (see CUTTINGS, § 7, FRONTLETS).

The view of Jos. *Ant.*, *l.c.* which distinguishes the *τελαμών* from the *στεφάνος* seems to find support in the evidence cited in n. 3, col. 3156, and n. 1 below, and was apparently held by Ben Sirā, Jerome, Philo, and the Pseudo-Aristeas.<sup>3</sup> From the dis-

<sup>1</sup> Did the inscription originally bear only the name יהוה? cp Isid. *Orig.* 29:21 (petalun, aurea lamina in fronte pontificis qua nomen Dei tetragrammaton Hebraicis litteris habebat scriptum), and Jos. *Bf.* v. 57.

<sup>2</sup> In *Ecclus.* 40:4 the wearing of the *עֲטָרָה* and *צִיץ* (*στεφάνος* [BNA], corona) typifies the man of high estate. Is the reference to priestly or royal authority? In the former case we may infer that the high priest's characteristic ornament could be called variously *עֲטָרָה*, *עֲטָרָה*, or *נֵזֶר*, and in the latter case we should find an interesting allusion to the sovereign's imperial head-gear, with its distinctive fillet. For the use of *עֲטָרָה* to denote a royal or priestly head-dress, see TURBAN.

<sup>3</sup> In *Ecclus.* 45:12 the Heb. reads *עֲטָרָה וְצִיץ* מִכֵּיל וּמִצִּיץ מִכֵּיל *עֲטָרָה* . . . For *עֲטָרָה* we must certainly read *מִכֵּיל* *עֲטָרָה* is out of place and has been already mentioned in v. 8. The *ḥiṣ*, here, is quite distinct from the *עֲטָרָה* which appears to correspond to P's *נֵזֶר*. Jer. *Ep.* lxiiv., ad *Fabiolam*: habet cidarim et nomen Dei portat in fronte, diademate ornatus est regio. Philo (*de Mose*, ed. Mangey, 2152): χρυσούν δὲ πέταλον,

MITYLENE

crepant accounts of Jos. it is obvious that the form of the mitre varied from time to time. Only on this assumption can we understand the statements in P. In Ex. 29:6 the *nēzer* is (as we should expect) placed upon the mitre, and this, too, is the position of the *ḥiṣ* in Ex. 39:30 f. Lev. 8:9. But in Ex. 28:36 f. the *ḥiṣ* is both on the mitre (cp c above), and on Aaron's forehead (cp a above). These contradictory statements are evidently the result of a conflate text, for a satisfactory solution of which the accessible evidence is insufficient.

In the Christian church the ecclesiastical head-dress is styled *mitra* and *infula*. The former, being originally characteristic of the Phrygians, is sometimes called 'Phrygium' by ecclesiastical writers of the Middle Ages (Marriott, *Vest. Christ.* 220). The

~ The mitre in Christian times.

*infula* is the long fillet of heathen priests and vestals. It was also a sacrificial ornament of victims (cp CHAPLET).

Polycrates (see Eus. *HE* 5:24, cp 3:31, Jer. de *Vir. illustr.* 45) mentions that John the apostle became a priest, τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκώς. James, the brother of Jesus, according to Epiphanius (*Hær.* 29:4), was permitted to wear τὸ πέταλον ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς. The survival of the term πέταλον is of interest, even if it is not to be understood literally.

Gregory Nazianzen († 389 A.D.) uses *κίδαρις* of the priestly cap (*Orat.* 10:4); Jer. (*Ep.* 64 n. 13), on the other hand, employs *tiara*. According to Sinkler (*Dict. Christ. Ant.*, s.v. 'Mitre'), there are no real grounds for supposing that an official head-dress was generally worn by Christian ministers during the first nine or ten centuries after Christ.

The mitre is not even now a badge of order, but only of dignity; not only are there mitred abbots, but in certain privileged chapters all the members on certain festivals wear mitres.

For the usages in the church in general cp Bunz, Herzog-Plitt, *RE* 8:44 ff. It is interesting to note that in the early Abyssinian church upon high occasions a turban (*matimtemia*) is worn along with a metal crown.

I. A. (§§ 1, 3); S. A. C. (§§ 2, 4, 5).

**MITYLENE** (ΜΙΤΥΛΗΝΗ, Acts 20:14 Ti. WH; in classical authors, and on coins, ΜΥΤΙΛΗΝΗ), the chief city of the island of Lesbos, to which in the Middle Ages it gave its own name, as now in its Turkish form, *Midüllü*; it is itself now called *Kastro*, 'castle,' from the Genoese castle which occupies the old acropolis. Its position is accurately marked in Acts, as midway between Alexandria Troas and Chios, viz., one day's run of Paul's vessel from either point. Mitylene lies on the SE. coast of Lesbos, on a peninsula which was once an island protecting two small but excellent harbours. The southern basin held fifty warships, and was closed by a chain; the larger and deeper northern basin, protected by a mole, was reserved for merchantmen (Strabo, 617); a narrow canal connected the two (Paus. viii. 30:2; Diod. 13:77). The roadstead, 7 m. N. of the SE. end of the island, is good in summer (hence Paul's vessel in April lay off the town all night), but in winter is exposed to the violent SE. and NE. winds. The city had from early times an extensive commerce, e.g., with Egypt as early as 560 B.C. (Herod. 2:178).

In the domain of literature Mitylene gained undying fame as the home of Alcaeus and of Sappho (θαυμαστόν τι ἔργον, Strabo, *l.c.*). Its situation and buildings are often praised (Strabo, *l.c.*; Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2:40, *urbs et patria ac situ et descriptione adificiorum et pulchritudine in primis nobilis*; Hor. *Ep.* 1, 11:7: *Mitylene pulchra*; Vitruv. 10). Mitylene, therefore, like Rhodes, became a fashionable resort for Romans compelled to withdraw from public life (Cic. *Ad. Fam.* vii. 3:5, *exsulatum esse non incommodiore loco, quam si Rhodum me aut Mitylenas contulisset*; cp id. *Ad. Fam.* iv. 7:4; *Ad. Af.* v. 11:6; Tac. *Ann.* 14:53). In Paul's time it was a free city (Pliny *HN* 5:39, *Libera Mitylene annis MD potens*), and claimed the title πρώτη Λέσβου (sed Marq.-Momms. *Röm. Staatsvertr.* 1345).

Description in Tozer, *The Islands of the Aegean*, 134 f. W. J. W.

ὄσανεὶ στέφανος ἐδημιουργεῖτο . . . μίτρα. 68 ὑπ' αὐτῷ, τοῦ μὴ ψάειν κεφαλῆς τὸ πέταλον . . . πρὸς δὲ καὶ κίδαρις κατασκευάζετο. κίδαρει γὰρ οἱ τῶν ἐθνῶν βασιλεῖς ἀντὶ διαδηματίου εἰσβάσει χρῆσθαι. Aristeas (ed. Thackeray, apud Swete, *Intro.* to *QT* Gr.), p. 536: ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔχει τὴν λεγομένην κίδαριν ἐπὶ δὲ ταύτης τὴν ἀμύμητον μίτραν, τὸ καθηγιασμένον [cp Lev. 8:9] βασιλείου, ἐκτυποῦν ἐπὶ πέταλῳ χρυσῷ γραμματεῖν ἁγίου ὄνομα τοῦ Θεοῦ . . . κατὰ μέτρον τῶν ὀφρῶν δόξῃ πεπληρωμένον.

MIXED MULTITUDE

MIXED MULTITUDE. See MINGLED PEOPLE.

MIZAR, THE HILL OF (מִצָּרִים; [ἀπὸ])

ΟΡΟΥΣ ΜΙΚΡΟΥ; [*de monte minimo* (Jer.)]. Ps. 426[7]. It being assumed that the text is sound, Mizar has been thought to be the name either of one of the lower hills of Hermon (so GASm. *HG* 477; cp Che. *Ps.*<sup>(1)</sup>; Kirkpatrick, Duhm), or of a mountain in the Gileadite ranges (Del., assuming the psalm to be Davidic), and modern names have been indicated which somewhat resemble Miš'ar (GASm. <sup>1</sup>*L.c.*; *Th. L.-bl.*, 1882, p. 45, see Now.-Hupf. *Psalmen* 1604). But the conjunction of a little-known hill or mountain with such a famous mountain-range as Hermon is most improbable, and the phrase 'little mountain'<sup>2</sup> (מִצָּרִים in) has, therefore, been taken to be a designation of Zion, which, though outwardly insignificant, to the eye of faith was far grander than Hermon, because Yahwe dwelt thereon (433; cp 6815 [16]f.). In this case we must explain either (Smend, Baethgen) 'I think upon thee (O God!) far from the land of the Jordan and of the Hermons, far from the little mountain' (*i.e.*, though an exile from the land of Israel), or (Hitz.; Che. *OPs.* 115 316f.; We.), 'I think upon thee now that I have reached the land (or 'above [all] the land,' as We.) of the Jordan and the Hermons (*i.e.*, the neighbourhood of the most famous sources of the Jordan), thou little mountain' (omitting the initial מ in inn as due to dittography). Neither of these views, however, is satisfactory. There must be much deeper corruption than critics have suspected.

The passage (*v.* 6[7]) must be treated, as a whole, from the point of view of a keen textual criticism. Probability is all that can be reached; but if we take this passage with others, in which a similar result seems almost forced upon us by criticism, the degree of probability may be considered to be high. Read therefore—

Preserve me, [O Yahwè] my God, from the tribe of the Arabians,  
From the brood of the Jerahmeelites [rescue thou me].

The last word, תְּפִלְתִּי, is restored from 431, where nearly the same restoration of the distich is required. מִצָּרִים is a corruption of a dittographed יְהוּדֵי יְהוּדָה. See Che. *Ps.*<sup>(2)</sup>, *ad loc.*

On Pss. 42-43 44 120 137 140, in all of which the Jerahmeelites (*te.*, the Edomites), and in some the Arabians, are referred to, according to a plausibly emended text, as enemies of the Judahites or Judeans; see PSALMS, §§ 28; cp also LAMENTATIONS.

T. K. C.

MIZPAH (מִצְפָּה, 'the watchtower'; cp MIZPEH; MACCHPA [ΜΑΧΠΑ]).

1. A hill-town of Benjamin, Josh. 1826, where it is called Mizpeh (μασσημα [B], μασφα [A]), near Gibeon (Jer. 4112) and Jerusalem (1 Macc. 346), and, if Eusebius and Jerome may be followed, also near Kirjath-jearim (OS 27897 13814). ASA fortified it, 1 K. 1522 (מִצְפָּה סְכוּמִיָּה [BAL]), and Gedaliah the governor adopted it as his place of residence, 2 K. 2523 (μασσηφαθ [B]) Jer. 4010 (μασσηφα [NQ]), but μασσηφαθ [Q] in *v.* 6 and Q<sup>m</sup>g. 411 μασσηφαθ [Q] *v.* 8). Into the great cistern constructed there by Asa, Ishmael, legend said, threw the dead bodies of the seventy pilgrims whom he had murdered after slaying the governor (Jer. 417-9). The hill on which Mizpah stood seems to have been regarded as sacred. The narrative in Judg. 21 (see *v.* 1) may be partly, and those in 1 S. 73-12 (μασσηφαθ [B] and A in *v.* 7<sup>3</sup>) 1017-24 (μασσηφα [A]) even altogether, untrustworthy from a historical point of view (cp We. *ProL.*<sup>(4)</sup>, 258); but they would hardly have contained references to the sanctity of Mizpah if there had not been a holy place there from very early times (cp Bu. *Ri. Sa.* 185). According to Jerome it was one of the places where the ark rested (*Quaest. Heb.* on 1 S. 72; so also Ens. OS 27897), and—a more valuable authority—1 Macc. 346 describes it as containing an ancient Israelitish 'place of

<sup>1</sup> Names with the radicals mentioned by Smith are not uncommon in Palestine (*e.g.*, Wady Za'arah, S. of Baniās).

<sup>2</sup> Cp Gen. 1920, where Zoar is called מִצְפָּה, 'a little thing'; but the text may be corrupt (see *Crit. Bib.*).

<sup>3</sup> In *v.* 5 c sup ras B<sup>1</sup> vid., μασσηφατ Avid.; A has *v.* 6-7, *v.* 12-a and in *v.* 11 A cm. In *v.* 16 A has μασσηφα.

MIZPEH

prayer,' such a spot perhaps as there was on the Mount of Olives (2 S. 1532, RV). It was at this holy place that faithful Israelites gathered when the Syrians had profaned the temple (1 Macc. 346 54). The thrilling account may illustrate Ps. 74 (Che. *OPs.* 94), even if we regard this psalm as pre-Maccabæan (see PSALMS, §§ 8 [δ], 17f., 28 [v.]). We also hear of Mizpah as an administrative centre under the Persian rule (Neh. 37 [μασφα (L), ΒΝΑ om. *v.* 7] 19 [μασφε (BA), -a (L), μαμφε (N)]). It was Robinson who first saw where with most probability its site may be placed (*BR* 1460)—*viz.*, on the mountain now called *Nebv Samwil*. This noble height rises 2935 ft. above the sea-level, and commands the most comprehensive view in southern Palestine, including within its range Jerusalem, which is only 4½ m. off on the NW. (cp 1 Macc. 346, 'over against Jerusalem'). On a lower hill to the N. lies the village of *el-Jib* (see GIBEON), which reminds us that the men of Gibeon and of Mizpah worked together on the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. 37).

Poels' attempt (*Le Sanctuaire de Kirjath-jearim*, 1894, part ii. chap. 1) to show that Gibeon and the town called ham-Mispah were two distinct places on the same sacred hill, to which the name ham-Migpah originally belonged, can hardly be taken seriously.

2. (מִצְפָּה, Gen. 3149 Judg. 111134; מִצְפָּה, Hos. 51; מִצְפָּה גִּלְעָד, 'Mizpeh of Gilead,' Judg. 1129). A town in Gilead where Jephthah resided; consecrated in sacred legend, as presented by E, by the compact of Laban and Jacob. It is the RAMATH-MIZPEH of Josh. 1826, and is most probably to be identified with Penuel—*i.e.*, the citadel and sanctuary of Salhad—though, to suit the present narrative of JE in Gen. 3146-54, it is plausible to identify it with Sif, NW. of Jerash (see GILEAD, § 4).

3. A 'land' or district (מִצְפָּה), and a 'valley' (מִצְפָּה), at the foot of Hermon, to the NE. of the waters of Merom, Josh. 113 (μασσημα [B], μασσηφαθ [A] 8 [μασσωχ [B], μασηκαφατ F], μασσηφα [L]). In MT, which is followed by RV, the land is called the 'land of Mizpah' (מִצְפָּה); but obviously the same region is meant, and we must read in both places either 'Mizpah' (L in both μασσηφα) or 'Mizpeh' (so Bennett, *SSOT*). In early times this district was inhabited by Hivites, or, according to a necessary correction, Hittites (see Moore, *Judges*, 81). Probably the Mizpah, or watchtower, was on some hill in one of the valleys of the Upper Jordan above Lake Hūleh. Robinson placed it at the mod. *Mutalleh*, a Druse village, on a high hill, N. of *Abil* and E. of *Nahr el-Hāshāny*. This, however, seems to be not far enough to the east. Buhl (*Pal.* 240) suggests the site of the castle on the mountain above *Bāniās* called *Kal'at es-Sūbēbeh*. Certainly the spot well deserves to be called Mizpeh.

T. K. C.

MIZPAR, or rather [RV] Mispar (מִצְפָּר); ΜΑΧΠΑ [AL]), a leader (see EZRA ii., § 8e) in the post-exilic list (*ib.* ii., § 9), Ezra 22 (ΜΑΧΠΑ [B])=Neh. 77, MISPERETH (מִצְפָּרָה); ΜΑΧΦΕΡΑΝ [B], ΜΑΧΦΑΡΑΔ [N], ΜΑΧΦΑΡΑΘ [A])=1 Esd. 58. ASPHARASUS (ΑΧΦΑΡΑΧΟΣ [BA]). This last form suggests a connection with Aspadata (אַספָּדָת)=ασπαδατης (Ctesias); so Marq. *Fund.* 35. Some other names, however, in the same verse favour a connection with Misrephath, another form of Zarephath (?); cp HASSOPHERETH.

T. K. C.

MIZPEH (מִצְפָּה, *i.e.*, 'watchtower'; MACCHPA [BAL]).

1. A town in the lowland of Judah, Josh. 1538 (μασφα [BA], μασηφα [L], φασμα [B<sup>a</sup>, b m<sup>g</sup>]), mentioned in the same group with Lachish and Eglon. Eusebius records a Maspha or Massema 'in the district of Eleutheropolis on the north' (OS<sup>(2)</sup> 27919). This agrees with the position of Tell es-Sāfiyeh, which is 7½ m. NNW. from Beit Jibrin, and by Van de Velde and Guérin is identified with this Mizpeh (but cp GATH). There was,

however, a second Maspha on the way from Eleuthero-  
polis to Jerusalem (Eus.). Jerome (*OS*<sup>2</sup> 1395) fuses  
the two statements of Eusebius into one.

2. A town of Benjamin, Josh. 1826 (μασσημα [B],  
μασφα [A]). See MIZPAH, 1.

3. (מַצְפָּה כְּזָבִיב) a place in Moab visited by David in  
his wanderings; 1 S. 22<sup>3</sup> (μασσημα [A]). Consistency  
requires us to suppose the same place to be referred to  
in v. 5, reading בְּמַצְפָּה בְּמַצְפָּה (Klo., Bu., HPSm.,  
Buhl). The geography of the section, however, is im-  
proved if for כְּזָבִיב we read מַצְרַיִם—i.e., the N. Arabian  
Muşri (see MIZRAIM, § 2 b), and for בְּמַצְפָּה, 'Adul-  
lam' is probably a disguise of 'Jarahmeel,' and 'Hareth'  
a corruption of 'Kadesh'; we should expect the original  
of MT's 'Mizpah of Moab' to be 'Zephath lor Zare-  
phath) of Musri.'

4. Mizpeh of Gilead (Judg. 11 29). See MIZPAH, 2.

5. A region by Mt. Hermon (Josh. 11e). See MIZPAH, 3.

T. K. C.

MIZRAIM (מִצְרַיִם); ΜΕΣΡΑΙΜ [AE]; مِصْرَائِم *meş-  
rân*; ΜΕΡΧΗ, var. ΜΕΣΤΡΗ, and [for the 'son' of Ham]  
ΜΕΡΣΑΙΟΣ, var. ΜΕΣΡΑΙΟΣ, ΜΕΣΤΡΑΙΟΣ, ΜΕΣΡΑΜΟΣ  
[Jos.]), or *Misraim*; generally the Heb. name for Egypt  
or Lower Egypt, and hence, according to the prevalent  
view, represented in Gen. 10 as a 'son' of Ham, as a  
brother of Cush, and as the father of Pathrusim=  
Pathros (Gen. 106 [P] 1314 [J] : Gen. 106 ΜΕΣΤΡΑΙΜ  
[D], 13 ΜΕΣΡΑΙΜ [E]; ΜΕΣΡΑΙΜ [L in both  
verses]).

The termination has been commonly regarded as  
dual, and as referring to the division of Egypt into  
Upper and Lower. It is better, however,

**1. Form and meaning of the name.** developed out of *Misram* (see especially  
E. Meyer, *GA* 1, § 42).

This view is rejected by Dillmann and König,<sup>1</sup> but gives the  
easiest explanation of the facts. (1) that מִצְרַיִם, *Misraim*, is twice  
expressly distinguished from PATHROS (פַּתְרוֹס) or Upper Egypt  
(Is. 11 11 Jer. 44), and (2) that the collateral form מִצְרַיִם, *Māsōr*,  
is also (see below) used of Lower Egypt. It is, moreover, the  
only view which does justice to the Bab. and Ass. forms.<sup>2</sup>  
These are Misri (Am. Tab., 21, etc.), Muşur, Mnsuru, Muşri,  
and (in the Babylonian versions of the inscriptions of Darius)  
Mişir. There is also an old form Mişşari (Mi-iš-ša-ri), which  
occurs once in a letter from the king of Assyria to the king of  
Egypt (Am. Tab. 152), while the Mitannite letters favour Mašri  
or Miziri (Wi. *Ann. Tab. Glossary*, 39).<sup>3</sup> The form Mişşari  
seems to Winckler to suggest *mişşōr*, מִצְרַיִם, as the right punctu-  
ation of the form מִצְרַיִם; the Massoretic pointing *māsōr*, מִצְרַיִם,  
is due to a faulty conjectural interpretation of Maşor as  
'fortification' or the like (cp Mic. 7 12, 5 and AV). Maşor  
(Mişşor) is generally recognised only in 2 K. 19 24 (= Is. 37 25)  
Mic. 7 12 Is. 196. Very possibly, however, מִצְרַיִם (Mizraim) at one

<sup>1</sup> König's argument against Meyer (*Theol. Lit.-blatt*, June  
19, 1896) is by no means cogent. That the Phœnician מצרים  
might be a dual form, if there were no special reason to the  
contrary, may be admitted. But there is such a special reason  
(see above). König's reference (made already by Ges.) to an  
old Egyptian appellation for Egypt—*ta-ui* 'the two worlds (or  
lands)—is not more relevant than Naville's (in Smith's *DB*<sup>2</sup>,  
86r) to another title of Egypt (common in Ptolemaic times)—  
*Kehhui*, 'the two basins' (rather 'the two cool, or pleasant,  
places')—and to the references to the two Niles (of Upper and  
Lower Egypt) in the inscriptions. [Egyptian sacred poetry  
reveals in such allusions to the prehistoric two kingdoms (see  
*Egypt*, § 43). Egypt has a double Nile, two classes of temples,  
etc. But these plays never entered into colloquial Egyptian,  
hence they can never have influenced the Asiatics. It is even  
questionable whether the designation 'both countries' (*taui* or  
*ioui*) was constructed grammatically as a dual in common parlance  
after 1600 B.C.—W. M. M.] Jensen's suggestion of מצרים (*ZDMG*,  
1894, p. 439), which is also rejected by König, is, however, not  
impossible (in the Amarna inscriptions the usual form is Mi-iš-  
ri-i). It had already been made by Reinisch (see Ebers, 1 90)  
and Friedr. Delitzsch (*Pur.* 309). Cp מצרים.

<sup>2</sup> See Wi. *ATUnters.* 168-174, esp. 170, and cp Schr. *KGF*  
246 ff.; Del. *Par.* 308 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Cp Msr in Minæan inscriptions, and Ar. Mişr (Egyptian-Ar.,  
Maşr). Also old Pers. Mudhrāya (from Ass. Muşur, Muşri),  
and the form *Murpa* ascribed by Steph. Byz. to the Phœ-  
nicians (?).

time appeared more frequently in the Hebrew texts. Sometimes  
it may have been distorted or (see Klo., Che. on Is. 59 10)  
mutilated by the ordinary causes of corruption; sometimes it  
may have been altered into מצרים by editors, who may perhaps  
have imagined that they saw a sign of abbreviation after מצר.  
As to the meaning of the name we can be brief. *Misraim* is  
certainly not *aque clause* (2 K. 19 24 Vg.), a view which  
Naville (Smith, *DB*<sup>2</sup>) adopts, with the explanation 'water  
enclosed in dykes or walls, basins or canals' (cp n. 1), nor  
'double fortified enclosure' (Ebers, *Aeg. u. d. BB.* Mos. 187).  
[W. Spiegelberg, *Rec. Trav.* 20 (1898), 40, attempted an Egyp-  
tian etymology *mz(ors)*, 'fortification, wall,' thinking that the  
origin of *Misraim* is to be sought for in the fortifications of the  
eastern frontier of the Delta, especially at the entrance to  
GOSHEN. As long as we cannot prove the use of *mzr* (?) in the  
wider sense, this theory possesses little probability. Besides,  
the pronunciation of the Egyptian word is doubtful.—W. M. M.]

*Misraim*, as the extended application of the name  
Muşur (Misir) in Assyrian (see §§ 2 a, 2 b) suggests, is  
most probably an Assyrian appellative = 'frontier-land.'  
See Hommel, *GBA* 550, n. 2; Wi., *AOF* 125; and  
below, § 2 b, end.

Schrader long ago pointed out (*ZA*, 1874, p. 53)  
that the name Muşri in the Assyrian inscriptions did  
not always mean Egypt. It was left for  
**2a. N. Syrian Musri.** Winckler, however, to show that there  
was not only a N. Syrian but also a N.

Arabian Muşri, and to bring this discovery into relation  
to OT criticism.

About 1300 B.C. (Shalmaneser I.) and again about  
1100 B.C. (Tiglath-pileser I.) we find the name Muşri  
applied to a state in N. Syria, S. of the Taurus, which  
also included parts of Cappadocia, Cataonia, and  
Cilicia, and reached southward perhaps as far as the  
Orontes (see *RP*<sup>2</sup> 1 109 f.; *KB* 135; Rogers, *Bab. and  
Ass.* 212). In Aşur-nasir-pal's time it is called Patin (so  
Wi., cp PADDAN-ARAM); but under Shalmaneser II.  
we again hear of a state—it is a very small one—called  
Muşri, which sent auxiliaries to Benhadad at the battle  
of Karkar. As is pointed out elsewhere (see *JEHORAM*,  
§ 2), this must be the state referred to in 2 K. 7 6 ('the  
kings of the Hittites and the kings of מצרים'), unless  
indeed we can believe (as J. Taylor well puts it) 'that  
the local Egyptian kings would serve as *condottieri* for  
Israel' (*Exp.* T 7 406 f.). Such a relation, however,  
might quite conceivably have been entered into by the  
kings of the Hittite territory and its neighbourhood.  
We may even go a step further, and criticise the common  
interpretation of 1 K. 10 28 f., 2 Ch. 1 16 f. The question  
is, did the agents of Solomon procure horses and  
chariots (both for Solomon and—as the text stands—  
for the Hittite and Aramæan kings) from Egypt or from  
the N. Syrian land of Muşri? It must be admitted that  
the critics before Winckler were somewhat credulous.  
Certainly, it may be assumed that the Egyptians bred  
horses for their own use.<sup>1</sup> But is it in the least probable  
that they ever had an export-trade in horses, when we  
consider the lack of extensive pastures in Egypt? Now  
that we know of a N. Syrian and Cilician Muşri, we  
cannot help interpreting the מצרים in 1 K. 10 28 2 Ch. 1 16,  
as the name of that region. It would, indeed, be passing  
strange if, while the Egyptians themselves imported  
powerful stallions from N. Syria,<sup>2</sup> the Israelites should  
have imported horses from Egypt.<sup>3</sup> But did Israel  
import chariots as well as horses from Muşri? Must  
the מצרים of 1 K. 10 29 be the N. Syrian Muşri? We  
know that the Egyptians had the most perfect of chariots.  
Though in the first instance they had imported chariots  
from Syria, their workmen soon became independent  
and improved upon their teachers (see Maspero, *l.c.*,  
and cp CHARIOT, § 5). If we believe that Solomon  
had close friendly relations with Egypt, we may, if we

<sup>1</sup> See Erman, quoted by Wi. (*op. cit.* 173).

<sup>2</sup> See Maspero, *Struggle of Nations*, 215, with thereferences.

<sup>3</sup> The 'great horses' which Aşur-bāni-pal (*Annals*, 2 40; *KB*  
2169) took as booty from the Egyptian city of Kipkip may or  
may not have been all bred in Egypt. Nowhere is any reference  
made by Assyrian kings to Egyptian horses as tribute: the  
supply would have been insufficient. Aşur-bāni-pal himself gave  
chariots and horses to Necho (*Annals*, 2 14; *KB* 2 167). See  
HORSE.

## MIZRAIM

will, suppose that he procured a few chariots from Egypt as models,<sup>1</sup> and that the compiler of 1 K. 10<sup>28</sup> f. interwove a tradition respecting the chariots imported from Mizraim (Egypt) with a tradition respecting the import of horses from the N. Syrian Mušri (and Kue, or E. Cilicia). The connection of Solomon, however, with Egypt is very disputable; it was probably with the N. Arabian Musri that he was connected by marriage. Moreover, as we shall see presently, Solomon's agents were not Israelites, but merchants of the Hittites and of Syria. These merchants had of course no dealings with Egypt. The source of supply for Solomon's horses and chariots was the N. Syrian Mušri; not only this district, however, but also the region called Kue, or Eastern Cilicia. מִצְרַיִם in v. 28, as Lenormant (*Orig. de l'hist.* 39) and Winckler (*AT Unt.* 174) have pointed out,<sup>2</sup> most probably enfolds this long-lost name (Kuē).<sup>3</sup> We know from Herodotus (390) that Cilicia was a famous horse-breeding country, and from Ezekiel (2714) that the Tyrians obtained their horses from Togarmah, at any rate from Asia Minor.

The whole passage should possibly run nearly as follows:—'And the source from which Solomon's horses were derived was Mušri, and the king's young steeds used to be fetched from Kuē. And a chariot was estimated at 600 pieces of silver. And [ ] pieces of silver [they used to pay] for a young steed to the merchants of the Hittites and of Syria, by whom they were exported.' With Ruben (*JQR* 10543) read יִקְחוּ for יִקְחוּ; the word should close v. 28. For כְּחֵרִי read כְּחֵרִי (see *Del. Ass. HWB*, s.v. 'Suhiru'), and for בְּמִצְרַיִם read בְּמִצְרַיִם transferring it to v. 296. Omit וְהִצִּיא בָּל (Ruben). For בֶּן read perhaps בְּקָה and for מְלִכֵי read רְבִלֵי (Che).

In 2 K. 7.6 (siege of Samaria) we should also apparently read מְצִירִים, and explain it of the N. Syrian Mušri (see Jerohoram, § 2).

We turn to another Mušri. It was not, as Schrader (*KB* 221) thought, over the marches towards the Egyptian Mušri that Tiglath-pileser appointed Idi-bi'il (see *ADBEEL*) governor, but over a distinct, though not far distant, Mušri in N. Arabia, bordering on Edom. Nor was it in Egypt that Hanunu of Gaza and Yaman of Ashdod sought refuge from the Assyrians, but in a nearer country, the N. Arabian Mušri, which was in Yaman's time under the supremacy of the king of Meluhha (in N. Arabia; see *SINAI*, map). Further, the king whom Sargon calls 'Pir'u šar (mat) Musuri' was, not the Egyptian Pharaoh (Schr. *KAT*<sup>2</sup>, 397), but a N. Arabian king (the next sovereign mentioned is Samsieh, queen of Arabia). This turtan (= tartan), or general, is Sib'e; he joined Hanun of Gaza, and fled from the field of battle; he is commonly but incorrectly known as 'So, king of Egypt' (see *So*). Now it was only to be expected that some references to this Musri in the OT should become visible to keen eyes. It is with a shock of surprise, however, that we gradually find out how many they are.<sup>4</sup> We are still further startled to hear that there was not only a Mušri but also a Kuš (Cush) in N. Arabia (see *CUSH*, 2); we find, however, that a flood of light is thrown thereby on a very large group of interesting passages. Caution no doubt is necessary. Winckler's theory, that the belief in the early residence of Israelitish tribes in Egypt arose simply and solely out of a confusion of the N. Arabian with the Egyptian Musri, is at any rate very plausible (see *MOSES*, §§ 2 ff., but cp *EXODUS* i.).<sup>5</sup> And it is in the

1 More than a few chariots for Palestine would have taxed the resources of the Egyptians too much. They were not rich in timber.  
2 Cp Ki. ('Chron.' *SBOT*), Maspero (*Struggle of Nations*, 740). Maspero's theory of 1 K. 10<sup>28</sup> f. is improbable.  
3 See Schr. *KGF* 236 ff.; Tiele, *BAG* 153; cp in 1 K. 10<sup>28</sup> f. θεκουε and the Hexaplar variant εκ κωα; 1 L adds και εκ δαμασκου.  
4 The biblical references which follow are partly due to the keen insight of Winckler. Take them altogether, and they seem almost to open up a new stage in OT criticism and history; but the student will be amply rewarded for the trouble of investigating and appropriating even a few of the chief results.  
5 It is no drawback to Winckler's originality that an English-

## MIZRAIM

highest degree likely that, in the original tradition, Hagar ham-misrith (EV 'the Egyptian') came not from Egypt but from N. Arabia (see *BEER-LAHAI-ROI*), and that the Pharaoh (Pir'u?) or Abimelech (Jerahmeel?) with whom, in duplicate forms of the same story, Abraham and Isaac are brought into connection, was a king of the N. Arabian Mušri (see *ABIMELECH*, *GERAR*). In the description of the district which Lot chose it is probably Mišrim, not Misraim, that should be read, though some will demur to this on account of the interference with the text which Winckler (rightly) allows himself (*Gen.* 13<sup>10</sup> f.). There can hardly be a doubt, too, that *ABEL-MIZRAIM* [*q.v.*] originally meant 'Abel in the land of Mušri,' and that the phrase מְצִירִים נָחַל originally meant, not 'the Egyptian Wādy,' hut 'the WHDY (or Torrent) of Mušri' in N. Arabia (see *EGYPT*, *RIVER OF*).

The present writer has sought to show that the land to which Abraham was sent with his son Isaac, according to *Gen.* 22, was Mušri, not 'Moriah' (see *ISAAC*, *MORIAH*), and that Dinahah (*Gen.* 36 32), and Pethor, from which Balaam came (*Nu.* 22 5a) are merely corruptions of Kehoboth (by the river of Mušri), and Mezahab and Dizahab corruptions of מְצִירִים (*Gen.* 36 39; *Dt.* 1 1; see *BELA*, *MATRED*, *PETHOR*, etc.). So too the family of Jarha traced its origin, no doubt, to a Mišrite or Mušrite, not to an Egyptian ancestor (see *JARHA*, *JERAHMEEL*). The slave left behind by an Amalekite in the story of the capture of Ziklag (1 S. 30 13), and the tall foe of Benaiah, who was slain by his own spear in the hand of Benaiah (2 S. 23 21), were also both Mušrites. It was the king of Mišrim who gave his daughter in marriage to Solomon and conquered Gezer for his son-in-law (1 K. 9 16; see *SOLOMON*), and Mišrim, not Mišraim, should be read in 1 K. 5 1 [4 21] 865. It was also with the N. Arabian Mušri that *JEROBOAM* [*q.v.*] was connected through his mother, and there he took refuge from the wrath of Solomon; and the same country gave a home to another adversary of Solomon (who likewise had a Mušrite mother). Hadad the Edomite (see *HADAD*, § 3).

That Mušri had close relations with Palestine in later times, we have seen already (story of Hanun and Yaman). The story of Elijah also contains indications of the same important fact. It was probably 'Arabians,' not 'ravens,' that the original text represented as the friends of Elijah, and the 'brook Cherith' should be the 'wady of Kehoboth' (see *CHERITH*, *RAVEN*). A pre-exilic writer too, gives, most probably, a list of districts bordering on N. Arabia as 'sons' of Mišrim (not Mizraim) in *Gen.* 10 13 f., whilst Mišrim itself is, according to P, a 'son' of Ham (Jerahmeel).<sup>1</sup> P of course is not himself pre-exilic; but we can at any rate refer to the prophecies of Isaiah; *Is.* 20 in its most original form, and 306 7 a, according to the original meaning, speak of Mišrim not of Mišraim. (See 'Isaiah,' *SBOT* 98, 102. On 1 K. 14 25, see *SHISHAK*.)

The N. Arabian Mušri is also very probably referred to in *Am.* 19 and 39,<sup>2</sup> also, by an archaism, in many other late passages, only a few of which can be mentioned, *Eccl.* 1, *Is.* 433 4514 [*SBOT*, 140], *Joel* 3 [4] 4<sup>3</sup> 19, *Hab.* 37, *Lam.* 4 21 56, *Ps.* 60 11 [9] 838 [7] 87 4 120 5 and, probably, elsewhere in the Psalter (see *PSALMS*, *LAMENTATIONS*).

Glancing once more in conclusion at the origin of the form Mizraim, we cannot help seeing how well E. Meyer's view (see § 1) agrees with the theory adopted

man, Dr. C. T. Beke, in 1834 anticipated him as to the general situation of the מְצִירִים of the Exodus (see *EXODUS*, § 4; *MOSES*, § 6). Though noticed in due time by Ewald, the leading OT scholar of the day, the suggestion produced no impression upon criticism. Internal evidence was not enough; archaeological data were necessary to complete the proof, or at any rate to enforce a respectful consideration of the hypothesis.

<sup>1</sup> According to the view proposed here and in *Crit. Bib.*, *Gen.* 10 13 f. should run thus (on *v.* 10-12 see *INIMROD*)—'And Mišrim begat Carmelites, and Meonites, and Baalathites, and Tappuhites, and Zarephathites, and Ziklagites, and Rehobothites, from whence came forth the Pelistim [to fight with David; cp 2 S. 21 78-22]. All these are places in S. Judah or on its border; the substitution of 'Rehobothites' for 'Capthorites' and of 'Zarephathites' for 'Pathrusim' may specially deserve attention.

<sup>2</sup> See the cogent argument of Wl. *Musri* 2 (1898), 8 f. It should be noted that *Am.* 110 corresponds with 39 where the 'palaces' or 'fortresses' in the land of מְצִירִים are mentioned. The writer assumes that the capital of Mušri was called מְצִיר. See *AMOS*, § 9.

<sup>3</sup> 'O Tyre and Zidon' (צִידוֹן) should probably be 'OMišsur' (מִצְוֹר); N. Arabia is meant. 'Philistia' (פְּלִשְׁתִּים) should perhaps be 'Zarephath,' a place and district which were reckoned to the N. Arabian Mušri. See *ZAREPHATH*.

MIZZAH

above from Winckler. In fact, in a Minæan inscription (*Hal.* 535) we find the terms Miṣran and al-Miṣr used indifferently for the same N. Arabian region (Wi. *AOF* 337). See especially Winckler, 'Musri, Meluhha, Ma'in,' I. and II. in the *MVG*, 1898. It should be noticed in connection with this subject (1) that there are textual phenomena—too many to be mentioned here—which strongly favour the theory that מצרים is often wrongly pointed מצרים; (2) that historical results are appearing which clear up various obscure parts of the Hebrew historical tradition; and (3) that there are other ethnics and place-names which have been misread in certain contexts, and which, if correctly restored, illustrate and confirm the view here given respecting מצרים, among which may be especially mentioned מואב (see MOAB, iii.), שכם for שָׁמָר [see SHECHEM, and SHECHEM, TOWER OF], עמלק for עמון, Jerahmeel, Jerahmeelim (see JERAHMEEL, MOSES, § 6 f.), חברון, כרית, and כרתה, רהובתי, רהובת (see REHOBOTH), קרש for חרשת, גשור (see GESHUR, 2), אשו (see SISERA), etc. It is not necessary to accept all these in order to do justice to the arguments in favour of מצור (מצור) and מצרים; but it is needful to see that the foundations of Israelite history have to be re-examined, and to realise that we have now fully passed the stage of merely speculative inquiry, and are reaching or have reached that of well-assured methodical investigation. If our general theory is sound, nothing indeed is stranger than the regularity with which scribes make their mistakes, and editors, under the influence of historical theory, their conjectural corrections. T. K. C.

The following illustrative passages from the inscriptions, relative to the N. Arabian Muṣri and Kuṣ, are taken chiefly from Schrader, *KAT* (2):—

1. p. 289, l. 73. Šarrānī mht Muṣri, the kings of Muṣur, mentioned along with the kings of Miluḥḥi (cp 80, 81).
2. p. 255, l. 19 ff., and Wi. *AOF* i. 26. Hanunu of Gaza fled to māṭ Muṣri. Cp 396 f.; the same Hanunu joins Saḥ-i, who is called siltannu (or turtannu) mht Muṣri, on which see Wi. *AOF* i. 26 f. Both together march against Sargon at Raphia. In l. 3 of the second inscription pir'u šar māṭ Muṣri occurs. Pir'u is not, as Schrader supposed in 1883=Ppharaoh, but the name of a N. Arabian king; he is mentioned with a N. Arabian queen, Samsieh, and a Sabæan, It'amar.
3. p. 398, l. 6 f.; cp Wi. 27. Sargon advances against Yaman; who flees 'ana iti māṭ Muṣri ša pa-aṭ māṭ Miluḥḥa innabit'—i.e., towards the district of Muṣur which belongs to Meluḥḥa. See ASHDOD.
4. p. 301, l. 23; Wi. 27; Šar māṭ Muṣri mentioned between Ashkelon and Ekron-and-Meluḥḥa—i.e., the N. Arabian region, including, as Wi. contends, the lands of Muṣri and Kuṣ.
5. A fragment (Rm. 284) of Esar-haddon's Annals (Wi. *AOF* ii. 17 f.). 'Esar-haddon, king of Aššur, šakkanak of Babylon . . . Kns, whither none of my fathers . . . [messengers] had sent, [answer] had not come back, . . . whither birds do not fly (?).'  
This is illustrated by the description which Esar-haddon gives in a fragment of his Annals (Budge, *Hist. of Esar-haddon*, 114 ff.; cp Wi. *Unters.* 97 f.), in which the king, speaking of his second Egyptian campaign, says, 'From the country of Egypt the camp I withdrew, and to the land of Meluḥḥa I set straight the road (expedition). . . Four kashu of ground, a journey of two days, snakes (with) two heads . . . of death, and I trampled upon . . . gazelles, of lizards winged (?). . . The god Merodach, the great lord (to my) help came, he saved the life of my army.' This passage, indeed, is of illustrative value, not only for the frequent relation to Kuṣ just quoted, but also for the striking description in Is. 30:6-7a, which (see ISAIAH [BOOK], § 11) really refers to the flight of Hanunu of Gaza to Pir'u king of the N. Arabian Muṣri. The Assyrian and the Hebrew descriptions of the inhospitable region traversed are in singular agreement. We should remember, in reading the former, that Esar-haddon sought to bring all Arabia under the supremacy of Assyria.
6. Esar-haddon's account of his tenth campaign (Budge, 117). The phrase 'which (is called) in the language of the men of the land of Kuṣ and Muṣur' can hardly refer, as Budge thought in 1880, to Ethiopia and Egypt. The order of the names would have been the reverse. So Winckler, *Musri* ii., 2, who gives another illustrative passage which need not be quoted.

MIZZAH (מִיזָה; § 32 n.), one of the four 'sons' of Reuel b. Esau; Gen. 36:13-17. 1 Ch. 1:37 (in Gen. MOZE, hut MOZAI [D] in v. 17; in Ch. OMOZE [B], MOXE[A], MAZE [L]). See EDOM, and cp GENEALOGIES i., § 7, col. 1665.

MOAB

MNASON (ΜΝΑΣΩΝ [Ti. WH]), a man of Cyprus, and 'an old disciple,' in whose house in Jerusalem Paul lodged on the occasion of his last recorded visit to that city (Acts 21:16), the apostle and his party having been conducted thither by the friends from Cæsarea.

In EV Mnason is represented as having accompanied the party from Cæsarea; hut ἀγοντες παρ' ὧ ξενισθόμεν Μνάσωι τινι ought rather to be resolved into ἀγ. πρὸς Μνάσ. ἵνα ξενισθόμεν παρ' αὐτῷ, and translated 'bringing us to one hinason . . . with whom we should lodge.' D Syr. p. marg. for ἀγοντες κ.τ.λ. reads as follows: οὗτοι δὲ ἡγαγον ἡμᾶς πρὸς οὗς ξενισθόμεν, καὶ παραγενόμενοι εἰς τινὰ κώμην ἐγενόμεθα παρὰ Μνάσωι Κυπρίῳ, μαθητῆ ἀρχαίῳ, κακεῖθεν ἐξίόντες ἤλθομεν εἰς Ἱερ., ὑπέδειξαντὸ (Tisch. ὑπέδειξαν) τε ἡμᾶς ἀσμένως οἱ ἀδελφοί—thus making out Mnason to have been Paul's host, not at Jerusalem, but at some village intermediate between Cæsarea and Jerusalem. The reading is accepted by Blass, Holtzmann, and Hilgenfeld; but, as Wendt (*ad loc.*, 1893), remarks, it is not easy to see how such a reading, had it been the original one, should have disappeared from the received text, whilst, on the other hand, its introduction into the received text may be easily explained as due to a certain difficulty caused by v. 17, which seemed to imply that Paul did not arrive in Jerusalem until after he had been with hinason.

Mnason is conjectured to have been a Hellenist and to have belonged to that circle of the (Hellenistic) 'brethren' by whom Paul was received gladly the day before he presented himself to James and the (Judaistic) elders (v. 17 f.). The designation 'old disciple' (ἀρχαῖος μαθητής) is perhaps to be associated with the 'at the beginning' (ἐν ἀρχῇ) of Acts 11:15; he may have been one of the men of Cyprus who were driven from Jerusalem by the persecution after the death of Strphen, and may have been first introduced to Paul at Antioch.

MOAB

Name (§ 1).	Cities (§ 9).
Boundaries (§ 2).	Neighbours (§ 10).
Country (§§ 3-6).	History (§ 11 f.).
People (§ 7).	Moab and Israel (§ 13).
Roads (§ 8).	More OT ref. (§ 14).

The exact form of the name is tolerably certain; Heb. מואב, Gen. 19:37, and 178 times (acc. to BDB), once

1. Name and geographical terms. מואב, 2 S. 8:12; מואב, מואב-geographical [ε]ΙΤΗC, Η ΜΩΑΒ[ε]ΙΤΙC; Ass. *Mu'-a-ba*, but also *Ma'-ba*, *Ma'-ab*, *Ma-terms*.

'a-ab (Schr. *KAT* 140, 257, 355 and Glossary; Del. *Par.* 294 ff.), MI מואב. The etymology offered in Gen. 19:37 is hardly sufficient proof that Mō'ab was ever slurred to Mē'ab, though such change was possible (Nestle, *St. Kr.*, 1892, p. 573). The etymology in question is given in the Greek of Gen. 19:37, λέγουσα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μου, which Ball (*SBOT*) adds to the MT: לאמר מצרי. Neither this derivation, however, nor an alternative of similar meaning (Ges. *Thes.*) can be the real one. The form seems participial, and the Heb. יאב, 'to desire,' has been suggested, as if Moab='the desirable' land or people. It is more in accordance with what we know of the Moabite tongue to seek for the root in Arabic, where, however, the only possible one is wa'aba, 'to be affected with shame or anger.'

To this question is allied the other, of the original and principal object of the name. Some authorities (e.g., Bennett in *Hast. BD* 3:403) take this to have been the land. The Hebrew evidence, however, rather points to the people.

It is indeed doubtful whether in any OT passage 'Moab' by itself means the land. BDB s.v. cites Nu. 21:11 as a passage where the land is meant; but in v. 13 Moab is parallel to the gentile Amorite: in v. 15 also it is the people. 'Moab' is not necessarily the land even in Judg. 3:29, nor in Am. 2:1 f., nor Zeph. 2:9 (parallel to Ammonites); and everywhere else the people are obviously meant.

This evidence is confirmed by the facts: that Moah has not survived as a geographical term; that the Greek translators found it necessary to form the geographical expression Moab-βείτις; and that similarly in Hebrew itself when the territory is intended one or other of several compound expressions is used: ארץ מואב, 'land of Moab' both in D (and Dt. 15:2869 [29:1] 34:5 f. and Dt. passages in other books, e.g., Judg. 11:15 ff.) and



MOAB

in P (Dt. 32.46) ; שְׂדֵה מוֹאָב, 'territory of Moab' E (? Nu. 21.20) ; שְׂרֵי מִי in P (Gen. 36.35) and in Ruth 1.4.6 26.4.3. Other names for parts of the territory are הַמִּישׁוֹר, 'the tableland,' in P (Josh. 13.10 16.7.20.8) ; probably also שְׂרֹן (1 Ch. 5.16, cp HG 548) from the same root ; מִדְּבַר מוֹאָב, 'wilderness of M.' (Dt. 2.8) = קְרִמּוֹת, 'wilderness of Kedemoth' or 'the eastern parts' (Dt. 2.26) ; עֲרֵבּוֹת מוֹאָב, 'steppes of M.', the parts of the Arabah opposite Jericho on the E. of Jordan : always in P (Nu. 22.1 26.3 63 81 12 33 50 36 13 Dt. 34.10 8 Josh. 13.32) ; אֶרֶץ יַעֲזֵר, 'the land of Ja'azer,' is used by JE (Nu. 32.1) for the bulk of the country ; and in Ezek. 25.9 we find כִּתְּף כְּמוֹב, 'shoulder of Moab,' doubtless meaning the ridge above the Dead Sea.<sup>2</sup>

The natural boundaries of the land of Moab are well defined except in the N., where there is practically no frontier. To the E. lies the Arabian desert ; but even here the line between arable land, on which men may settle, and the real desert suitable only for nomads, is indeterminate. As the ruins of towns, however, all cease before the Hajj (Mecca pilgrimage) road is reached, and as very few of the wadies rise farther E., the road may be taken as a conventional boundary in that direction. On the S., Is. 15.7 gives the נַגַל הַתְּרָבִים ('torrent valley of the Poplars' : see ARABAH [BROOK]) as the frontier ; this is probably the long Wādy el Hasy (or Hesi or Hessi cf the PEF reduced map, or el-A)ḥsā of some travellers), running up SE. from the south end of the Dead Sea, and described by Doughty (*Ar. Des.* 126) as dividing the uplands of Moab from those of Edom (the מִדְּבַר אֲדוֹם, 'wilderness of E.,' 2 K. 38). On the W. the boundary was the Dead Sea and the Jordan. On the N. and NE. lay the territory of Ammon ; but here there are no natural features conspicuous enough to form a boundary. When Moab's political frontier lay so far N. it probably took a diagonal direction, running SE. from the torrent valley now called W. Nimrin, to the present Hajj road : there are no Moabite towns identifiable at any distance to the N. of W. Ḥeshbān (but see under AMMON and JAZER). Within these boundaries, measuring from the W. Nimrin on the N. to the W. el-Hasy on the S. and from the Dead Sea coast on the W. to the Hajj road on the E., we get a territory about 60 m. long by 30 broad ; but the actual utmost length of Moab may have been rather under than over 50 m. ; cf the breadth, not more than two-thirds was ever cultivated or settled land.

The bulk of this territory consists of high tableland on much the same level as the great deserts to the E. of it, but broken by several wide, deep, and precipitous cañons across the greater part of its breadth, and by many shorter, gisens immediately above the Dead Sea.<sup>3</sup> In other words, Moab is but the cracked and gaping edge of the great Arabian plateau. The elevation is from 2300 to 3300 above the Mediterranean, or from 3600 to 4600 above the Dead Sea ;<sup>4</sup> rising slowly from N. to S., and as a rule a very little higher along the W. edge (before the promontories run out) than towards the desert, to which there is a slight dip. The geology is the same as that of the range on the other side of the

3. Character of region.

The bulk of this territory consists of high tableland on much the same level as the great deserts to the E. of it, but broken by several wide, deep, and precipitous cañons across the greater part of its breadth, and by many shorter, gisens immediately above the Dead Sea.<sup>3</sup> In other words, Moab is but the cracked and gaping edge of the great Arabian plateau. The elevation is from 2300 to 3300 above the Mediterranean, or from 3600 to 4600 above the Dead Sea ;<sup>4</sup> rising slowly from N. to S., and as a rule a very little higher along the W. edge (before the promontories run out) than towards the desert, to which there is a slight dip. The geology is the same as that of the range on the other side of the

<sup>1</sup> [It is not impossible that in documents used by the writers of our present Hexateuch the geography differed in important respects from that which we find in this work, and that the geographical difficulties which this work presents are largely owing to this. See special articles on the place-names, and WANDERINGS. Thus 'Moab' may often have come from Mišsur (the N. Arabian Musri ; see MIZRAIM, § 2 b), and 'Arboth-Moab' may have been corrupted out of 'Arāb-mišsur.—T. K. C.]

<sup>2</sup> See col. 3170, ll. 2-3. The surface falls into two parts : N. of W. Wāleh there is a rolling plain, now part of the Belkā', and probably the Mišar of Josh. 13.16, etc. (see § 1) : it is broken only by short glens in the W. From W. Wāleh southwards the surface is broken as far E. as the desert by the great canons.

<sup>3</sup> The PEF Survey Maps give the following heights from N. to S. : Elealeh 3064 (on a height above the surrounding plateau), Heshbon 2964, Mt. Nebo 2642 (rather below the plateau), Medela 2380 (?), other neighbouring figures are 2600, 2700, 2800 ; Kerak 48 2323, Moteh 2800, Jafar 4114 (?). The figures on the Hajj road from N. to S. run 2400, 2700, 2500, 2900.

MOAB

great Jordan fault : a basis of Nubian sandstone (as can be seen in the cañons and along the Dead Sea coast) rising to 1000 ft. above the Mediterranean ; upon that a crystalline limestone some 1500 ft. thick ; and then 500 ft. of soft cretaceous limestone, on which lies the soil of the plateau.<sup>1</sup> The springs all rise at the junction of the hard and soft limestone. Thus the plateau itself is without them ; but they are found in all the cañons and glens, which for the most part have in consequence perennial streams. As throughout Eastern Palestine, there are volcanic features : scattered outbreaks of black basalt, many of them with warm and sulphurous fountains. The rainfall is 'fair' (Wilson, *PEFQ*, 1899, p. 309), 'the climate colder than that of W. Palestine, and snowstorms<sup>2</sup> are not uncommon in winter and spring, and then the easterly winds are very cold. The summer is hot, but the nights cool' (*ibid.*).

Seen from Western Palestine, with the Dead Sea between, Moab presents the appearance of a mountain-wall (mountains of the ABARIM [q.v.]), the red sandstone glowing above the blue waters, and broken only by two or three valleys, of which the Mōjib or Amōn offers the widest gap. Seen from the Jordan valley, the range of 'Abārim breaks up into what seem separate mountains, rising from the Dead Sea by slope and precipice to a height of 3000 and 4000 ft. ; but in reality these are not so much mountains as piers or promontories of the plateau, at pretty much the same level as the latter. Behind them runs, a very little higher than they, its long western ridge (already referred to), from which the plateau slopes very gently to the desert.

The general exposure of the plateau is thus eastwards and to the desert ; the slight western ridge shuts out the view to the W. From the similar geology, the scenery of the plateau is very like that of the hill-country of Judæa. In most localities one would not know the difference, except that in Judah the inhabitant always feels the great gulf lying to the E. and isolating the land from the rest of Asia ; whilst from Moab the open desert rolls eastward without trench or bulwark between. This fact is pregnant with much of the distinction between the histories of the two countries. In Moab you never feel out of touch with Arabia ; but Western Palestine belongs to the Levant.

The limestone soil of Moab, though often shallow, stony, and broken by ridges and scalps of rock, is extremely fertile, and produces, without artificial additions, large crops of wheat. Every traveller has been impressed with this. Visiting it in March, Bliss calls it 'the green plateau' (*PEFQ*, 1895, p. 205) ; even in July (1891), when the present writer was there, though the general aspect was brown and white, the amount of edible grass was considerable and the still unreaped fields were heavily laden with corn. In the town of Kerak, Doughty says (*Ar. Des.* 122, cp 12 f.) that grain 'is almost as the sand.' Where there is no cultivation the high healthy moors are tolerably covered with rich aromatic pasture and scattered bushes of 'retem' or broom ; and in the hollows, upon the non-porous limestone, the grass grows high and thick (*ib.* 27), and even the surrounding slopes are in spring 'staidly green' (Bliss, *op. cit.* 213). With the nomadic character of so many of the present population, there are few vineyards (only about Kerak) ; but the English survey discovered many ancient winepresses, especially about Heshbon and about Sibmah in the Jordan valley. The plateau itself is almost absolutely treeless,<sup>3</sup> and the slopes towards the Jordan valley bear little more than thorns and thistles ; but in the well-watered cañons there is much bush, tamarisks are frequent, and especially long lovely groves of oleander ; in places rushes and ferns grow luxuriantly. Consequently there is a wealth of bird-life (Tristram, *Land of Moab*) ; wolves, jackals, hyænas, gazelles, wild cows, and the *beden* or ibex are

<sup>1</sup> Cp Conder, Append. A to *PEFM*, *Heth and Moab* ; Wilson, *PEFQ*, 1899, p. 307.

<sup>2</sup> In Feb. 1898 Brünnow was delayed by deep snow in the Belkā' (*MDFV*, 1899, p. 24).

<sup>3</sup> Whilst Gilead is thickly wooded, the woods cease S. of the Jabhok ; here the only wood is the Hirsch el-'Amīyeh. See *PEF Survey, E. Pal.*, 109, cp group of firs at eš-Šinūbarāt, i.e., 'the Firs' (*idem*, 220).





MOAB

all found (*Heth and Moab*, 122 f.). Bees abound, and there is considerable cultivation of honey.

The principal valleys with watercourses and intervening mountains or headlands are the following, beginning

First, there are a dozen **4. Watercourses and headlands.** from the N. or more short watercourses (of which the longest is hardly 16 in.) falling rapidly from the surface level of the hard limestone, 2500 ft. above the Mediterranean, by more or less narrow glens, almost straight into the Jordan valley and Dead Sea, 1290 ft. below the Mediterranean. They contain shallow burns or brooks of water. The chief are the WBdies Nimrin, Kefrein, Kūṣeib, HesbBn, 'Ayiin Mūsā, el-Jideid, el-Meshabbēh. 'Ain HesbBn (see HESHBON) is about 500 ft. below the village of that name, and gives birth to a considerable stream of pure water in a valley with many gardens and some ancient ruins. The headland between WHdy HesbBn and W. 'Ayiin Mūsā, el-Meṣukkar, is probably the biblical BETHPEOR (q.v.; פְּעוֹר probably = 'gorge' or 'pass'). The next headland, that to the S. of the W. 'Ayūn Mūsā, still bears the name Nebā, and may [as the text stands] confidently be identified with the Mt. Nebo of P, for which E and D give 'the Pisgah' (see *HG*, 563 f.; but cp NEBO, MOUNT). The AŠHDOTH PISGAH are the barren terraces and steep slopes, covered with thistles only, which fall down into the W. 'Ayiin Mūsā, and the Seil el-Hery or W. Jideid. The W. 'Ayūn Mūsā would therefore be the 'glen' of Nu. 2120; though some prefer for this the W. Hēsban. The headland S. of W. Meshabbēh is taken by Conder and others to be Bethpeor; behind it on the plateau is Mā'in, probably BAALME'ON.

After this series of short watercourses and intervening headlands we have the three large cañons, which, with

some of their tributaries, break from the desert itself. At first broad, shallow basins, they slowly shelve westward, narrowing as they deepen to some thousands of feet below the level of the plateau; with colossal cliffs and, in some places before they reach their mouths on the Dead Sea coast, narrow ravines, almost impassable.

The first of these great trenches is the Wādy Zerḳā Ma'in, with sources so far N. as the southern side of the watershed from the 'Ammān, in Ammonite territory, and draining the whole of the northern plateau. The higher elevation of the plateau to the S. prevents any but the most meagre of tributaries from that direction. Ten miles from the Dead Sea the W. Zerḳā Ma'in is nearly 2 m. wide from lip to lip and 1400 ft. deep. The whole of the stream in the Wady (not merely the hot wells upon it) appear to be the Καλλιρόη, Callirrhoe, of Josephus (*Ant.* xvii. 65; *BJ* i. 335) and Pliny (*NH* v. 1672).

Josephus places 'down upon it' (κατά) the hot baths to which Herod was carried.<sup>1</sup> *BJ* vii. ii 3 seems to describe the same wells in the valley to the N. of Machaerus (the modern Mkaur on the headland to the S. of W. Zerḳā Ma'in) under the name of Baapas, in which Greek form one may perhaps recognise בְּאֵרֵי. Jerome (*OS s. Beelmeon*) gives the name as 'Baaru in Arabia [i.e., in the Roman province of that designation] ubi aquas calidas sponte humus effert' (while under *Cariatthaim* he mentions Baare to R. m. W. of Medeha). Now 4½ m. from the mouth of the W. Zerḳā Ma'in, and due N. from Mkaur, there are hot wells: four large and some smaller, of which the hottest have a temperature of about 140° F. with strong deposits of sulphur. Ancient roads have been traced leading to the spot (which lies on the N. side of the shallow stream in a ravine 120 ft. broad, with luxuriant vegetation); and Roman medals with tiles and pottery have been discovered (see *Seetzen, Reisen*, 2335 f., Irby and Mangles, *Travels*, 144 f., Tristram, *Moab*, Conder, *Heth and Moab*, 145, 149). The identity of the W. Zerḳā Ma'in with Callirrhoe is therefore tolerably certain. Conder suggests the same Wady and stream as the Nahaliel

<sup>1</sup> This distinction between the stream on which the baths were and the Laths themselves is overlooked by those who take Callirrhoe as referring to the baths (so Robinson, *Phys. Geog.* 164), and wonder why Josephus describes them as flowing into the Dead Sea. This removes any reason for finding Herod's Baths at es-Sara (Zarah) farther to the S., as Dechent proposes to do (*ZDPV* 7 196 ff.).

MOAB

of Nu. 2119 (see, however, NAHALIEL). S. of the W. Zerḳā Ma'in, the plateau bears one of its few high eminences, Jebel 'Attārūs (c. 4000 ft.); see ATAROTH. In this connection we may refer to Buhl's suggestion (*Pal.* 124) as to the פְּעוֹרָהּ 77 of Josh. 1319 (see ZARETH-SHAHAR; cp Zarah, *PEF Survey*, 289).

The next cañon southwards is the Wādy Mōjib, the biblical ARNON. The main branch starting in the wilderness of KEDEMOTH [q.v.] receives its first considerable contribution of water from the Rās el-Mōjib, a fountainhead some 5 m. W. of the Hājī road. The stream after running through a shallow depression falls in a cascade over 30 ft. high into a valley, which deepens rapidly (Buhl, *Pal.*, after Langer's *Reisebericht* 16 ff.). From the S. it is met by a wady, in which three have joined: the W. es-Sulṭān, the Seil Lej(j)ūn, with their sources not far from Kaṭrāneh on the Hājī road, and a shorter W. Balu'a. See the new survey (which differs from previous accounts) by Bliss, *PEFQ*, 1895 pp. 215 ff., with map, p. 204. Again, about 4½ m. from the mouth it receives from the N. the W. Wāleh with tributaries draining the plateau from as far N. as the Ḳal'at el Belḳā' on the Hājī road. In biblical times all (or at least all except the last) of these branches appear to have borne the name Arnon: cp the plural phrase 'valleys of Arnon' in Nu. 2114<sup>1</sup> (on vv. 14 f., cp VAHEB).

The main valley where it is crossed by the great high road of Moab (about 8 or 9 m. from the Dead Sea) is some 2000 ft. deep, with cliffs which have impressed every traveller: 'the cliff of the valleys.' Nu. 2115; 'ostendunt regionis illius accolæ locum vallis in praecepta demersæ, satis horribilem et periculosum, qui a plerisque usque nunc Arnonas appellatur' (Jer. OS, *Arnon*); cp Burckhardt and Seetzen's *Travels*, Doughty, *Ar. Des.*, and Bliss (*PEFQ*, 1895, p. 215): 'a thrilling moment of surprise on coming suddenly to the edge of the almost perpendicular cliffs.' From edge to edge of these the distance is over 2 m.; at the bottom the bed is 40 yards wide. The Mōjib issues on the Dead Sea through a chasm little more than 100 ft. wide. Altogether there is not S. of the Jabbok another natural division so decisive and impressive. It cannot, therefore, surprise us that, although lying across the middle of what we have seen to be the land of Moab, the Arnon should so often in history have proved a political boundary.

On the arrival of Israel the Arnon separated the Amorites from Moab, whom the former had driven S. of it (Nu. 2113<sup>2</sup> Jndg. 1118). It is also given as the S. limit of Reuben. In 37 A.D. it appears to have been the border between the territories of Herod and those of the Nabataeans, whom Herod had pushed to the S. of it (Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 51; *HG*, 569). Till 1893 the Arnon formed the S. boundary of the Turkish Mutaṣerrāfik of the Belḳā' and of effective Turkish rule in E. Palestine:<sup>3</sup> and it is still the border between the lands of the Keraki and Ḥamādeh Arabs (Bliss, *op. cit.* 216).

The third great cañon across Moab starts close to Kaṭrāneh on the Hājī road as the Wādy 'Ain el-Franjy (perhaps the Brook ZERED<sup>4</sup> of Nu. 2111 f.), and then, as the W. Kerak, winds a narrow and deep ravine past Kerak (just before it leaves the plateau) and falls into the Dead Sea N. of the Lisān peninsula. By Kerak there is cultivation of olives, figs, pomegranates, and some vines. Between the Wādies Mōjib and Kerak are two short glens with [watercourses W. el-Ḡarrah and W. Beni (Hamid or) Ḥammād; somewhere here was the ascent of LUHITH. S. of the Mōjib the Jehel Shihān rises above the plateau to a height of about 3000 ft. Between the Wādies Kerak and el-Hasy (or

<sup>1</sup> In v. 13 the Arnon crossed by Israel is described as 'in the wilderness which comes forth from the border of the Amorite,' which may refer to one of the branches of the W. Wāleh.

<sup>2</sup> [Elsewhere (see WANDERINGS, and cp VAHEB) it is pointed out that under the present text, which is not free from critical difficulty, there are traces of an earlier narrative in which the place-names belong to the Jerahmeelite and Mjrite region. According to this view, Arnon in Nu. 2113 f. has displaced 'Arām = Jerahmeel, and Moab (as often in the narrative hooks) is a corruption of Miṣsur (i.e., the N. Arabian Muṣri).—T.K.C.]

<sup>3</sup> In 1893 a new mutaserrāfik was established S. of the Arnon with its centre at Kerak, but taking its name from Ma'an near Petra.

<sup>4</sup> [The present geography of Nu. 2111 f. may perhaps be of later origin (cp ZERED); but this does not dispense us from the duty of seeking to understand it.]

## MOAB

Ahsii) are several shorter watercourses, of which the most important are W. el-Kuneyeh (?) and W. Numēre, the latter held by many to be the WATERS OF NIMRIM (Is. 156 Jer. 4834).

Along with this great plateau, the people of Moab at certain periods in their history held, and gave their name to, that part of the Jordan valley immediately below its northern section—*i.e.*, opposite to Jericho on the E. of the river. This is what P calls the 'Arboth Moab' (see above, § 2). The name Moab does not appear here before P; yet earlier conquests of the eastern Jordan valley by Moab are not only asserted by presumably ancient narratives (*e.g.*, Judg. 3 12-30; see Moore's commentary), but were at all times extremely probable from the geographical relations of the Jordan valley to the Moabite plateau. The long level stretch just to the N. of the Dead Sea and E. of Jordan lies as much at the mercy of the occupants of the tableland above it as the opposite plains of Jericho lie open to the highlanders of Judaea and Ephraim. The warmth of the valley makes it an attractive refuge from the winter weather of the plateau, where according to an Arabic proverb 'the cold is always at home' (HG 56). Nor is the whole district so barren as the names 'ARABAH, JESHIMON, and BETH-JESHIMOTH [*qq.v.*] would seem to imply. These are terms strictly applicable only to the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea. Farther N. there are many streams, and the soil in the warm air is exceedingly fertile. Irrigation is very easy. At the present day the Arabs of the plateau have winter camps in the valley; and the 'Adwān tribe cultivate fields upon it (as the present writer on a visit in 1891 learned through the absence from the camp in W. Hesbān of the chief 'Ali Dhiāb, who was said to be attending to his harvests in the Ghōr). Then the Jordan with its few and difficult fords opposite Jericho forms a frontier, which its more passable stretches farther up, opposite Ephraim, cannot provide. Consequently, even when Israel crossing the latter held Gilead, it was quite possible for Moab to hold the part of the valley opposite Jericho. In every way this belongs to the tableland above it. Similarly Moab must have held the well-watered and fertile land at the S. end of the Dead Sea.

The fertile plateau (see above, § 3) with its extensive pasture-lands, and its much cultivation, producing corn, vines, and many fruit-trees, enjoyed a temperate climate (§ 3). It was therefore able to sustain an abundant population. To this the frequent ruins of small villages and not a few considerable towns still bear testimony. For the most part they evidently date from the Roman and Byzantine periods,<sup>1</sup> when the country was well protected from the desert Arabs by forts and camps, and was traversed by well-made roads (§ 8), with a considerable commerce. Under native kings, or when held by Israel, the land of Moab cannot have been quite so safe, and therefore hardly so thronged; still, we shall not be far wrong in conceiving of the population even then as abundant. In OT times we read of the 'cities of Moab'; and the people are pictured in multitudes and always as aggressive and tumultuous ('sons of tumult' Nu. 24 17 [see SHETH], cp Is. 15 f. Jer. 4845).

If we were sure of the exact character of the many dolmens and cromlechs scattered over the NW. of the plateau (Conder reckons 200 in the portion he surveyed) we might add these to the proofs of a large population in the very earliest period. On the other hand, we must keep in mind that very large stretches of the plateau must always have been pastoral with few inhabitants. The figures on the Moabite Stone are puzzling; in L. 16 Meshā claims to have put to death in one place no fewer than 7000 Israelites; but again in L. 20 the forces he led against Jahaz consisted only of 200 men, taken 'from all the clans of Moab.

The disposition and nature of the land cannot have been without effect on the character and manner of

<sup>1</sup> Cp Briinnow, *MDPV*, 1898, p. 34.

## MOAB

life of the inhabitants. So tempting a province, so open to the desert, must always have had a large portion of its population in various stages of transition from the nomadic and pastoral to the settled and agricultural conditions of life. So they are pictured throughout history and so they are to-day. The OT recognises Moab as a Semitic people, therefore of nomadic and Arabian origin, who had settled in their land shortly before the arrival of Israel.<sup>1</sup> It mixes up Moab and Midian (Nu. 25). From the fifth century onwards we find them dispossessed or overrun by 'Arabs' and 'Nabataeans.' The Roman Empire—by means of chains of forts and several large and heavily fortified castles like those whose ruins are now called Lej(j)ūn, Kaṣr Bshēr, and perhaps also Meshetta (Bliss, *PEFQ*, 1895, with plans and views)—kept the nomads back; and hence villages and cultivation multiplied in Roman times more than other periods. Under the nominal government of the Turks the bulwarks gave way; and to-day we find the pure Arab tribes like the 'Anazeh harassing the E. border; whilst within it other Arabs like the 'Adwān are settling to the cultivation of definite lands. Thus there must have been many successive deposits on the broad plateau from the restless human tides of Arabia. This may partly explain the noisy, aggressive character attributed to Moab by the OT (see above). The story of the origin of the nation (Gen. 19 30 ff.) and other passages in the OT (Nu. 25 Jer. 4826) seem to charge them with drunkenness and licentiousness. We have seen that the vine was extensively cultivated, and in the portion of the land surveyed by Colonel Conder's party many winepresses were discovered both on the plateau (especially about el-Meshakkar and Ḥesbān and at Sūmiā). The heat, too, of the Jordan valley enervates and demoralises; it was on its plains that Israel gave way to the impure rites of Beth-peor. Altogether we see from the geography, and from the OT pictures of Moab, a wild Arab race decadent under the first temptations of vine-culture and a relaxing climate.

The main lines of wayfaring and traffic across Moab have always been very much the same; and now the less important tracks of ancient times are still discernible. From the fords of Jordan opposite Jericho (there were four or five, all difficult) and the bridge which in Roman times (according to the recently discovered Mosaic map, see MEDEBA) spanned the river in the neighbourhood of the present bridge, various roads crossed the Jordan valley to the E. and SE. In contrast to the W. coast of the Dead Sea the E. coast gives no room for a road at the level of the sea; for the most part the cliffs come down to the water's edge (see a paper by Gray Hill in the *PEFQ*. 1900).<sup>2</sup>

Yet a track runs somewhat up the side of the hills as far as the W. Zerkā Ma'in; and some distance above it, just after the W. Ghuweir is passed, there is a stretch of ancient road marked on the PEF reduced Map at a level of 183 ft. below the Mediterranean or about 1000 ft. above the Dead Sea. It appears again on the S. of the W. Ḥawārah, and must have led to the healing springs in the valley of Callirhoe (see § 5), converging on which several ancient tracks have been discovered. One must have continued at least to Machærus.

All the other roads from the Jordan made for the slopes and passes leading to the plateau. One, at present much frequented, by which the present writer travelled, climbs the ridge of Rās Kuṣeib and then curves S. towards Ḥesbān. But there are tracks, with remains of ancient roads,<sup>3</sup> apparently Roman, up the W. Hesbiin, from which a road led through a steep rock-cutting upon Ḥeshbōn on the edge of the plateau. Another ancient track passed by el-Meshakkar (§ 4) on Heshbon (*PEFM E. Pal.* 151); another by the W. 'Ayūn Mūsā to Nebo (?); and another by W. Jideid

<sup>1</sup> [Compare, however, *GAD*, § 8.1

<sup>2</sup> N. of the W. Zerkā Ma'in there is a broad shelf before the plateau itself is reached.

<sup>3</sup> Also near Sūmiā.

## MOAB

to Medeba or Ma'in. The name of the lower stretches of the latter Wādy (Ghuweir, 'the little Ghôr' or 'chasm'), suggests to Conder (*PEFM*) the Heb. מַרְיָה, with probably the same meaning, and therefore the 'ascent of HORONAIM [*g.v.*] (Is. 15:5 Jer. 48:5).<sup>1</sup> Less plausible is the same explorer's suggestion of Tal'at Heisah or el-Heithah (a glen running up from W. Jideid upon Nebo) for the 'ascent of LUHITH' (Is. 15:5 Jer. 48:5).

All these roads from the Jordan valley struck a trunk road running S., along the whole extent of the plateau by Elealeh, Heshbon, and Medeba, across the W. Wāleh, by the W. of Dibon close by Kaṣr el-Besheir, across Arnon, by Rabbah to Kerak, and so ultimately across Edoni to the Gulf of 'Akabah. Its course is marked by Roman milestones, many still *in situ*, and other ancient remains. In the Wādies Mōjib and el-Hesi 'the gradients were laid out with great skill' (Sir Ch. Wilson, *PEFO*, 1899, p. 309). A branch connected this road with Ma'in (Bliss, *PEFO*, 1895, p. 213), which lies to the W. of it. Other branches struck N. and NW. from Heshbon to Rabbath-Ammon, and can still be traced past Kh. el-'Amriyeh, and to the NW. of Umm el-Ḥanāfish (PEF red. Map). Other branches struck across the country to the second great N. and S. road along the borders of the desert, represented to-day by the Hajj road.<sup>2</sup> Whilst the remains of all these ancient roads are Roman, dating from the Antonines, the great road-makers in Syria, they probably represent still older lines of travel. Whilst the western trunk road **must** always have been the more secure from the nomad Arabs, the deep cañons which it crosses make it much the more difficult. The line of Israel's passage N. lay along the E. trunk road till at least the W. Wāleh was passed, when it turned NE. upon Heshbon, and so down either the W. 'Ayiin Mūsā or the W. Ḥesbān to the Jordan Valley (see *HG* 564).

Of the 'cities of Moab' we have first of all a group in the Jordan valley: BETH-NIMRAH [*g.v.*] at Tell Nimrīn; BETH-HARAN [*g.v.*] at Tell Rāmeḥ; both of which, though they are mentioned in the OT only in connection with the Amorites and Gad, must have belonged to Moab at many periods (cp NIMRIM of Is. 15:6); BETH-JESHIMOTH [*g.v.*] at Suweimeh; HORONAIM [*g.v.*] on one of the passes leading up to the plateau (see above, § 8). According to Eusebius BETH-PEOR [*g.v.*] lay between Beth-nimrah and Beth-haran; but see above, § 4. SEBAM or SIBMAH [*g.v.*] is placed by Conder (*PEFM* 221) at Siimia in the W. Ḥesbān, 2 m. from Hesbiin.

On the plateau N. of W. Zerḳā Ma'in were situated the following towns, beginning from the N.: ELEALEH, HESHON, NEBO, MEDEBA, BETH-MEON. These are either on high sites on the promontories and considered as sacred, like Nebo and Beth-meon, or on mounds by the main road, like Elealeh, Heshbon, and Medeba. Kh. 'Abii Nalkh Merrill identifies with the 'Moabite town' Νέκλα of Ptolemy; in es-Siimik, a few m. E. of Ḥesbān, some see Samaga, taken along with Medeba by John Hyrcanus (Jos. *Ant.* xiii. 91). Kefeir el-Wuṣṣa and Kefeir 'Abū Sarbūṭ, on the main road, must have been considerable towns in Byzantine times and perhaps earlier (*PEFM E. Pal.*). Kal'at Zizā, about 4 m. to the W. of the Hajj road, was a military post of the Romans (*Not. Dignit.*). On Mashetta or Umm Shetta, to the E. of the Hajj road see Tristram (*Land of Moab*) and Bliss (*PEFO*, 1895). On Kal'at Belḳā, a castle on the Hajj road, see Doughty (*Ar. Des.* I 13-19).

<sup>1</sup> Jos. *Ant.* xiii. 154 mentions Oronas as a town of Moab.

<sup>2</sup> A third Roman road N. and S. appears to have run from Rabbath-Amman by el-Kahf, Umm el-Walid, Kemeil, Trayya, Kaṣr Bshēr and Rujūm Rishān to Lejjūn. On this, and on the line of forts protecting the springs to the E. of it, and on the Roman roads S. of Lejjūn, see Brünnow's papers in *MDPV*, 1898-1899.

## MOAB

Between the W. Zerḳā Ma'in and the W. Wāleh there were no towns on the main road; but to the W. lay 'ATAROTH [*g.v.*, modern 'Attārūs], KIRIATHAIM [*g.v.*, modern Ḳureiyāt], arid the strong fortress of MACHÆRUS [*g.v.*, and cp ZERETH-SHAHAR].

South of the W. Wāleh lay DIBON [*g.v.*], the modern Dhibān to the E. of the main road, on which farther S. are the ruins of the Roman castle, now called Kaṣr el-Besheir. North-east of Dibon is el-Jumeil, identified by some with BETH-GAMUL of Jer. 48:23: cp the el-Gamila of Idrisi (*ZDP V* 8128). Buhl, however, puts Beth-gamul S. of Arnon. East of Dibon (Bliss, *op. cit.*, 227) are the important ruins of Umm er-Reṣāṣ reckoned by some to be KEDEMOTH [*g.v.*]; JAHAZ [*g.v.*] (which Eusebius places between Dibon and Medeba) must also have lain about here; and MEFHAATH (Josh. 13:18 Jer. 48:21), according to Eus. a castle on the edge of the desert. Upon the main road just as it dips into the precipitous W. Mōjib lay AROER [*g.v.*].

In the valley of the Arnon there apparently lay 'the city in the midst of the valley' (Josh. 13:9): see AR.

Of the sites S. of the Arnon the following lie on or near the great trunk-road. On the S. edge of the W. Mōjib are the ruins, Mehātet el-Ḥajj, which Tristram and others propose to identify with AR. To the W. of the road at the foot of the hill called Shiḥān are ruins of the same name: and farther S. on the road others at Haimer, Erihah, Beit el-Karm, called also Kaṣr Rabba with 'tanks and a great building evidently Roman' (Irby and Mangles, ch. 8), and Hemēmat with a tower, Misde (also at Mejdelein, west of the road). Then come the more considerable remains of Rabba (*ib.*, 'two old Roman temples and some tanks' but no trace of walls; Brünnow, *MDPV*, 1895, p. 71, notices 'a kind of forum'). This appears to be Rabbath (*i.e.*, chief town of) Moab (see OS) to which the Greeks gave the name of Ἀρεόπολις (see AR). Buhl (*Pal.* 270) thinks it possible that we have here KERIOTH and KIR-MOAB (see KIR-HERES); but KIR-MOAB, known also as KIR-HARESETH, is placed by most at Kerak,<sup>1</sup> for a description of which see KIR-HERES. To the proofs of the identification of KIR-HERES with Kerak, given there, add the name (hitherto overlooked in this connection) of Wādy Harasha (with a ruin Kaṣr H.) which is applied, according to Brünnow (*MDPV* 1895, p. 68) to the lower part of the WHdy Kerak. Some 12 m. E. of Kerak lies the ruin Lej(j)ūn, for the exact orientation of which, with plans, see Bliss, *PEFO*, 1895. South of Kerak Eusebius places EGLAIM [*g.v.*].

Indeed, this district of Moab, 'a country of downs with verdure so close as to appear almost turf and with cornfields,' is 'covered with sites of towns on every eminence and spot convenient for the construction of one . . . ruined sites visible in all directions' (Irby and Mangles, ch. 7, May 14 and 15). Here was the scene of the first encounter of Moslem troops with the Romans and their defeat at el-Mōteḥ 'Dāt-rās on the N. edge of the W. el-Ahsī is the Thorma of the' Itinerary' (Wilson, *PEFO*, 1899, p. 315).

From Kerak a Roman road led SW. into the Ghôr (Brünnow, *MDPV*, 1895, p. 68) by Dera'a on the W. Ḥarasha<sup>2</sup> (see above); and on this flank of Moab also not a few remains have been noted by travellers (see LUHATH, NIMRIM, and cp Tristram, *Land of Moab*, 57; Buhl, *Pal.* 272).

In the time of Josephus there lay at the S. end of the Dead Sea a town Zoapa (*BJ* iv. 84, v. *II*. ζωαπα, etc.). In OS under βαλα, Eusebius calls it σηγωρα and ζωαπα, and describes it as lying on the Dead Sea, with a garrison: 'the balsam and palm grow by it.' It is the same, which under the name Zughar, Sughar, or Sukar is mentioned by the Arab geographers (Le Strange, *Pal. under Moslems*, 286 ff.), as a station on the trade route from the Gulf of 'Akabah to Jericho, one degree of lat. S. of Jericho. They describe it as on the Dead Sea, near the desert, overhung by mountains, near el-Kerak,

<sup>1</sup> Besides Irby and Mangles (*Travels*, ch. 7 f.), cp A. L. Hornstein in *PEFO* 1898, pp. 93 ff., with views.

<sup>2</sup> Here some place the 'descent of Horonaim'; but see § 8

## MOAB

with a hot and evil climate; the people thickset and swarthy. The Crusaders knew it as Segor (Röhricht, *Gesch. Königr. Jerus.* 15, 409, 411; see also *ZDPV* 14, the Florentine map) but called it Palmen (Will. of Tyre, 108 22<sup>30</sup>), Villa Palmarum, and Paumer. It is curious that Napoleon should mention the place under its biblical name 'at the extremity of the Dead Sea 20 leagues from Hebron, 15 from Kerak' (*Guerre d'Orient, Camp. d'Égypte et de Syrie*, vol. ii. 12 f.). Where did he get this information? Irby and Mangles (*Travels*, 1st June, 1818) place it in the lower part of the W. Kerak. Clermont Ganneau (*PEFQ*, 1886, p. 20) proposes a site near the Tawahin es-Soukhâr in the Ghôr es-Şâfieh; Kitchener (*PEFQ*, 1884, p. 216) found many ruins of great antiquity under the name Kh. Labrush. See also Reland, *Palest.* 577, 957, and Robinson, *BR* 648 ff. The Arab geographers identify it with the Zoar of Lot and this is accepted by those modern authorities who place the 'cities of the plain' at the S. end of the Dead Sea. See further ZOAR, SODOM.

G. A. S.

Moab and Ammon (children of Lot) constitute along with Edom and Israel (children of Isaac) that group of four Hebrew peoples which in early antiquity had issued from the Syro-Arabian wilderness, and settled on the border of the cultivated land eastward of the 'great depression.' According to Genesis, they had come out of Mesopotamia, and so were precursors of the larger wave which followed from the same quarter, forming the most southern outpost of the Aramsan immigration into the lands of Canaan and Heth (see AMORITES, CANAAN, CANAANITES). The aborigines in whose lands the H'ne Ammon and Moab and the Bne Israel successively settled were not extinguished by the conquest; they even exercised a far-reaching influence over their lords. The Moabites, and doubtless also the Ammonites and the Edomites, spoke the language of Canaan as well as the Israelites. They must have learned it from the Canaanites in the land eastward of Jordan. Our knowledge is extremely imperfect as regards other departments of the Canaanite influence; but in religion it has left a noticeable trace in the cultus of BAAL-PEOR (*q.v.*), which was carried on in Moabite territory but was certainly of Canaanite origin. The special god of Moab, however, was Chemosh. Just as Israel was the people of Yahwê, and Ammon the people of Milcom, Moab was the people of Chemosh (כִּמּוֹשׁ, Nu. 21.29). The kingship of Chemosh was regarded as thoroughly national and political in its character, but did not on that account exclude the institution of a human king, which appeared in Moab much earlier than in Israel; in the time of Moses the Moabites had a king, and the institution was even then old. The capitals of the kingdom were 'Ar Moab and Kir Moab, S. from the Arnon; these were not, however, the constant residences of the kings, who continued to live in their native places, as, for example, Mesha in Dibon.

The historical importance of the Moabites lies wholly in their contact with Israel. After the Israelites had

### 11. Early

quitted Egypt and passed a nomadic life for about a generation in the neighbourhood of Kadesh, they migrated thence into northern Moab, dispossessing the Amorites, who had made themselves masters of that district. The interval from Kadesh to the Arnon could be passed only by a good understanding with Edom. Moab, and Amman, -a proof that the ethnical relationships, which at a later period were expressed only in legend, were at that time still living and practical. In

<sup>1</sup> [Three kings of Moab (Ma'ha, Mu'aba, Ma'ab) are mentioned in the cuneiform inscriptions, -Salmanu who was subdued by Tiglath-pileser in 733; Kammušunadbi (Chemoshnadah), who paid tribute to Sennacherib in 701; and a king of uncertain name who warred against the king of Kedar in the name of Ašur-bāni-pal (Schr. *KAT*<sup>2</sup>, 251, 291, Wi. *GI* 108 f.).]

## MOAB

all probability the Moabites called the Israelites to their aid; they were not as yet aware that this little pastoral people was destined one day to become to them a greater danger than the Canaanites by whom they were threatened at the moment.

As the story of Balaam indicates, the Moabites would willingly have been rid of their cousins after their service had been rendered, but were unable to prevent them from settling in the land of Sihon. The migration of the tribes of Israel into western Palestine, however, and the dissolution of their warlike confederation soon afterwards made a restoration of the old frontiers possible. If king Eglon took tribute of Benjamin at Jericho, the territory between Arnon and Jordan must also have been subject to him, and Reuben must even then have lost his land, or at least his liberty. It would appear that the Moabites next extended their attacks to Mount Gilead, giving their support to the Ammonites, who, during the period of the judges, were its leading assailants. So close was the connection between Moab and Ammon that the boundary between them vanishes for the narrators (Judg. 11). See AMMONITES, JEPHTHAH.

Gilead was delivered from the Ammonites by Saul, who at the same time waged a successful war against Moab<sup>2</sup> (1 S. 14.47). The establishment of the monarchy necessarily involved Israel in feuds with its neighbours and kin. The Moabites being the enemies of the Israelite kingdom, David naturally sent his parents for shelter thither when he had broken with Saul (1 S. 22.3 f.; see, however, MIZPEH, 3); the incident is precisely analogous to what happened when he himself at a later period took refuge from Saul's persecution in Philistine territory, and needs no explanation from the book of Ruth. As soon as he ceased to be the king's enemy by himself becoming king, his relations with Moab became precisely those of his predecessor. The war in which apparently casual circumstances involved him with the Ammonites really arose out of larger causes, and thus spread to Moab and Edom as well. The end of it was that all the three Hebrew nationalities were subjugated by Israel; the youngest brother eclipsed and subdued his seniors, as Balaam had foreseen. Both Ammon and Moab, however, must have emancipated themselves very soon after David's death, and only now and then was some strong king of Israel able again to impose the yoke for a time, not upon the Ammonites indeed, but upon Moab. The first to do so was Omri, who garrisoned some of the Moabite towns and compelled the king to acknowledge Israel's suzerainty by a yearly tribute of sheep—a state of matters which continued until the death of Ahab ben Omri. That brave king, however, fell in battle with the Aramaeans at Ramoth Gilead (about 850 B.C.), and Meshao of Dibon, then the ruler of Moab, succeeded in making himself and his people independent. In his famous inscription (see MESHU) he gives his patriotic version of the story; in the book of Kings we find only the curt statement that Moab rebelled against Israel after the death of Ahab (2 K. 11); on the other hand there is a full narrative (2 K. 3) of a vain attempt, made by Jehoram ben Ahab, to bring Mesha into subjection. See MESHU, § 6, and JEHORAM, § 4.

As the Moabites owed their liberation from Israelite supremacy to the battle of Raniah—that is, to the Aramaeans—we find them (as well as the Ammonites) afterwards always seconding the Aiamsans in continual border warfare against Gilead, in which they took cruel revenge on the Israelites. With what bitterness the

<sup>1</sup> The facts as a whole are indubitable: it cannot be an invention that the Israelites settled first in Kadesh, then in northern Moab, and thence passed into Palestine proper. The only doubtful point is whether the song in Nu. 21.27 ff. is contemporary evidence of these events.

<sup>2</sup> [There is indeed, as so often, a doubt whether the original document did not refer rather to Mišsur [see MIZRAIM] than to Moab. See SAUL, § 3.—T.K.C.]

Israelites in consequence were wont to speak of their hostile kinsfolk can be gathered from Gen. 19<sup>30</sup> ff.—the one trace of open malice in the story of the patriarchs, all the more striking as it occurs in a narrative of which LOT (*q.v.*) is the hero and saint, which, therefore, in its present form, is of Moabite origin, although perhaps it has a still older Canaanite nucleus. Of these border wars we learn but little, although from casual notices it can be seen (2 K. 13<sup>20</sup> Am. 113; cp 2 K. 52) that they were kept up long, although not quite uninterruptedly. When at length the danger from the Aramæans was removed for Israel by the intervention of the Assyrians, the hour of Moab's subjection also came; Jeroboam II. extended his frontier over the eastern territory, as far as to the 'Brook of the Poplars' (Am. 6<sup>14</sup>; but cp ARABAH, BROOK OF THE).

It would seem that subjugation by the Assyrians was not as heavy a blow to the Moabites as to some neighbouring peoples. Probably it helped to reconcile them to the new situation that the Israelites suffered much more severely than they. From these, their deadly enemies, they were henceforth for ever free. They did not on that account, however, give up their old hatred; they merely transferred it from Israel to Judah. The political annihilation of the nation only intensified the religious exclusiveness of the Jewish people. Terrible expression was given by the Edomites and the Moabites to their malignant joy at the calamities of their kinsfolk.<sup>2</sup>

'Because Moab saith: Behold the house of Judah is like all the other nations, therefore do I open his land to the Bne Kedem,' says the prophet Ezekiel (25<sup>8</sup> ff.). His threat against the Moabites, as well as against the Edomites and the Ammonites is, that they shall fall before the approach of the desert tribes (see EAST, CHILDREN OF THE; REKEM). Probably in his days the tide of Arabian invasion was already slowly rising, and of course it swept first over the lands situated on the desert border. At all events the Arab immigration into this quarter began at an earlier date than is usually supposed; it continued for centuries, and was so gradual that the previously-introduced Aramaising process could quietly go on alongside of it. The Edomites gave way before the pressure of the land-hungry nomads, and settled in the desolate country of Judah; the children of Lot, on the other hand, appear to have amalgamated with them—the Ammonites maintaining their individuality longer than the Moabites, who soon entirely disappeared.<sup>3</sup>

Israel and Moab had a common origin, and their early history was similar. The people of Yahwé on the

### 13. Israel and Moab compared.

one hand, the people of Chemosh on the other, had the same idea of the Godhead as head of the nation, and a like patriotism derived from religious belief—a patriotism that was capable of extraordinary efforts, and has had no parallel in the West either in ancient or in modern times. The mechanism of the theocracy also had much that was common to both nations; in both the king figures as the deity's representative, priests and prophets as the organs through whom he makes his communications. Still, with all this similarity, how different were the ultimate fates of the two! The history of the one loses itself obscurely and fruitlessly in the sand; that of the other issues in eternity. One reason for the difference (which, strangely enough, seems to have been felt not by the Israelites alone but by the Moabites also) is obvious. Israel received no gentle treatment at the hands of the world; it had to carry on a continual conflict with foreign influences and hostile powers; and this perpetual struggle with gods and men was not profitless, although the external catastrophe was in-

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps the song in Nu. 21<sup>27</sup> ff. refers to these events; some critics will add Is. 15<sup>1-16</sup> 12.

<sup>2</sup> Zeph. 2<sup>8</sup> f. 2 K. 24<sup>2</sup> and Ezek. 25<sup>8</sup> ff. It need hardly be said that the Moabites shared the fate of all the Palestinian peoples when supremacy passed from the Assyrians to the Chaldeans, and that, notwithstanding their hatred of the Jews, they had no difficulty in seeking alliances with them, when occasions arose on which they could be made useful (Jer. 27<sup>3</sup>). [The prophecy against Moab in Jer. 48 cannot be the work of Jeremiah. See JEREMIAH II, § 20, ix.; col. 2392.1 J 3 We. *Kleine Propheten* (2), 206 (on Obadiah); [on certain references to the Moabites in late OT writings—Ezra 9<sup>1</sup> Neh. 13<sup>1</sup> Is. 25<sup>10</sup> f. Ps. 83<sup>7</sup> (6)—cp *Intr. Is.* 159, 161.]

evitable. Moab meantime remained settled on his lees, and was not emptied from vessel to vessel (Jer. 48<sup>11</sup>), and corruption and decay were the result. This explanation, however, does not carry us far, for other peoples with fortunes as rude as those of Israel have yet failed to attain historical importance; they have simply disappeared. The service the prophets rendered at a critical time, by raising the faith of Israel from the temporal to the eternal sphere, cannot be exaggerated (see PROPHECY).

J. W.

The authors of the above sections are scholars who have a right to speak, and whose writings will not soon

be forgotten. A union of forces, however, seems necessary in order to take a fresh step in advance. The geographical section would be very incomplete without

the historical, and it may perhaps be hoped that a supplement to the historical section will add somewhat to its usefulness. For there is a preliminary inquiry, which no good scholar in recent times has altogether neglected, but which requires to be taken up in a more thorough and methodical manner—the state of the texts on which our geography and our history are based. It must also be confessed that our criticism of the narratives has been, until very lately, too literary, and not quite sufficiently historical. A criticism of the local names may not have led as yet to as many important results as the criticism of the personal names of the OT; but an examination of the special articles dealing with the names of the 'cities of Moab' (§ 9) will show that an inquiry which cannot safely be ignored is being made, and that identifications have in the past too often been tried, and views of the route of the Israelites in their migration taken, which presuppose doubtful, even if ancient, readings. Textual criticism, too, has objections to make to some of the historical inferences of earlier critics because of their precarious textual basis. It is obvious that if 'Moab' and 'Mišsur,' 'Midian' and 'Mišsur,' 'Ammon' and 'Amalek,' 'Edom' and 'Aram' (=Jerahmeel), are liable to confusion, the greatest care becomes necessary in steering one's way between the rocks. Mistakes will sometimes occur, as when, after correcting some of the most corrupt names in Gen. 36<sup>31-39</sup>, 'Edom' is retained by the author of the article BELA (col. 524) in v. 31<sup>f.</sup> and 'Moab' in v. 35. For these two (corrupt) ethnic names 'Aram' and 'Mišsur' should probably be substituted. The historical result would be that it was not Midian and Edom but Midian and Jerahmeel that fought together in the early times referred to, and that the territory that was contested was the highland of Mišsur, not the plateau of Moab.<sup>1</sup> The story of Balak and Balaam also needs to be re-read in the light of text-critical discoveries. It is most probable, from this newer point of view, that Balak, with whom the Israelites are said to have had to do, was king, not of Moab, but of Mišsur. It is doubtful, too, whether in its original form the story of Eglon and Ehud represented the former as being of Moab and not rather of Mišsur (note that Eglon gathers 'the b'ne Ammon and Amalek,' really, the b'ne Jerahmeel, and that they occupy 'the city of palm trees' (*i.e.*, really, the city of Jerahmeel).<sup>2</sup> Even if in this instance we adhere to MT, Winckler (*GI* 1205) will probably still be right in using the narrative as an evidence of the lateness of the Moabite people as compared with the b'ne Israel. More probably, however, Eglon was a Mišrite king. Nor can we at all trust the records of the conquests of Saul and David. A group of phenomena make it very nearly certain that in 1 S. 14<sup>47</sup> 2 S. 82 'Mišsur' has been transformed into 'Moab.'

That Saul conquered either the Moabites or the Mišrites is of course most unlikely; but the probability is strong even against

<sup>1</sup> Cp Judg. 54, where we should probably read 'Mišsur' (not 'Seir') and 'the highland of Aram (=Jerahmeel)'.  
<sup>2</sup> See JERICHO, § 1. The 'city of Jerahmeel' may quite as well mean Kadesh-barnea ('barnea' should be read 'Jerahmeel') is Jericho.



MOADIAH

the view that David had to do with the Moabites. The whole passage (2 S. 81-2) first becomes intelligible when we read it thus. 'And David smote the Philistines, and took the Maacathite country out of the hand of the Philistines. He smote Mišsur and Jerahmeel and the Zarephathites, and those of Mišsur became servants to David, bringing tribute.' If we are reluctant to admit the change of 'Moab' to 'Mišsur,' let it be remembered that the same textual criticism dispenses us from the obligation of pronouncing David guilty of barbarity to the conquered—to a people from whom, according to one tradition, his parents had received hospitality.<sup>1</sup> The right reading was probably known to the writer of Nu. 24.17.<sup>2</sup>

Thus it is probable that the first trustworthy notice of contact between Israel and Moab is in 2 K. 11. This notice, however, as Kittel points out, is very isolated (cp § 11), and we naturally infer that a record of wars between the two peoples has been lost. Moab, then, is at any rate a younger people than Israel.

What event is referred to in Is. 151-1612 has been much disputed. According to Duhm and Marti, the foes of Moab are the NABATÆANS (g.v.). Diodorus (1994) says of these nomads that they regarded it as wrong to plant wheat and trees and wine. This would make the destruction of the vines referred to in the prophetic elegy intelligible. If so, Is. 151-1612 may be referred to the fifth century; the postscript. (13 f.) will be later (time of Alexander JANNEUS [g.v.]?).

There is little more to add by way of supplement to §§ 10-13. The absence of the name of Moab in the list of the vassal states of Bir-'idri (K<sup>B</sup> 2173) is accounted for by Winckler (GI 1207) by the supposition that a Moabite contingent was included among the troops of Ahab, who is mentioned (see AHAB, § 4 f.). Whether the Moabites are rightly included in 2 K. 242 among the peoples which sent 'bands' against Judah in the reign of Jehoiakim may be doubted. A comparison of passages in the Psalms, Lamentations, and later prophecies and narratives irresistibly leads the present writer to the conclusion that the right names are Cushites, Jerahmeelites, and Mišrites (see OBADIAH [BOOK]). It is also very possibly an error to suppose that the Moabites are specially referred to in the Book of Nehemiah; this, however, is partly connected with the question as to the ethnic names in the narrative of the migration of the Israelites. There is, at any rate, much confusion in the names mentioned in Nehemiah, and elsewhere (see SANBALLAT) it is maintained that both 'Sanballat' and 'Horonite' are probably miswritten: the one for 'Nebaiothite' (=Nabataean?), the other (which is to be taken with the miswritten 'Tobiah') for 'Rehobothite.' Cp also RUTH [BOOK].

Winckler (GI 1204) makes the striking remark that Moab at the time of its immigration was probably just such a small tribe as the Calebites and the separate Israelitish tribes. In civilisation and racial consciousness there was no difference, and in language none worth mentioning, between them and the Israelites. Noldeke (Die sem. Sprachen, 17) also remarks that the style of the inscription of Mesha is essentially that of the OT, and allows us to infer the existence of a similar literature among the Moabites. As Noldeke also points out, the only important un-Hebraic feature of the inscription is the occurrence of the eighth Arabic 'conjugation' (with t after the first radical). The inscriptional style may, however, have differed considerably from the type of the actually spoken tongue. Cp MESHÄ, § 4.

G. A. S., §§ 1-9; J. we., §§ 10-13; T. K. C., § 14.

MOADIAH (מוֹדִיָּה), §§ 33, 72, 'Yahwè promises?'), a priestly family temp. Joiakim (EZRA ii., § 66, § 11), Neh. 1217 (om. BN\*A; EN KAIPOIC [N<sup>c.a</sup> mg. inf.]; MACCAI [L]); cp MAADIAH.

<sup>1</sup> 1 S. 223, where read 'Zephath (Zarephath) of Mišsur.' See MIZPEH.

<sup>2</sup> מִשְׁרָן (Jer. 4545) is accepted by Di. for מִשְׁרָן, however, as also in Am. 22, comes from מִשְׁרָן (the N. Arabian Cush), which at once suggests מִשְׁרָן for מִשְׁרָן.

MODIN

MOCHMUR (μοχμοϋρ [B; om. A], მოყყ. [N\*], მოკ. [N<sup>c.a</sup> vid.], machur [Vet. Lat.]; ܡܚܡܘܪ [Syr.]), a brook upon which stood CHUSI (Judith 718). It was situated near to EKREBEL (mod. 'Akraheh), whence Schultz has identified it with Makfuriyeh close to 'Akraheh.

MODIN, a city or village of Judæa. Most modern authorities (e.g., Grimm, Schurer, Zockler) rightly refer the form Modein or Modeim.

Ⓢ's readings vary considerably; μωδειν [N\* 1 Macc. 21. K<sup>c.b</sup> 164 V 919]; -ειν [A 21 etc.]; -μ [A 223 919]; -ειν [N<sup>c.a</sup> 21. K<sup>c</sup> 919 etc.]; -μ [A 164]; -ειν [V 2 Macc. 1314]; -μ

L. Name. [A ib.]; -μ [N\* V 164]; -μ [V 215 23]; -ω [V 21]; other readings are μωδαις [Jos., ed. Niese, Ant. xii. 61], -ειν [ib. 1121, -ν [B/1.13]; in OS 281 59 14020 μηδεειν Modeim; Modin [Vg., whence EV].

The later Hebrew form (which often has the article also) varies. Pal. Mishnah (ed. Lowe) reads מוֹדִיָּה (Mōdi'ith) Pēsāh. 92 (Talm. Bab. 93b), Hag. 35 (Talm. Bab. 256). Other readings are מוֹדִיָּה, מוֹדִיָּה, מוֹדִיָּה.

In the Medeba mosaic (see MEDEBA) the reading Μωδιθα occurs, and this seems to point back to the Hebrew Modi'ith.

In 217 Modin is called a city, πόλις (so in v. 15 εἰς Μωδειν τὴν πόλιν). Josephus, on the other hand, describes it as a village of Judæa (ἐν Μωδαί, κώμη τῆς Ἰουδαίας, Ant. xii. 6 x 112). Eus. (κώμη) and Jer. (ψικία) agree with Josephus; so Jerome on Dan. 1138. In v. 15 it is referred to as a hill (ἐν ὄρει Modin), and this, curiously enough, reappears in later Rabbinical authorities. See Grimm on 1 Macc. 21, and Rashi on T. B. Bābā Bathrā 10 b. Naturally the place was of most importance in Maccabæan times; by the time of Josephus it may have dwindled. The ruins at el-Medyeh, with which Modin is usually identified, seem to point to an ancient collection of villages, a fact which the plural form of the name also attests. Grimm reconciles the two statements by describing Modin as a κομὸπόλις.

The interest in Modin arises from its association with the Maccabæan history. The place is not named in

MT (though curiously enough Porphyry 2. History. on Dan 1138 read Modiim for the difficult מוֹדִיָּה. See Jer. ad loc.). We first hear of Modin in 168 B.C.; it became the residence of Mattathias, when he felt it no longer safe or honourable to remain in Jerusalem (1 Macc. 21). By Simon's time Modin was the special city of the Hasmonæans (τῆ πατρίδι, Jos. Ant. xiii. 66); but even in Mattathias's day it must have been the permanent home, not merely the temporary asylum, of the family; Mattathias (1 Macc. 217) is termed 'a ruler and an honourable and great man in this city.' From another passage (1 M. 270) it appears that the sepulchres of Mattathias's ancestors were situated in Modin.

Modin was the scene of the outbreak of the revolt against Antiochus IV. Epiphanes. Here it was that Mattathias was summoned by a Syrian officer to follow the general example and offer a pagan sacrifice. He refused, and his slaying of an apostate Jew at the altar erected in Modin was the first act of armed rebellion (1 Macc. 215-28). Mattathias then fled from Modin; but the place was not garrisoned by the Syrian forces, for, on his death shortly afterwards, his sons buried him there (1 Macc. 270 Jos. Ant. xii. 64). Modin is again mentioned in 2 Macc. 1314. Judas Maccabæus is there reported to have fixed his headquarters at Modin before his victorious night attack on the army of Antiochus V. Eupator. When Judas subsequently fell in battle at Elasa his body was recovered by his brothers Jonathan and Simon, and buried at Modin (1 Macc. 919 Jos. Ant. xii. 62). Simon rendered a similar service to Jonathan (1 Macc. 1325) and he erected in Modin a splendid monument to his illustrious family (1327-30). See below § 3.

At Modin Judas and John, sons of Simon, passed the night before making their successful attack on Cendebæus (1 Macc. 164) whose headquarters were at Cedron (Kaṭra) in the Philistine lowlands. In Rabbinic times Modin was regarded (Mishna, Pēsāhim 92) as fixing the legal limit of distance with regard to the injunction in Nu. 910. Rabbi 'Akiba held that any Jew who happened to be as distant from Jerusalem as Modin might be regarded as 'on a journey afar off.' The

MODIN

Bab. Talmud (*Pēsāhīm* 936) explains that this distance was 15 m. In another case of ritual law Modiith is cited by the Mishna (*Hag.* 35), and from this passage it has been inferred by some Rabbinical authorities that the city or district of Modin was the centre of the pottery industry.

A Rabbi Eleazar of Modin (contemp. with 'Akiba, and cent. A.D.) is quoted with respect in the Mishnah (*Abōth* 3 3) and Talmud (F. B. *Shabbāth* 556. *Bābū Bathrā* 106). He is sometimes designated simply *Ham-modai* or *Ham-mudai* 'the man of Modin.' (Clermont-Ganneau found that the modern ethnic name of the inhabitants of Medyeh is Midnāwy, pl. Medāwneh.)

The monument which Simon erected (see above) was lofty, of polished stone behind and before. Seven pyramids, over against one another, commemorated Simon's father, his mother, and his four brothers; the

**3. Simon's mausoleum.** remaining one being designed for himself. Stanley (*Jewish Church*, 3318) describes the mausoleum as a square structure surrounded by colonnades of monolith pillars. The pyramids were ornamented with bas-relief, of weapons.<sup>1</sup> Mindful of the commercial use to which the Phœnician coast was put by the Maccabæans, Simon added carvings of ships *εἰς τὸ θεωρεῖσθαι ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν πλεόντων τῆν θάλασσαν*. This phrase is commonly rendered 'that they should be seen of all that sail on the sea.' As the sea is at least 13 m. from Medyeh (and farther still from any other site with which Modin has been identified) this statement has given considerable trouble. Josephus, it may be observed, omits this detail (*Ant.* xiii. 66). Commentators explain, 'only in its main outlines, and not in its minor features could this monument be visible from the Mediterranean' (*Camb. Bib. ad loc.*). But the association of the 'ships' with the 'seafarers' raises some difficulty against accepting this theory. E. le Camus (*Rev. Biblique*, 1109, 1892), explains the Greek *το* mean that the ships were so naturally carved that they won the admiration of expert seamen. This is certainly ingenious, and Buhl (*Pal.* 198) adopts the theory of Le Camus on this point though he contests the same writer's other objections to the identification of Modin with Medyeh. The writer of 1 Macc. (about 100 B.C.) tells us that the monument was standing in his day, and Josephus repeats the assertion nearly two centuries later. Eusebius and Jerome also seem to declare that the monument was still intact, though the language they use is not conclusive. (As the passage from the *Onomast.* is of importance for the discussion that follows it is cited in full: *Μωδεειρ, κώμη πλησίον Διοσπόλεως, ὅθεν ἦσαν οἱ Μακκαβαῖοι, ὧν καὶ τὰ μνημεῖα εἰς ἐτι νῦν δείκνυνται. Μωδεῖν vicus iuxta Diospolim, unde fuerunt Maccabæi, quorum hodieque ibidem sepulchra monstrantur.*) Supposed remains of the monument have been shown at Soba, while Guérin in 1870 created some sensation by claiming to have discovered the Mausoleum at Kh. el-Gherbāwi in the neighbourhood of Medyeh. The structure so identified by him was, however, shown by Clermont-Ganneau to be of Christian origin. There is certainly nothing at Medyeh above ground or (as yet) excavated that in the slightest degree resembles the description in 1 Macc.

The geographical position of Modin cannot be determined with absolute certainty. Šōbā, about 6 m. W. of Jerusalem, was long identified with Modin; but this identification has nothing but a late tradition in its favour. The proposal of Robinson (*BR* 151 f.; cp. on Šōbā, *ibid.* 26) to locate Modin at Lātrūn has won little support. It is now very commonly believed that the village of el-Medyeh marks the site of the old home of the Hasmonæans (Conder, *PEFM* 2297 341-352; C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Arch. Res. in Pal.* 2359). The identification was first proposed by Em. Forner in 1866, and a little later by Neubauer (*Glog. du Talmud*, 1868, p. 99), and by Sandreczki (1869) who located the mausoleum at the Kabur el-Yahiid, a little to the SW. of Medyeh. El-Medyeh is a large village a little off the old Roman road which passed from Jerusalem to Lydda through the two Bethhorons (see EPHRAIM, map; Midieh). It is about 16 m. NW. of Jerusalem, and 6½ m. from Lydda. The village proper is separated on three sides from higher ground; to the W. lie several ruins, among them the Kh. Midyeh, Kh. el-Himmām, and especially the Sheikh el-Gharbāwi where Guérin erroneously thought in 1870 that he had discovered the Maccabæan Mausoleum. (*La Samarie*, 2401; *Galilée*, 1, 47.) South of the village is a conical knoll called er-Rās, ('the head'), about 700 ft. high, and this has been taken by Conder and others as the most likely spot for Simon's monument. Er-Rās has the appearance of

**4. Geographical position.**

<sup>1</sup> [It may be noted that for *πυραμίδας* the Syr. has *naphsāthā*, perhaps 'grave-stones,' and *μηχανήματα* may have been simply machines for raising the pillars.]

MOLE

having been artificially cut. The village is shut in by the surrounding heights; but there is a fine view obtainable from er-Rās, and Jaffa and the sea are clearly seen. From the sea the bare outlines of Simon's monument would have been visible when the sun was behind the observer.

There are many tombs in the neighbourhood, deeply cut in the rock, the openings covered with great stones. Nothing has so far come to light, however, to suit the description in 1 Macc., hence it may be said, that a personal visit to Medyeh, while revealing no valid objection to its identification with Modin, does not produce a sense of absolute conviction. Medyeh certainly fulfils all the other requirements. Though we must eliminate the condition of visibility from the sea, Modin probably stood on a hill. It is unlikely that Simon would have erected a monument, meant to be conspicuous, unless it was so situated as to be clearly seen from afar. Moreover, the most natural inference from 1 Macc. 164 is that Modin stood near the plain, but not in it. Medyeh admirably suits this inference. The statement of the Talmud that Modin was 15 m. from Jerusalem, and the assertion of the *Onomast.* that Modin was near Lydda, both support the claims of Medyeh. The identity of name is also a weighty support. Clermont-Ganneau (*PEFQ*, 1897, p. 221) asserts the general rule that the Aramaic termination *-itha* becomes regularly *-ie* in Arabic. Hence *Μωδεθα* (see § 2) would be represented by the Arabic *Mediē* (pronounced, according to Ganneau, *Meūdiē*). (The present writer, when in Judæa in 1898, came across an Arab in Jerusalem who suggested as the site of Modin a high hill just above 'Amwās. This hill is locally known as *Medemneh*. An examination of the site revealed some, but very few, ruins of ancient buildings.) Le Camus (*loc. cit.*) objects to the identification of Modin with Medyeh: (a) that Medyeh was in Dan, not Judæa, (b) that 1 Macc. 164-10 requires a more southerly position than Medyeh and (c) that Medyeh is not sufficiently central to have formed the headquarters of the revolt. These arguments are none of them conclusive. I. A.

**MOETH** (Μωεθ), 1 Esd. 863= Ezra 833. ΝΟΑΔΙΑΗ (1).

**MOLADAH** (מולדה); usually מולאדה, a place in S. Judah towards Edom mentioned in (a) Josh. 1526 מולאדה [A], (b) Josh. 192, κωλαδαμ [BA], ΔΑΜ [B<sup>b</sup> per ras], Μωλαδαμ [B<sup>a</sup> (vid.) mg.]; (c) 1 Ch. 428, Μωλλαδ [B], ΜΟΥΛΑΔΑ [L]; (d) Neh. 1126 (B<sup>8</sup>\*A om.). The notice in (c), however, is admitted to be derived from (b), and the words 'and Shema and Moladah' in (a) are an interpolation (see SHEMA) from Neh. 1126 (see Bennett, *SBOT* 'Joshua'). The two remaining passages (6 and d) tell us this—that Moladah was first Sineonite, then Judahite (see Sta. *GV*, 1b, 154), and that it was in the neighbourhood of Shema or Sheba and Beersheba. Originally it was probably Jerahmeelite, as its name appears to indicate (see MOLID). Moladah is very possibly the Malatha or Malaatha in Idumæa, to the 'tower' of which Agrippa at one time retired (Jos. *Ant.* xviii. 62). Respecting this Malatha, Eus. and Jer. tell us (OS 8722, 21455, 11927, 25578, 1333, 26642) that it was 4 R. m. from Arad and hard by Ether (Jattir). If this statement is correct, it is fatal to the identification (in itself phonetically difficult) of Moladah with *Kh. el-Milh* (13m. E. of Beersheba), which has been adopted from Robinson (*BR* 621 f.) by Guérin, Miichlau, and Socin (cp SALT, CITY OF). The fortress of Malatha seems to have been entirely razed. The ruin of *Derjās* or *Darjāt*, on the slopes and summit of a knoll, with caverns, referred to by Buhl (*Pal.* 183), seems too insignificant. It is, however, in the right district, being NW. of *Tell 'Arād* towards *Attir*. C p [ERAHMEEL, § 2. T. K. C.

**MOLE**, 1. (מולת פרוה); but some MSS. Ezra, and the moderns read מולת פרוה, from מולת, 'to dig?'—only in plur., cp Theodot. φαρφαρωθ; τοις ναταιοις [BNAQI]; Is. 2207). The idolaters, say he commentators, will have to throw their idols into the holes burrowed by moles. The genus *Talpa* (mole) has not been found in Palestine; but its place has been taken by the mole-rat, *Spalax typhlus*. Mole-rats are common about ruins and the outskirts of villages, etc. They are considerably larger than moles. Their eyes are completely covered by skin; the ear conchs are small and the incisor teeth large and prominent. They

form long burrows, sometimes 40 ft. in length and about 18 in. below the surface, in which they live gregariously. seldom, if ever, coming to the surface. The objection is (1) that the existence of a word 'הפר', 'moles,' is uncertain, and (2) that the common view makes a miserable sense. One can hardly doubt that there is a textual corruption, and that the 'moles' and 'bats' have to disappear. Read 'In that day men shall cast away the idols of silver and gold which the Jerahmeelites (ירחמאליים) made for them to worship'; cp v. 6, where פלשתים, as usual, is a popular corruption of צרפתים, 'Zarephathites' (often a synonym for 'Jerahmeelites'; see PELETHITES).

2. In Lev. 1130 occurs תַּשְׁתִּיחַ, which is now generally explained 'chameleon' (see LIZARD, 6). Onk., however, gives אַחְשָׁא, 'the mole,' with which Ⓢ Vg. (ἀσπίδαξ, talpa) agree. Did Ⓢ, Onk., read in this passage אֲשֶׁת (or אֲשָׁא)? In v. 18 'הַנֶּשֶׁת' evidently means some kind of bird, and it is unlikely that this name was really given to animals belonging to quite different categories. It is noteworthy that Tg. reads אֲשָׁא, 'mole,' instead of MT's אֲשֶׁת, in Ps. 589 (see OWL, § 1 [c]).

3. On the proposed rendering MOLE for מֹלֵךְ in Lev. 1129, see WEASEL.

T. K. C. — A. E. S.

### MOLECR, MOLOCH'

Heb. מֹלֵךְ, Lev. 205, in MT always pointed with the article except in 1 K. 117; Ⓢ in Pent. ἀρχων, ὁ ἀρχων [= מֹלֵךְ, as in Gen. 4920 Nu. 2321 Dt. 171415, etc.], in 1 K. 117 [Ⓢ L,

1. Name. μελαχου] Jer. 3235 βασιλευς, which was probably the original rendering in all passages in Kings and Prophets where later Greek translators find Molech;<sup>2</sup> Aq. Symm. Theod. Moloχ, which has intruded into Ⓢ BNA as a doublet in Jer. 3235 [Ⓢ 3935] and in different manuscripts in a number of other places; in some cases it has supplanted the rendering 'king,' as in Ⓢ Q, etc., in Jer. 3235. Ⓢ AB 2 K. 2310 [Ⓢ L Μελαχου, cp v. 13], Ⓢ vid. om. Am. 526 [see Hexapla]; Pesh. in Pent., following an old Jewish exegesis,<sup>3</sup> interprets of impregnation of a heathen woman; 2 K. 2310 Jer. 3235 'amlek 11 K. 117 Am. 526 Zeph. 15 mal'om, Milcom]; Tgg. מֹלֵךְ.

The name of a deity to whom the Judæans in the last ages of the kingdom offered their own children in sacrifice with peculiar rites. The places in which the name Molech occurs in MT are Lev. 1821 202-5 1 K. 117<sup>4</sup> 2 K. 2310 Jer. 3235 [= Ⓢ 3935]; Greek translators have Moloχ also in Am. 526 Zeph. 15. Allusions to the worship of Molech are recognised by many modern scholars in Is. 3033 579 (EV 'the king'); but the view of Geiger, who found references to this cult in a much larger number of passages, has been generally rejected.<sup>5</sup> The evidence of MT and the versions, a brief summary of which is given above, shows that the older interpreters took the word (מֹלֵךְ, מֹלֵךְ) not as a proper name, but as an appellative or a title used in the cultus (see below, § 5), and read it *mēlek*, 'ruler, king'; the pronunciation *mōlek*<sup>6</sup> is probably an intentional twist, giving the word the vowels of *bōseth*, 'shame.'<sup>7</sup>

The oldest witness to the pronunciation *mōlek* is the text of Acts 743. The name does not occur in Philo, Josephus, or any of the remains of the Jewish Hellenistic literature of the time, and is not found even in the Greek *Onomastica*. In Jubilees 3010 the Ethiopic text has Moloχ, but the Old Latin version *alienigena* (see footnote 3 below).

<sup>1</sup> Moloχ EV Acts 743, AV Am. 526.

<sup>2</sup> Cp the variants of Ⓢ and the Hexapla in Zeph. 15 Am. 626—where the testimony is confused under the influence of Acts 743—Is. 3033.

<sup>3</sup> Cited to be condemned in *M. Megilla*, 49; cp Tg. Jer. 1 on Lev. 1821; see Geiger, *Urschrift*, 303. Add *Iub.* 3010 Lat. *alienigena*.

<sup>4</sup> In 1 K. 117, Molech is an error for Milcom; cp MILCOM, § 1.

<sup>5</sup> Geiger, *Urschrift*, 306 ff.; against Geiger, Oort, *Menschen-offer*, 60 ff.; Kuenen, *Th. 1* 2 562 f.; Eerdmans, *Melekdiemst*, 24 f.

<sup>6</sup> Moloχ, *Moloch*, by vowel assimilation; cp Βοός, Αχινοομ, etc., Franke, *Vorstudien*, 119.

<sup>7</sup> Geiger, *Urschrift*, 301 (1857); Dillmann, *MBAB*, 1881, June 16; G. Hoffmann, *ZATW* 3124 (1883); WRS *Rel. Sem.* (2), 372 n., and many. Cp the substitution of *bōseth* for *ba'al* in Jer. 324 1113 Hos. 910; also Ⓢ ἡ αἰσχύνη, ἡ Βααλ (ἡ Μολοχ Ⓢ<sup>247</sup> 2 K. 231). See IDOL, § 3.

The term regularly employed to describe the rites of Molech worship is הַעֲבִיר (he'ebir), cause to pass, make

2. The sacrifice. 'give' or 'pay' (in sacrifice);<sup>1</sup> thus, to Yahwè (firstlings), Ex. 1312; to Molech, Jer. 3235 Lev. 1821 (in the latter a doublet or gloss to 'give,' cp Ezek. 1621); cp 'give to Molech,' Lev. 1821 202-4; 'make over' victims to idols, Ezek. 1621 2337; frequently, 'make over, offer, by fire' (without the name of the deity), Dt. 1810 2 K. 163 1717 216 2 Ch. 336 Ezek. 2031 (Ⓢ generally δάγειν ἐν πυρὶ); 'make over by fire to Molech (2 K. 2310). The common rendering, 'make (a son or daughter) pass through the fire to Molech' (so EV), is also possible, if 'to Molech' be understood not locally but as the dedication of the sacrifice. The verb occurs so constantly in this connection that were it not for Ex. 1312 it would doubtless have been regarded as belonging distinctively to the Molech cult.

The words הַעֲבִיר בָּאֵשׁ, rendered 'cause to go through the fire,' have often been thought to describe a ceremony of consecration or februation by passing through fire,<sup>2</sup> such as has been practised in different forms and on different occasions in all parts of the world,<sup>3</sup> the Roman Palilia being a familiar example.<sup>4</sup>

Thus Theodoret (*Quest. 47 in iv. Reg.*) brings to the explanation of the phrase customs which had fallen within his own observation: 'I have seen in some cities once in the year fires lighted in the public squares, and persons leaping over them and jumping—not merely boys but grown men, while infants were handed through the flame by their mothers. This was regarded as an expiation and purification.' The 65th Canon of the Concilium Quinisextum (692 A.D.), in forbidding under severe penalties the ancient custom of leaping over bonfires in the streets at the new moon, quotes as warrant for the prohibition 2 K. 2165.

This interpretation is old: it is expressed in Ⓢ Dt. 1810, 'No man shall be found among you who purifies his son or daughter by fire';<sup>5</sup> cp Vg. Jer. 3235 *ut initiarent filios suos et filias suas Moloch*. The Mishna seems to understand the rite as an initiation—not as a sacrifice;<sup>7</sup> in the Babylonian Talmud Rabbi Abaye (4th cent.) explained the custom as he imagined it: there was a row of bricks with fires on both sides of it, between which the child must pass. His contemporary Raba compared it to the Jewish custom of swinging over the Purim bonfires.<sup>8</sup> Similarly Jewish interpreters in the Middle Ages—e.g., Rashi on Lev. 1821: the father handed over his son to the heathen priests; they built two large fires between which the boy was made to pass.<sup>9</sup> It is generally assumed that the child went through unscathed (so Rashi, Maimonides); but others believed that the ordeal had a more serious ending: the child was compelled to go back and forth till the flames seized him or he fell into the fire;<sup>10</sup> or at least that the trial was sometimes fatal. Another old interpretation of the laws in Lev. 1821 202-5 (commerce with heathen women) has been mentioned above (§ 1, n. 3).

The testimony of both the prophets and the laws is abundant and unambiguous that the victims were slain and burnt as a holocaust: see Jer. 731 194-6, cp 3235 Ezek. 1620 f., cp 2337-39 (? 246 ff.), Dt. 1231, cp 1810; also 2 K. 1731; see further Jer. 324 Is. 575 f. 9 Ps.

<sup>1</sup> For this interpretation see Vitrings, *Obs. sacr.*, lib. 2, chap. 1; Kuenen, *Th. 1* 160 ff. (1867); Dillmann, *Exod.-Lev.* (2) 141 f. 599. Eerdmans, *Melekdiemst*, 7 f.

<sup>2</sup> Cp Nu. 3123, of the spoil of war whatever will stand fire, הַעֲבִיר בָּאֵשׁ, 'ye shall pass through the fire and it shall be clean': cp the following clause on purification by water.

<sup>3</sup> On fire festivals and ceremonies see Mannhardt, *Baumkultus*, 497 ff.; Frazer, *Golden Bough* (2), 3237 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Ovid, *Fasti*, 472 ff. <sup>5</sup> Mansi, 11073.

<sup>6</sup> περικαθαίρων, Vg. *qui lustret*; cp Chrysost. *Hom. in Joann.* 116, φαίβαζεν. Ⓢ F om. ἐν πυρὶ.

<sup>7</sup> M. *Sanhedrin*, 77: cp *Tos. Sanhedr.* 104 f.; *Siphra* on Dt. 1310; Jer. *Sanhedr.* 713 (fol. 256 c); Hab. *Sanhedr.* 64 a 6.

<sup>8</sup> Bab. *Sanhedr.* 64 b; see *Aruch*, s.v. שׁוּר. On the Purim fires, see Frazer, *Golden Bough* (2), 3172 f.

<sup>9</sup> Cp Kashi on *Sanhedr.* 64 6: Maimon, *Yad Hazaqā*, *Abdāh Zivāh*, 63; *Morē Nebōkīm*, 337.

<sup>10</sup> See *Aruch*, l.c.

MOLECH, MOLOCH

106<sup>37</sup> f. These passages, it will be observed, prove also that the children were not burnt alive, but were slaughtered like other sacrificial victims; see especially Ezek. 16<sup>20</sup> f. 23<sup>37</sup> f., cp also Gen. 22. Josephus, therefore, correctly interprets 2 K. 16<sup>3</sup> when he says of Ahaz, 'he also sacrificed his own son as a burnt offering to the idols (δολοκαύτωσε), according to the custom of the Canaanites.' Some of the midrashim give gruesome descriptions of the roasting of children in the arms of the idol of Molech (see below, § 3).

Ibn Ezra bluntly explains the word העביר as equivalent to שרף, 'burn,' 'for thus was the cult.'<sup>1</sup> Many scholars have endeavoured to reconcile these conflicting views in the theory that children were sometimes only 'passed through' the fire in rites of initiation or februation, sometimes actually burned. Analogies have been cited both for the attenuation of a sacrifice to a symbolical delivery to the flames, and for the growth of a real offering out of a more harmless rite.<sup>2</sup>

The only seat of this cult of which we have certain historical knowledge is Jerusalem. The catalogue of the sins for which the northern kingdom was destroyed, 2 K. 17<sup>7</sup> ff., in which the Israelites are charged with offering their sons and daughters by fire (v. 17, ויעבירו), was drawn up by a deuteronomistic writer (in the sixth century) from Dt., Jer., and Ezek. The prophets of the eighth century, in their indictment of contemporary Israel, say nothing of such sacrifices. (On 2 K. 17<sup>31</sup> and Is. 57<sup>3</sup> ff. see below, § 4.)

In Am. 5<sup>26</sup>, ושאתם את כבוד מלככם, ⚡ has τοῦ Μολοχ (cp Acts 7<sup>43</sup>), Vg. *Moloch* (Aq. Μολοχου, Pesh. *malōm*), and many interpreters down to our own time find here the name of Molech (see AV), some—chiefly older scholars—thinking that the idolatry of the forefathers in the wilderness is meant,<sup>3</sup> others: foreign cults of the author's own time. If, however, 'Siccuth' (Saknt) is, like 'Chiun' (Kaiwān), the proper name of a Babylonian deity, as is now the generally accepted and most probable opinion, ⚡ can only be appellative, 'your king,' and thus, apart from the question of the genuineness of the verse, the reference to Molech disappears; see CHIUN, and AMOS, § 13 (but cp MOSES, § 11; SHECHEM, ff.) Even with the appellative interpretation of (כבוד, 'tabernacle,'<sup>4</sup> the verse would testify only that to some (unnamed) god the epithet 'king' was applied; there is no allusion to the peculiar rite of Molech worship. Hos. 13<sup>2</sup> has been understood to refer to human sacrifice<sup>5</sup> to the calves of Israel (not Molech!), but the better interpretation is, 'Human offerers kiss calves!'<sup>6</sup>

The place of sacrifice at Jerusalem was in the Valley of Ben Hinnom (see HINNOM, VALLEY OF; JERUSALEM, col. 2423 n. 7), just without the city gate 'Harsith' (Jer. 19<sup>2</sup>), not far from the Temple, and is called 'the Tophet' (התפת).<sup>7</sup> This pronunciation of the name is probably, like 'Molech,' one of the cases in which MT has given a word of idolatrous association the vowels of *bōsēth* (Geiger; see above, § 1); cp ⚡ θαφεθ, ταφεθ, θαφθεθ, Pesh. *tappath*. On the derivation and meaning of the word see TOPHET. If we may connect it with Aram. תפא (Jer. Tgg., Talm.) and the cognate words (see especially RS<sup>(2)</sup> 377 n.), תפת (pronounced *tēphāth*) is a loan word of Aramaic origin (cp Heb. *ʿāṣpōth*, and the denom. vb. *šāpāth*, set (a pot) on the fireplace).<sup>8</sup> The meaning 'fireplace' would agree well with Is. 30<sup>33</sup>, the only passage in the OT which seems to describe Tophet.

<sup>1</sup> Geiger's surmise, on Lev. 18<sup>21</sup> (*Urschrift* 305), based on MT 2 Ch. 28<sup>3</sup> (against all the versions) compared with 2 K. 16<sup>3</sup>, that the original reading was everywhere הבעיר, 'consume' by fire, for which העביר is a euphemistic substitute, is generally rejected.

<sup>2</sup> See G. Voss, *De origine . . . idolatriæ*, lib. 2, ch. 5; Spencer, *De legibus ritualibus*, lib. 2, ch. 13, § 2. Braun, *Selecia Sacra*, 471 ff.; Witsius, *Miscell. Sacra*, lib. 1, diss. 5, § 18 f.

<sup>3</sup> See Kuenen, *Religion & Israel*, 1250; cp *Th. T* 2 592 (1868). Literature of the question in Eerdmans, *Melekdienst*, 142 n.; further Robertson, *Early Religion of Israel*, 257 ff.

<sup>4</sup> So, most recently, Nath. Schmidt, *JBL* 13 9 f. (1894).

<sup>5</sup> So Oort, Kuenen, Eerdmans (23).

<sup>6</sup> Wellhausen, Stade, Nowack, and others.

<sup>7</sup> On human sacrifices outside of cities see WRS *Re? Sem.*(2) 371 ff.

<sup>8</sup> The supposed Aramaic origin of the word seems at variance with the probably Phœnician origin of the cult; see below, § 6.

MOLECH, MOLOCH

Whatever explanation be given of the form, the word *tophētē* is obviously synonymous with תפת; it is a fireplace, apparently a pit or trench—'deep and wide—in which the fuel was piled.<sup>1</sup> Compare the χάσμα πλῆρες πυρός in Diodorus' description (probably from Duris of Samos) of the child sacrifices of the Carthaginians (20 14), and the lines of Euripides, *Iphig. in Taur.* 621 f., quoted by Diodorus in the same connection, where Orestes, about to be sacrificed asks, Τάφος δὲ ποῖος δέξεται μ' ὄταν θάνω; Iphigenia answers: πῦρ ἱερὸν ἐνδον χάσμα τ' εὐρωπῶν πέτρας.<sup>2</sup>

The language of Jeremiah when he says that the people of Judah had built 'high places of Tophet' (7 31), or of Baal (19 5 32 35), does not contradict this inference, for these expressions mean no more than a 'heathen sanctuary' (see HIGH PLACE, § 5).

There is nothing in the OT about an image at this sanctuary; Ezek. 16<sup>20</sup> f. is hardly—in this rhetorical indictment—to be put into such close connection with v. 17, that we should understand the 'images of a male' in the latter verse of a Molech idol to whom the children were sacrificed;<sup>3</sup> and the author of 2 K. 23<sup>10</sup> would scarcely have failed to mention the image, if one had been there.

The descriptions of the idol of Molech in *Echā rabbāthi* on Lam. 19, and *Yalqūt* on Jer. 7 31 (from Midrash *Yelammea'enu*, cp *Tanchuma*, ed. Buber, *Dibārīm*, fol. 8a) which have been repeated by many Jewish and Christian authors, are not only much too late to have any value as evidence to the fact, but are manifestly derived from Greek accounts of the image of Kronos to which the Carthaginians hrned their sons.<sup>4</sup>

That the 'Tophet' was to the Molech worshippers a very holy place is evident from 2 K. 23<sup>10</sup>, but especially from Jer. 7 32: in the day when the Valley of Ben Hinnom shall be called the Valley of Slaughte, they shall bury the slain in Tophet for want of room, and thus be constrained themselves to defile it (cp Ezek. 9 7, of the temple), Jer. 19 12 f.

The testimonies in the OT concerning the sacrifice of children to 'Molech' with peculiar rites—the question is not here of the antiquity of human sacrifice in general<sup>5</sup>—relate chiefly to the seventh and the beginning of the sixth century B.C. We have, indeed, a statement that Ahaz (reigned from about 734) 'offered his son by fire' (2 K. 16 3, העביר), and many scholars are accordingly of the opinion that the cult was introduced in the eighth century—most likely by Ahaz himself, whose penchant for foreign fashions in worship is known (2 K. 16 10-16). There is no intrinsic improbability in this; but we may hesitate to affirm the fact on the sole testimony of the author of Kings (end of 7th cent.) in his pragmatic judgment of the reign of Ahaz (2 K. 16 1-4). The prophets of the eighth century—in striking contrast to those of the next—make no mention of child sacrifices in their enumeration of the sins of their contemporaries; and, if Ahaz really offered up his son it would be more natural to regard it as a last resource in desperate straits,<sup>6</sup> like Meshah's sacrifice (2 K. 3 26 f.), than as an early instance of the 'Molech' cult.

4. Age of the cult in Judah.

Is. 30 33 (cp § 3) obviously plays upon this cult: for the enemies of Judah a vast fire pit is prepared (*tophētē*), like the Tophet in the Valley of Ben Hinnom; 'this, too, is for the king,' as that Tophet for the king-god ('Molech'). The elimination of the latter clause (Duhm) removes but half the difficulty. If the horrid rites of Tophet had been as familiar in Isaiah's day as this verse implies, is it conceivable that we should have but one reference to them, and that in sarcasm rather than in abhorrence? The difficulty would not exist if

Is. 30 33 (cp § 3) obviously plays upon this cult: for the enemies of Judah a vast fire pit is prepared (*tophētē*), like the Tophet in the Valley of Ben Hinnom; 'this, too, is for the king,' as that Tophet for the king-god ('Molech'). The elimination of the latter clause (Duhm) removes but half the difficulty. If the horrid rites of Tophet had been as familiar in Isaiah's day as this verse implies, is it conceivable that we should have but one reference to them, and that in sarcasm rather than in abhorrence? The difficulty would not exist if

<sup>1</sup> See Che. *Isaiah* (SBOT) 157.

<sup>2</sup> Examples of burning men in fire pits are cited from Arabic literature by WRS *Rel. Sem.*(2), 377.

<sup>3</sup> Kuenen, *Th. T* 2 577 ff., cp 574 f. Oort, *Menschenoffer*, 79 f. thinks that Molech was properly the name of the image, which was arranged to serve as an altar.

<sup>4</sup> See Moore, *JBL* 16 161 ff. (1897). For the Greek and Roman testimonies see Maximilian Mayer, in Roscher, *Lex.* 2 1501 ff. See also WRS *Rel. Sem.*(2), 377 n.

<sup>5</sup> See SACRIFICE, § 13.

<sup>6</sup> As the occasion we should probably think of the invasion of Judah by Pekah and Rezin (Is. 7 1 2 K. 16 5). Rut it would be strange that we find no allusion to the deed in Is. 7 f.

## MOLECH, MOLOCH

we could assume that *tophet* was a common name for a fire pit, which only later became specifically associated with the offerings to Molech, but the probability is that *tôpheth* (*tôphāth*) is a foreign word which was adopted with the cult (see above, § 3); the corresponding Hebrew words have not developed similar meanings.

Is. 30 27-33, as a whole, is regarded by several recent critics as 'post-exilic' (Guthe, Hackmann, Cheyne), and this may be confidently affirmed of v. 30; the tone of the allusion is rather that of a writer remote from these atrocities, than of a prophet in the midst of the struggle against them.

In the last half century of the kingdom of Judah the denunciations of the prophets (Jer. 7 31 19 5 ff. 32 35, cp 3 24; Ezek. 16 20 f. 36 20 26 31 23 37 39, cp Mic. 6 6-8) and the prohibitions of the legislation (Dt. 18 10, cp 12 31; Lev. 18 21 20 2-5)<sup>1</sup> prove that the sacrifice of children was a common thing, not on occasions of extremity, but as part of an established cult. The victims were frequently, if not always, firstborn sons or daughters of their mother (Ezek. 20 26, cp Mic. 6 7; see below, § 7). The author of Kings, in his recital of the sins of Manasseh for which Judah was doomed (2 K. 21 2-9, cp Jer. 15 4), includes the offering of his son by fire (v. 6, *הקביר*, see also 23 10), and although the verse is little more than an application to Manasseh of Dt. 18 10 f. and the testimony of such catalogues of crimes is always to be taken with caution, in this case it may very well be true. A public cult of this kind is more likely to have been introduced from above than to have sprung up from below; particularly if, as we shall in the sequel find reason to think probable, the peculiar rites came from abroad.

The sacrifices were suppressed and the sanctuary dismantled and defiled by Josiah in 621 (2 K. 23 10); but the worship was revived under Jehoiakim and continued till the fall of Jerusalem (Jer. 11 10-13 Ez. 20 30 f.). Is. 57 5 has sometimes been thought to attest the survival—or revival—of the sacrifice of children among the descendants of the ancient Israelites at a very late date;<sup>2</sup> cp v. 9 where the 'king' is understood of the divine king ('Molech,' Ewald); but the evidence is of doubtful interpretation, and it is uncertain how far the writer is describing cults of his own time.

It has generally been held that these sacrifices were offered to a foreign god named Molech, cognate or perhaps identical with the Ammonite Milcom, whose worship ~~for~~ some reason received a great impulse in the last century or two before the fall of Judah. The language of the prophets seems to confirm this view: Jeremiah calls the place of sacrifice 'the high place of the baal' (*i.e.*, a heathen deity, Jer. 19 5 32 35), 'the baal' (MT *hōšeth*) had devoured the children of the Judæans (3 24); Ezekiel speaks of sacrificing children to idols (23 39, *gillūlim*), and characterises the worship as fornication (*e.g.*, 16 20) or adultery (23 37), expressions which since Hosea had been standing metaphors for apostasy. There can, indeed, be no question that to the prophets this cult was an apostasy to heathenism; as little can we doubt that the rites were introduced from a foreign religion (see below). But we cannot be equally certain that the judgment of the prophets accurately reflects the intention of the worshippers; we shall find evidence in the prophets themselves that those who brought these sacrifices devoted them to no foreign god.

The pronunciation 'Molech,' as we have seen (§ 1), is a figment of Jewish readers; the word was originally spoken as it was meant by the writers, *ham-milek*, 'the king,' a title or *ἐπικλησις*,<sup>3</sup> not a proper name. There is a strong presumption that the deity who was thus

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps only 20 2a is the old law; see LEVITICUS, § 18.

<sup>2</sup> Verse 5 is regarded by Duhm and Cheyne as secondary in a late context. That Is. 56 9-57 11a is not a fragment of a prophet contemporary with Jeremiah and Ezekiel, as was thought by critics of the last generation, is now generally recognised.

<sup>3</sup> On the religious importance of these *ἐπικλησεις* see Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States*, 1 35.

## MOLECH, MOLOCH

addressed in Jerusalem was the national God, Yahwē. The title 'king' implies the belief that the god to whom it is given rules the destinies of the people; and whatever foreign deities Manasseh admitted to his pantheon, he and his people never ceased to acknowledge Yahwi: as the god of Israel.

The king' (*mēlek*) is, in fact, a common title of Yahwē: see Is. 6 5, 'the king, Yahwi: of Hosts'; Jer. 46 18, 'As I live saith the king, whose name is Yahwi: of Hosts' (cp 48 15); Is. 44 6, 'Yahwē, the king of Israel' (cp 41 21 43 15 Zeph. 3 15); a contemporary of Jeremiah hears the name Malchiah, 'my king is Yahwē' (Jer. 21 1 38 1), nor is there any reason to think that in the older names Malchishua (son of Saul, 1 S. 31 2), Abimelech (Judg. 9 1), Ahimelech (a priest of Yahwē, contemporary of David, 1 S. 21 f. 2 S. 8 17), *mēlek* is to be understood otherwise; note the analogy of haal-names (see BAAL, § 5).<sup>1</sup>

This presumption is strongly supported by the testimony of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Jeremiah is constrained to protest repeatedly that Yahwē had not enjoined these sacrifices: the people of Judah built the 'Tophet' sanctuary in the valley of Ben Hinnom 'to burn their sons and daughters with fire; a thing which I commanded them not, nor did it enter into my mind' (7 31, cp 19 5 32 35). The prophet's emphatic denial is the best evidence that those who offered these sacrifices offered them to Yahwē, as they believed in obedience to his command. This conclusion is confirmed in a remarkable way by Ezekiel: the people had obstinately disobeyed the good laws which Yahwē had given them (20 18 ff.), therefore 'I gave them statutes not good and ordinances whereby they cannot live, and defiled them by their sacrificial gifts in offering every firstborn, that I might fill them with horror' (Ezek. 20 25 f., cp v. 31). The prophet does not, like Jeremiah, deny that Yahwē had commanded any such thing; he declares that these bad and destructive laws were what the people had deserved by rejecting better ones. He leaves us in no doubt what the law was, for he uses the very words of Ex. 13 12, 'Thou shalt offer every firstborn to Yahwē' (*והקברת כל פטר מוס ליהוה*); see below, § 7. The prohibition Lev. 18 21 also shows that the 'Molech' sacrifices were offered to Yahwe: 'Thou shalt not give any of thy children [offering them, *להקביר*, gloss] to the king, and shalt not [thus] profane the name of thy God.' Cp also Mic. 6 6 f. Gen. 22.

The natural, and indeed almost inevitable, inference from the facts that have been brought out in the foregoing paragraphs—the place at which the sacrifices were offered, the peculiar rite, the time in which the worship first appears—is that the offering of children by fire at the 'Tophet' in the Valley of Hinnom to Yahwē the king was a foreign cult introduced in the reign of Manasseh. And, inasmuch as in this age, when the relations of Judah to Assyria were uniformly friendly, the influence of Assyrian civilisation—which, as always, necessarily includes religion—was at its height, and since other cults which then came into vogue can with much probability be traced to Babylonia,<sup>2</sup> it is not surprising that many scholars should have thought that the 'Molech' worship came from the same quarter.<sup>3</sup> This conjecture seemed to be confirmed by the fact that the colonists from Sepharvaim—long identified with Sippara in northern Babylonia—are said in 2 K. 17 24 31 to have burned their sons to their gods ADRAMMELECH and ANAMMELECH (*qq.v.*), whose names are obviously compounded with *mēlek* (Adarmalik, Anumalik). The divine name or title *malik* was read in many Assyrian inscriptions;<sup>4</sup> texts were

<sup>1</sup> On these names see Gray, *Hebrew Proper Names*, 115 ff. 138 ff. 146 ff.; Kerber, *Hebräische Eigennamen*, 37 ff. [Cp also MALCHIAH, SAUL, and *Crit. Bib.*, where an attempt is made to go behind MT, and recover more original forms of the names.—T. K. C.]

<sup>2</sup> See QUEEN OF HEAVEN.

<sup>3</sup> So Graf, *Jeremia*, Preface, 12 f. (1862); Tiele, *Vergelijkende Geschiednis*, 692 ff.; Stade, *ZATW* 6 308 (1886).

<sup>4</sup> Schrader, *Th. St.* 47 324 ff. (1874): Adar or Adrammelech = Saturn = Moloeh-Kewan-Sandan-Hercules, etc., 328 f.

understood to speak of human sacrifice;<sup>1</sup> reliefs and figures on seal-cylinders were thought to represent it.

The progress of investigation has left but little of this seemingly sufficient demonstration. Sepharvaim is not the Babylonian Sippara (Abū Habba), but a city in Western Syria (see SEPHARVAIM); the texts supposed to speak of human sacrifice were wholly misinterpreted; the representations in art are more than doubtful.<sup>2</sup> *Malik* is an epithet of various gods, probably not, however, in the meaning 'king' (*šarru* - e.g., *šar ilāni Ašur*; id. *Marduk*; *Sin šar ilāni ša šamē u iršitim*),<sup>3</sup> but 'counsellor,' 'decider' (prop. *mālik*),<sup>4</sup> or perhaps 'prince.' The cases in which *Malik* appears alone as though a proper name, particularly the inscription of Nabu-bal-iddin from Sippara (col. 55<sub>40</sub> 67),<sup>5</sup> where it occurs in connection with Šamaš and Bunē, are variously explained;<sup>6</sup> but it is at least certain that if *malik* ever became locally a proper name, the god to whom it was given occupied no such conspicuous place in the Assyrian pantheon as to make it probable that his worship should be taken up with so much zeal in distant Palestine, and, so far as our evidence reaches, there is no trace in Babylonia of the peculiar child sacrifices of the 'Molech' worship.

The OT represents these sacrifices as Canaanite.<sup>7</sup> The value of this testimony is diminished by the fact that from Hosea onwards the contaminating influence of Canaanite culture was the common prophetic explanation of the religious corruption of Israel; and the late date at which the peculiar Molech cult appears forbids us to suppose that it was adopted, like the baal worship, from the old population of the land in the period of occupation and settlement. But if we may take Canaanite in the larger sense in which it includes the Phœnicians,<sup>8</sup> this theory of the origin of the cult is probably true. For, though there is sporadic or inferential evidence of child sacrifice in many parts of the world,<sup>9</sup> the Phœnicians and their colonists, especially the Carthaginians, are the one civilised people of antiquity of whom we know that the sacrifice of their own children was practised, not as an occasional recrudescence of savage superstition, nor in the hole-and-corner rites of some abominable mystery, but as an established and prominent part of the public religion. These sacrifices seemed to the Greeks so remarkable in their atrocity, that no author who touches upon the history or customs of the Phœnician race fails to mention them. And it is of great significance for our question that in the descriptions of these rites, whether in mythical or historical form, the pit of fire constantly recurs.<sup>10</sup>

The deity to whom these sacrifices were offered is

<sup>1</sup> Sayce, 'Human Sacrifice among the Babylonians,' *T.S.B.A.* 425; Lenormant, *Études accadiennes*, 312; see Eerdmans, *Melchisedech*, 105 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See W. H. Ward, 'Human Sacrifice on Babylonian cylinders,' *Amer. Journ. Arch.* 534 ff. (1889); C. J. Ball, *P.S.B.A.* 14149 ff. [1892]; A. Jeremias in Roscher, *Lex.* 23110.

<sup>3</sup> Del. Ass. *HWB.* 692.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* 412 ff.; A. Jeremias in Roscher, 23109.

<sup>5</sup> *KB* 31, 174 ff.

<sup>6</sup> See Jastrow, *Rel. Bab. and Ass.* 176 ff.; Tiele, *Babylonisch-Assyr. Geschichte*, 524; Jeremias, *l.c.* See also Eerdmans, 73 ff.

<sup>7</sup> *Di.* 1229-31 189-14 Ezek. 16 20 (in the midst of a description of the corruption of Israel in Canaan; cp v. 26 ff., intercourse with foreigners); Jer. 324 19 j (the 'baal'—i.e., Canaanite deity). [Cp PLAGUES, TEN.]

<sup>8</sup> Sidon the firstborn of Canaan, Gen. 10 15; see CANAAN, §§ 1-5.

<sup>9</sup> See Bachofen, *Mutterrecht*, 212 ff. 229 ff.; Frazer, *Golden Bough* (2), 238 ff.

<sup>10</sup> The testimonies are collected by Miinter, *Religion der Karthager*, 17 ff.; Maximilian Mayer, in Roscher, s.v. 'Kronos,' 21501 ff. (cp E. Meyer, *ib.* 11223 2869 f.). The most important are: the Platonic *Minos*, 315 C; Kleitarchos, quoted in Scholia to Plato, *Rep.* 1337 A; Diodorus Siculus 20 14 (from Duris of Samos?), 1388; Plutarch, *De Superstitione*, c. 13; Porphyry, *De Abstinentia*, 256; cp Philo-of Byblos, frg. 3, 4 (*F.H.G.* 3570). On the fiery pit cp also the myth of Talos, Sophokles, *Daïdalos*, frg. 163, 2; Simonides, frg. 202 A, Bergk; Eustath. on Odys. 20 302 (p. 1893), etc. See Moore, *JBL*, 16 164 (1897).

called by the Greeks Kronos. Philo of Byblos tells us that the native name of the Phœnician Kronos was El (frag. 214, *F.H.G.* 3567, cp frag. 4, *ib.* 570 f.), and relates of this god that he killed a son and a daughter with his own hands, 'so that the other gods were amazed at Kronos' disposition' (frag. 218, *l.c.* 568); and that in a time of plague he sacrificed his only son to his father Ouranos (frag. 224); another passage narrates the sacrifice of his only son when great peril of war threatened the country (fragg. 4 f., *l.c.* 570 f.); human sacrifices to Kronos, of which, according to Porphyry, the Phœnician history of Sanchoniathon was full, followed the example given by the god himself. It would be too much to infer from our evidence that the 'Kronos' sacrifices were always dedicated to the one god El; indeed, in the light of what we know of the Phœnician religion this is altogether improbable. Human sacrifices were offered to other gods, for example, to Melkarth, the city god of Tyre, whom the Greeks called Herakles.<sup>1</sup>

Many Phœnician proper names are compounded with *melk*, *milk*, 'king.'<sup>2</sup> The title, like *da'al*, was doubtless given to the divine rulers of different cities; whether in time it attached at least by eminence to certain among them is not proved, though inherently probable enough. In particular we do not know that the god (El) or gods to whom children were sacrificed were specifically invoked with this ἐπίκλησις. At this point the chain of evidence connecting the hōlech sacrifices of the Israelites with the Phœnician cult is not complete. It is perhaps not irrelevant to observe, however, that not only does the Kronos-El of Philo of Byblos reign upon earth in a way that no other god in his pantheon does (frag. 226; cp 2428 etc.), but that in Greek authors also the epithet βασιλεύς is applied to Kronos in a much more primitive sense than to Zeus.<sup>3</sup>

We should err widely if we imagined that these heart-rending sacrifices were introduced, like Ahaz's new altar,

in idle imitation of a foreign fashion. The spirit in which they were offered is expressed in the words which the author of Mic. 67 puts into the mouth of the people: 'Will YahwP accept thousands of rams, myriad streams of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?' The sacrifice of the firstborn, the dearest thing on earth, is the most costly and therefore the most efficacious piaculum by which the wrath of God can be averted. It is not strange, therefore, that these sacrifices should have been multiplied in the last age of Judah, when disaster after disaster proved how heavily the anger of Yahwè rested upon the nation.<sup>4</sup> If their neighbours, at such a time, offered to their gods this uttermost atonement, would Yahwe expect less of his people? Nay, did not he demand as much? We have learned from Jeremiah and Ezekiel (above, § 5) that their contemporaries alleged a law in which Yahwè claimed these sacrifices, and Ezekiel quotes the law: 'Thou shalt offer every firstborn to Yahwè' (Ex. 1312).<sup>5</sup> In the law books as we have them, this and the parallel laws are protected by clauses prescribing the redemption of firstborn children (see, however, Ex. 2229[28]). If these provisions attached to the laws from the beginning,<sup>6</sup> the worshippers may have treated them as permissive, and thought that a more unreserved devotion would not avail itself of the privilege of substitution. More probably the safeguarding clauses were added to exclude the interpretation of the law—not contemplated by its framers—which became current in the seventh century, according to which it demanded the actual sacrificing of the firstborn of men as well as of beasts.

A story repeated by Dionysius of Halicarnassus presents a

<sup>1</sup> Plin. *NH* 86 39; cp Quint. Curt. 4 5.

<sup>2</sup> See Baethg. *Beitr.* 37 ff.; E. Meyer in Roscher, *Lex.* 23106 f.

<sup>3</sup> On the latter point see Max. Mayer, in Roscher, *Lex.* 21457 ff.

<sup>4</sup> The same causes led to the foreign cults and strange mysteries described in Ezek. 8.

<sup>5</sup> See FIRSTBORN.

<sup>6</sup> On this question see Kue. *Th. T.* 1 53-72 (1867); Tiele, *Ver-gelijkende Geschiednis*, 695 n.; against Dozy, *Israëlieten te Mekka*, 10 f. etc.

## MOLI

striking analogy<sup>1</sup> the Tyrrhenians [Dionys. 'Pelasgians'] in a time of scarcity vowed to Zeus, Apollo, and the Kabiri to sacrifice tithes of all their increase. Their prayer having been heard, they offered tithes of their cattle and the fruits of the soil. A dire famine, with many other signs of the wrath of the gods, came upon them, and when they consulted the oracle they received this response: It was because, when they got what they desired, they did not pay what they had promised, but were still owing the most valuable part of all. They did not understand the response, but one of the older men interpreted it: The gods were just; they had indeed paid the first-fruits of their property honestly, but they still owed the tithe of human kind, which the gods prized above all.<sup>2</sup> There was a division of opinion about this interpretation, some rejecting it as given with evil intent; but a second appeal to the oracle confirmed it.<sup>3</sup>

If our hypothesis is correct, the religious motive of the child sacrifices in Judah came from within; the form of the piacula was foreign, probably Phoenician.

Jn. Selden, *De dis Syris*, 1617; in later edd. with additamenta by Andr. Beyer; Jn. Spencer, *De legibus ritualibus* (1685), lib. 3, ch. 13; Jn. Braun, *Selecta sacra* ch. 8;

**8. Literature.** Herm. Witsius, *Miscellanea sacra* lib. 2, diss. 5; Goodwin, *Moses et Aaron*, lib. 4, ch. 2; dissertations by Dietzsch and Ziegler in Ugolini, *Thesaurus*, 23861 ff. 887 ff.; Miinter, *Religion der Karthager* (1821); Movers, *Phönizier*, 1322-498 (1847); Dauner, *Feuer- und Molochdienst der alten Hebräer* (1842); Ghillany, *Die Menschenopfer der alten Hebräer* (1842); E. Meier, *Th. St. u. Kr.*, 1843, pp. 1007-1053; Geiger, *Urschrift*, 299 ff.; Oort, *Het Menschenopfer in Israël* (1865); Kuen, 'Jahveh en Molech,' *Th. T.* 2, 559-598 (1868), pp. 153 ff. 691 ff. (1867); *Godsdienst van Israël*, 1259 ff. (1869) = *Religion of Israel*, 1249 ff.; Tiele, *Vergelijkende Geschiedenis*, pp. 457 ff. 508 ff. 692 ff. (1872); cp *Gesch. van den Godsdienst in de Oudeheid*, 1, 228 f. 327 ff. (1893); Baudissin, *Jahve et Moloch* (1874); art. 'Moloch' *PRE*, 10, 168 ff. (1882); Scholz, *Götzendienst u. Zauberwesen*, 182 ff. (1877); Eerdmans, *Melochdienst en Vereering van Hemellichamen in Israël's Assyrische Periode* (1891); V. Hoonacker, *Le vœu de Jephthé* (1893); Kamphausen, *Das Verhältnis des Menschenopfers zur Israelitischen Religion* (1896). G. F. M.

**MOLI**, AV, 1 Esd. 847 = Ezra 818, MAHLI.

**MOLID** (מֹלִיד), a name in the genealogy of Jerahmeel; 1 Ch. 229† (מֹוּחַל [B], מֹוּלַדַּל [A], מֹוּוּלִי [L]).<sup>4</sup> The name of his brother is Ahbar (so read, with **BL**), Ahbar and Molid are, with the help of transposition, carved out of Jerahme'el, like Jerah and Almodad (probably) in Gen. 1026. This does not exclude the possibility that Molid, or perhaps hfolad (cp A), may have been regarded as the 'father' of MOLADAH [q. v.], which is indeed probably another record of Jerahmeel. Cp JERAHMEEL, § 2 a. T. K. C.

**MOLOCH** (Am. 526 AV and RV<sup>mg.</sup>, Acts 743†). See MOLECH and CHIUN AND SICCUTH.

**MOLTEN IMAGE** (מִסְפָּה), Dt. 912. See IDOL, § 1, e.

**MOMDIS**, 1 Esd. 934 = Ezra 1034, MAADAL.

**MONEY.** As in the case of metals, it has been judged best not to give a long comprehensive article, but to treat the subject in a series of special articles (see especially MANEH, PENNY, SHEKEL, STATER; WEIGHTS AND MEASURES).

The Hebrew narrators (J, E, P) who recast the Hebrew legends relating to primitive times had not forgotten the advanced civilisation prevalent in Canaan when their forefathers entered it; they presuppose the existence of a metallic currency, in harmony with the ancient Egyptian tribute lists and the Tell el-Amarna letters.

A favourite opinion connected with the patriarchal story must, however, be abandoned. The notion that the *kesitah* of Gen. 3319 and two other passages was a piece of precious metal, with the stamp of a lamb, indicative of its value, is based on the fact that **BL**, Vg., and Onk. render 'lamb' or 'sheep'—a very insufficient ground (Che.; for a better explanation, see KESITAH).

There is no passage in the OT suggestive of anything like the Assyrian ingots stamped with 'the head of Ištar of Nineveh,' to which Babelon (58, quoted by Kennedy) refers. At the same time, there can be no doubt that in-

<sup>1</sup> *Antiqq. Rom.* 123 f., from Myrsilos of Lesbos; see FNG 4, 445 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cp Varro's explanation of child sacrifice cited in Aug., *Civ. Dei*, 719: quod omnium seminum optimum est genus humanum.

<sup>3</sup> See also what follows in Dionysius.

<sup>4</sup> **BL** suggests (but cp Ki. in *SBOT*) that the ך is intrusive.

## MONTH

got of fixed weight were in use among the early Israelites (see, e.g., 1 S. 98), and in those transactions in which the strictest accuracy was required, the money was specially weighed. Hence לָקַח (šāḥal), properly 'to weigh,' often means 'to pay'—e.g., Gen. 2316 Ex. 2216 1 K. 2039 Is. 552 Ezra 825. Gen. 2316 is especially interesting, from the vividness of the description of a business transaction in the course of which it occurs. The meaning, however, is hardly given correctly by the commentators whom Kennedy (Hastings, *DB* 3420 a) follows. Methodical emendation of the text brings out a meaning which is far more satisfactory and suggestive (see KESITAH).

The clue to the problem of the *kesitah* has been given by a misreading of **BL** in Chronicles, and in solving this problem light has been thrown on another passage (Gen. 2316), where the phraseology had not been questioned. It was for four Carchemish-minæ of gold that Abraham, according to P, purchased Machpelah (Gen. 2316), and for one mina of Carchemish that Jacob, according to E, bought a piece of land at 'the city of Shechem' (Gen. 3319, cp Josh. 2432; but see SHECHEM). How important the Carchemish mina was, is seen by the fact that it was carried by Phœnician traders to Greece. The description of the purchase in Gen. 23 reminds us of many Assyrian documents in which the mina of Carchemish is expressly mentioned as the standard of money payments (*KB*, vol. iv.).

**Literature.**—To ascertain the value of the coins in use among the Jews in the post-exilic age, we must have recourse to metrology. Works relating to this subject are therefore to be included here. See especially J. Brandis, *Das Münz-, Maas- u. Gewichtswesen in Vorderasien* (1866), and 'Literature' under WEIGHTS AND MEASURES.

On the Egyptian and Babylonian use of the precious metals for the purposes of exchange, cp Maspero, *Dawn of Civilization*, 324 ff. 749 ff.; and on the question, 'Did the Assyrians coin money?' see the essay by C. H. W. Johns, *Expos.*, Nov. 1899. On Jewish coins, see Madden, *Coins of the Jews* (1881); Lévy, *Gesch. der jüd. Münzen* (1862); de Saulcy, *Recherches sur la numismatique judaïque* (1854), and *Numismatique de la Terre Sainte* (1874); and Th. Reinach, *Les monnaies juives* (1887). See also A. R. S. Kennedy's excellent monograph 'Money' in Hastings, *DB* 3417-432. On the statement of Herodotus (194) that the Lydians first coined money see LYDIA, § 1.

**MONEY CHANGERS.** See TRADE.

**MONSTER** (מִוְנֵי), Lam. 43 AV, etc. See JACKAL, LILITH, WHALE.

**MONTE**, the period from the first appearance of one new moon to that of the next—in other words, the period of a lunar revolution. Naturally, therefore, when months are spoken of, only

### 1. Meaning

**o. terms.** lunar months can be meant; of any such artificial product as the so-called 'solar' month the ancient Israelites took no more account than do the modern Jews in arranging their calendar. Both the OT words for month—*hōdeš* (חֹדֶשׁ) and *yerah* (יָרַח)—correspond to the natural definition given above. *Hōdeš*, the commoner and specifically Hebrew name, denotes originally the new moon (the 'new' light), a meaning which the word retained throughout in Phœnician (cp the n. pr. חֹרֶשׁ = *Νουσημῖος*, of the inscr.); *yerah*, the word for month common to all the Semitic languages (cp Phœn. ירה, Aram. ירח, Assy. arḥu, etc.), though comparatively rarely employed in the OT (Ex. 22 Dt. 2113 3314 1 K. 637 38 82 2 K. 1513 Job 36 7 3 29 2 39 2 Zech. 118 Ezra 615 and Dan. 426 [29]), tells the same story plainly enough by its close relationship to *yārāh* (יָרַח), the word for moon. The appearance of the new moon (חֹדֶשׁ) inaugurated a new period, a new month, and was festally observed by the Israelites from ancient times (cp, e.g., Am. 85 Hos. 211 [13] Is. 113 f.). See NEW MOON.

The mean length of such a month is 29 d. 12 h. 44 m. 2.82 sec., and accordingly it was impossible that the determination of the month, as long as it rested on direct observation only, could arrive at any absolutely uniform result; the observed months inevitably varied in length between twenty-nine and thirty days, and the order in which the months of twenty-nine days (חֹדֶשׁ קָטָן) alternated with those of thirty days (חֹדֶשׁ מָלֵךְ) had not yet been fixed even at the time when the Mishna

MONTH

was composed; even at that late date, in the second century A.D., the point was decided by the first visibility of the new moon (cp also Jer. 31 6). It was only with the introduction of a fixed calendar in the fourth century, that a regular order was determined in this matter also (see YEAR).

The oldest names of months of the year preserved in the OT are the following four :—(1) Ahih (הַאֲחִיב, always

with הָרֵשׁ preceding), Ex. 13 4 23 15 34 18 (Canaanite) Dt. 16 1, i.e., the month of the ripening ears of corn, ear month; (2) Ziw (זִיב, זִיב, I K. 6 37, and זִיב, I K. 6 1 [where also,

however, זִיב ought probably to be read]), the month of splendour, flower month; (3) Ēthānīm (יָרֵחַ הָאֲתָנִים), I K. 8 2), perhaps meaning the month of perennial streams, the month, that is, in which only such streams contained any water; and (4) Būl (בּוּל, I K. 6 38), probably meaning rain month, but according to others, with less likelihood, the month of growing crops. Plainly these four names were originally Canaanite, and were taken over by the Israelites when they settled in that country; Ēthānīm and Būl are met with on still extant

MONTH

Phœnician-Cyprian inscriptions (יָרֵחַ בּוּל, e.g., at the beginning of the inscription of Eshmunazar; יָרֵחַ אֲתָנִים, CIS 1, no. 86 a), and the meaning of all four, so far as can be seen, has reference to the regular rotation of the seasons of the year as experienced in Palestine.

Other Phœnician names of months are preserved on Phœnician-Cyprian inscriptions, but partly only in mutilated form (their interpretation also still remains very problematical): כַּרְפָּא (CIS 1, no. 11); בַּרְרִי (CIS 1, no. 92); מַפַּ (CIS 1, no. 4); . . . פַּעַל, perhaps = פַּעֲלֵת (ib., no. 88); and וְכַחֲשֵׁמֶשׁ (CIS 1, no. 13).

It is not probable that the Canaanites understood by *yérah* a solar month, and had thus accepted the Egyptian year. In any case the old names Ābib, Ziw, etc., do not point to an Egyptian vague year, the employment of which would have involved such a displacement that at the end of every 120 years the names of the months would have been a whole month too early. A further evidence that the Canaanite months were originally lunar is undoubtedly suggested by the fact that in Phœnician inscriptions, יָרֵחַ בּוּל, 'on the new moon of the month,' denotes the first day of the month in question (cp CIS 1, p. 92 ff.; the monument is referred to the first half of the 4th cent. B.C.).<sup>2</sup> Further, that the

NAMES OF MONTHS

CAANAANITE.	NO.	BAB.-ASS.	HEBREW.	LXX, ETC.	MACEDONIAN.	SOLAR.
אֲחִיב	1	Ni-sa-an-nu	נִסְיָן, <i>nisin</i> (Neh. 2 1)	N(ε)ισάν (in Esth.)	Ξανθικός	April
זִיב	2	Ai-ru	אֵר, <i>iyār</i> (Targ. 2 Ch. 30 2)	Ἰάρ (Jos. Ant. viii. 3 1)	Ἀρτεμίσιος	May
	3	Si-va-nu. or Si-man-nu	סִינָן, <i>sīwān</i> (Esth. 8 9)	Σ(ε)μουάν (Bar. 1 8 and Esth. 8 9 [א <sup>c.a</sup> mg.])	Δαίσιος	June
	4	Du-u-zu	תַּמּוּז, <i>tammūz</i>		Πάνεμος	July
	5	A-bu	אָב, <i>āb</i>		Λῶσος	August
	6	U-lu-lu	אֱלוּל, <i>ēlūl</i> (Neh. 6 15)	Ἐλούλ (1 Macc. 14 27, not K)	Γορπιαίος	September
אֲתָנִים	7	Taš(tiš)-ri-tum	תִּשְׂרִי, <i>tīšrī</i>		Ἰπερβερεταίος	October
בּוּל	8	A-ra-aḥ sam-na	מַרְחֶשְׁוָן, <i>marḥešwān</i> <sup>3</sup>	Μαρσουάνης (Jos. Ant. i. 33)	Δίος	November
	9	Ki-[i]s[i]-li-mu	כִּסְלֵו, <i>kislew</i> (Zech. 7 1 Neh. 1 1)	Χασελεύ or -αλ. (1 Macc. 15 4)	Ἀπελλαίος	December
	10	Tē-bi-[e]-tu[m]	טֵבֵת, <i>tēbēt</i> (Esth. 2 16)	Τεβέθος (Jos. Ant. xi. 64).	Ἀδωναίος	January
	11	Ša-ba-ṭu	שֵׁבַט, <i>šēbāt</i> (Zech. 17)	Σαβάρ (1 Macc. 16 14)	Περίτιος	February
	12	Ad-da-ru	אֲדָר, <i>ādār</i> (Esth. 3 7)	Ἀδάρ (1 Macc. 7 43)	Δύστρος	March
Inter-calary.		Ar-ḥu ma-aḥ-ru ša Addaru	אֲדָר בְּתֵרָא, after-Adar, or שְׁנֵי אֲדָר, second Adar.			

<sup>1</sup> To these add (Lidzbarski, *Nordsem. Epig.* 412) חִיר, כִּפְע, כִּרְוּח, חִיר.  
<sup>2</sup> Even though Di. doubts this translation and maintains that the expression means simply 'on the new moon that happens in the month in question,' the words cannot be employed as an argument for the solar month theory. The expression could be used only as long as one new moon alone in a month was possible, or 'new moon' must have lost its original meaning, and in that case must be interpreted as meaning simply the first day of the month, just as the Gk. *νοσημία* does in later usage. But even this later usage also shows that originally the new moon

marked the beginning of the month and that the months were lunar. Moritz Schmidt's not quite certain restoration of the Cyprian-Greek text in the inscription known as *Jadaliensis I.* (CIS 1, p. 104 ff.), a bilingual in Phœnician and Cyprian Greek dating from the fourth century B.C., according to which the inscription would contain reference to five supplementary days, could not in any case be accepted as convincing evidence regarding Canaanite usage.  
<sup>3</sup> כִּרְחֶשְׁוָן according to Dalman.



## MONTH

mourning period of thirty days, spoken of in Dt. 21 13 (cp Nu. 20 29 Dt. 34 8), should be called 'a month of days' (יָמֵי חֹדֶשׁ) is not impossible where reckoning is made by lunar months, and does not necessarily imply acquaintance with the solar month of the Egyptians.

With the exile, and the shifting of the beginning of the year (borrowed from the Babylonians) to the spring season, the old names of the months began to be abandoned and their place was taken by the ordinal numerals. Abib now became the *first* month (cp Ex. 13 4 with 12 2), Ziw the *second* (1 K. 6 1), Êthānīm the *seventh* (1 K. 8 2), and Būl the *eighth* (1 K. 6 38); the numeration started from the new beginning of the year—viz., spring. In course of time the Assyrian-Babylonian names for the months began to gain currency; but without addition of their numbers they are met with only in Ezra 6 15 (Aramaic) and in Nehemiah (1 21 6 15).<sup>1</sup> The latest date at which they can have first come into use among the Jews could be fixed with certainty if in Zech. 1 7 and 7 1 the names really dated from the time of the prophet Zechariah. That, however, is not probable; we must, therefore, content ourselves with the general statement that they can hardly have come into use with the Jews before the fifth century and even then were far from being exclusively employed. They are not all of them met with in the OT; but their Hebrew form can be recovered from post-biblical literature, for example, from the *Roll of Fasts*, an Aramaic document dating from 66-70 A.D.<sup>2</sup> The name of the eighth month (see the table given above) shows very clearly on the one hand that these names are not of Persian but of Babylonian-Assyrian origin, and on the other that they assume the year to begin in spring; for A-ra-aḥ-sam-na means the eighth month (*arāḥ*=חַר and *samna*=שְׁמוֹנָה). Moreover the name of the intercalary month betrays its character by its dependence on the name of the preceding (twelfth) month; it is no more than a second closing month that is occasionally tagged on.

These Babylonian-Assyrian names have held their own in the Jewish calendar down to the present day.

**4. Macedonian names.** It was only for a short time that they found rivals in the Macedonian names. One certain trace of this use of the Macedonian calendar we have in 2 Macc. 11 30 where the month corresponding to Nisan is called *Ξανθικός*. It is not quite certain whether in 2 Macc. 11 21 the name of the month *Διοσκορίνθιος*, as it is now read, is merely a corruption of text for *Δύστροπος* (a name which occurs in Tob. 2 12 [N]), or whether it is due to an oversight of the author, or whether it is the name, otherwise unknown, of an intercalary month to be inserted between Dystrus and Xanthicus. Josephus still employs at pleasure the Macedonian names for the Hebrew. Finally, in 3 Macc. (638) we meet with two Egyptian months: Pachon (Παχών; not in V), the ninth Egyptian solar month (of thirty days), and Epiphi (Ἐπιφίλη), the eleventh.

In the foregoing table the post-exilic usage is followed and the year reckoned as beginning in spring.

**5. Comparative calendar.** According to the autumn reckoning which was afterwards returned to and still rules in the Jewish calendar, the seventh month was the first in the year and the insertion of the intercalary month was made accordingly in the middle of the year. For the mode of insertion see YEAR. It will of course be understood that the months named in the last column, being solar months, correspond only roughly and in a general way to those in the preceding columns, which are lunar.

The month was divided into decades ('*āsūr*, אֲשֻׁר) or into weeks (*šābūʿ*, שָׁבֻעַ). It would be too bold an under-

<sup>1</sup> In Esth. 9 15 17 19 21 the number is not given with the name, because in 9 1 it is given, once for all, for Adār.  
<sup>2</sup> See Dalman, *Dialektproben* (1896), pp. 1-3, 32.

## MOON

taking to seek to prove from the division into decades that the Israelites were acquainted also

**6. Divisions of month.** with the Egyptian month of thirty days, and thus had at one time even reckoned by solar months. The division of the month into three thirds of ten days each could have commended itself to the Israelites just as easily as one into four fourths of seven days each, inasmuch as they too had months of 30 days as well as months of 29 days. It is only in one passage (Gen. 24 55), however, that '*āsūr* means a space of ten days; everywhere else, where the word is applied in relation to time, it means 'the tenth day' (Ex. 12 3 Lev. 16 29 Josh. 4 19 2 K. 25 1 Ezek. 20 1 24 1 40 1). On the division of the month into weeks, see WEEK. These divisions were never made use of for dating the day of the month: thus it never was said 'on such and such a day of such and such a decade' or 'on such and such a day of such and such a week.' Dates were given simply by the number of the day of the month.

See especially Di., 'Ueber das Kalenderwesen vor dem Babylonischen Exil' in *MBBA*, 1882, pp. 914-939; Schiirer, *GV* 1 (2) 623 f.; cp also We. *Heid.* 89 ff.; Schr.

**7. Literature.** *KAT* (2), 379 f., and W. Muss-Arnolt, 'The Names of the Assyro-Babylonian Months and their Regents,' *JBL* 11 [1892], pp. 72-94 and 160-176. K. M.

**MONUMENT.** On 2 K. 23 17 RV (יָצִי) and Is. 65 4 AV (יָצִי) see TOMB; on 1 S. 15 12 RV (רָ) see SAUL.

**MOOLI** (μοολεῖ [BA]), 1 Esd. 8 47 KV. See MAHLI.

**MOON.** The words are: (1) *yārēʿāh*, from a root *רָחַח* (see BDB), probably connected with *אָרַח*, to travel, wander (so MV, Buhl, *Lag. BN* 46, and cp the Eg. name for the moon Hunsu, 'the wanderer').

2. *lḇānāh* (√ 'to be white' or 'pale') occurs three times, Cant. 6 10 Is. 24 23 30 26. New moon is *šārēʿ*, *šādeš*, from the root *שָׁרַע*, to be new, whilst full moon is *kēseʿ*, *késeʿ*; cp *Ass. kusēʿu* (= *agū*), a cap or tiara, the god at full moon being supposed to have his tiara on.

In Gen. 1 4 f., where the story is told of the creation of sun and moon and stars, the moon is not mentioned

by name; she is the lesser of the two great lights set in the firmament to give light upon the earth (*v. 16 f.*), and rules the night (cp Ps. 136 9 Jer. 31 35), apparently in independence of her fellow. According to the priestly writer the oldest Hebrew month and year were lunar (see MONTH, YEAR), so that the words of *v. 14* (cp Ps. 104 19), 'Let them be for signs and for seasons, for days and years,' would have a special force when applied to the moon. How far the Hebrews attributed to her a permanent influence on things terrestrial—that is to say, whether they planted and sowed, reaped and felled and sheared, according as she waxed or waned—we do not know; in one passage only (Dt. 33 14) is the growth of vegetation apparently ascribed to her influence;<sup>1</sup> but the correctness of the text is very doubtful. It is certain, however, that the day of new moon (*שָׁרְעָה*), and in a lesser degree that of full moon (*כֶּסֶף*, cp Ps. 81 4 [3], if the usual reading and interpretation are correct) were marked with red in the Hebrew calendar. (For *שָׁרְעָה* as a religious festival cp 1 S. 20 5, and || *שָׁרְעָה*, 2 K. 4 23 Am. 8 5; || *כֶּסֶף*, Is. 1 14; || *כֶּסֶף*, Ps. 81 4 [3]: see NEW MOON.) In Ps. 121 6 (we can hardly quote Hos. 5 7, a very doubtful passage) we find a malignant influence attributed to her; the reference may be to the blindness that results from

<sup>1</sup> AV has 'for the precious things put forth by the moon'; RV, '... of the growth of the moons.' AV therefore covers over the difference between the singular *שָׁרְעָה* in *a*, and the plural *שָׁרְעָה* in 6. In the || passage Gen. 49, 25 *a* and 6 together are represented by 'blessings of the breasts and of the womb' (*שָׁרְעָה*), again an inconsistency of number, but one that is of no exegetical significance. *שָׁרְעָה*, *gréēš*, rendered in RV 'growth,' is a *ἀπ. λεγ.*, and is suspicious.

sleeping in the moonlight with uncovered face (so Carne, *Letters from the East*, 77; but see Macrobius, *Saturn.* 7 1626). The word *σεληνιαζόμενος* in Mt. 424 and *σεληνιαζέται* in 17 15 testify to the prevalence of the belief that the moon caused epilepsy.

References to the moon are frequent in Hebrew poetry. She is the emblem of beauty (Cant. 6 10), and of the order that does not change (Ps. 72 57 89 37). That she should stay her course (Josh. 10 12 f. Hab. 8 11) is a crowning evidence of God's might; that she should suffer eclipse (Is. 13 10 24 23 Joel 2 10 Mt. 24 29, etc.) or turn to blood (Joel 2 31 quoted Acts 2 20 Rev. 6 12) betokens that the day of God's wrath is at hand. The moon shall not 'withdraw herself' (Is. 60 20), but 'her light shall be as the light of the sun' (cp Enoch 72 37), when 'Yahweh binds up the breach of his people and heals the wound of its stroke' (Is. 40 26).

The moon's very splendour was a danger for religion (Dt. 4 19, cp Wisd. 13 2 f.). The Assyrians and Babylonians had for ages been addicted to the worship of the heavenly bodies, and such a name as BETH-SHEMESH [*q.v.*] suggests that sun-worship was practised among the Canaanites.

2. Moon-worship of the heavenly bodies, and such a name as BETH-SHEMESH [*q.v.*] suggests that sun-worship was practised among the Canaanites. possibly through early Babylonian influence; the names JERICHO and JERAHMEEL [*qq.v.*] we abstain from quoting. 'Among the Hebrews,' says Robertson Smith (*Rel. Sem.*<sup>2</sup>), 135, n. 2), 'there is little trace of [astral worship] before Assyrian influence became potent,' and he would be a bold man who would argue from the problematic astral elements in some of the OT narratives (cp Winckler, *GI2*), or from doubtful proper names like LABAN, MILCAH, SARAH, or from the real or supposed origination of the Hebrews in two famous seats of moon-worship (UR [*q.v.*] in S. Babylonia and HARAN [*q.v.*]) that moon-worship—a religion of more venerable antiquity in Babylonia than sun-worship—must have been one of the chief temptations of the primitive Hebrews. Something, at least, we do know: from the time of Ahaz onwards a syncretistic tendency, though checked for a time by Josiah, gained more and more ground in the kingdom of Judah. Striking evidence of this is given in Jer. 82 19 13, and even though 2 K. 17 16 comes from a late writer (see Kittel in *HK*), the truth of its statement cannot be doubted (Ani. 626 is not here quoted for a special reason; see PHENICIA, § 12). Certainly, moon-worship is but once explicitly mentioned in the OT; but the one proof-passage, though post-exilic, is of great importance. It is the famous passage in Job 31 26 relative to the hand-kiss to sun and moon. We must not say that the language is merely dramatic, as if the writer aimed dispassionately at reproducing primitive times with strict accuracy. In this section of Job, especially, the poet is thinking of his own time; his heart throbs as he writes. We may add that the imported cultus of Tammuz, which is attested by Ezek. 8 14, almost certainly presupposes moon-worship, Tammuz and the moon, as Winckler has pointed out, being closely related. Nor is it unfair to suggest that the crescents worn by the women of Jerusalem in later times (Is. 318, part of an inserted passage) had a heathenish connection.

The QUEEN OF HEAVEN mentioned in the Book of Jeremiah (7 18 44 17) forms the subject of a special article. On the name Sinai, see SINAI.

See Jensen, *Kosmologie der Babylonier*, 101-108; ZA, 1896, pp. 298-301; Winckler, *GI2* (e.g., 23 ff. 57 ff.); Hommel, *AHT*, and *Aufsätze*, bk. ii. (1900), also *Der Gestirnsdienst der alten Araber* (a lecture, 1900); G. Margoliouth, 'The earliest religion of the ancient Hebrews,' *Contemp. Rev.*, Oct. 1898; Goldziher, *Hebrew Mythology*, 71-76, 204-6, 351 f. The mention of these books by no means implies acceptance of the theories, sometimes not very strictly critical, expressed in them.

A. C. P.

MOOSIAS. RV *Moosias* (ΜΟΟΣΣ[Ε]ΙΑΣ [BA]), 1 Esd. 9 31 = Ezra 10 30 MAASEIAH, 13.

MORASTHITE, THE (מֹרַשְׁתִּי); ΤΟΝ ΤΟΥ ΜΩΡΑΣΘΕΙ [B], ΜΩΡΑΣΘ[Ε]Ι [AQ\*], ΜΩΡΑΣΘΙΝ [Q<sup>mg</sup>], in Jer. 26 18 ΜΩΡΑΣΘΕΙΤΗΣ (BKAQ), a phrase used of

<sup>1</sup> See Che. *Intr.* Is. 19 f.; Marti, *Jes.* in *KHC* 44.

Micah (Mic. 1 1 AV, RV *Morashtite*), and supposed to mean a native of a place called Moresheth, a dependency of Gath, in the maritime plain (so Driver, *Intrud.*<sup>1</sup>, 326; cp MORESHETH-GATH). This, however, is not very plausible; it would seem that 'Gath' (גַּת) in Mic. 1 14 must necessarily be corrupt. In Mic. 1 13 Lachish is called the prime occasion of sin to the people of Zion (בֵּית צִיּוֹן). Then Micah continues, 'Therefore (*i.e.*, because of the sin which spread from Lachish) thou wilt have to bid farewell (lit. to send a parting present, as to a bride) to Moresheth, O people of Zion' (גַּת was corrupted into גַּת, and צִיּוֹן fell out of the text). Moresheth, or rather Morashah, appears to be another form of Mareshah, adopted to suggest the meaning 'betrothed' (מְאָרְשָׁה). It corresponds to *mē'arēis* (מְאָרְשִׁים) in 2. 15, which should most probably run thus:—

עֲרִימָרְשׁ אֲכִילָה יִשְׁכַּבְתָּ מְאָרְשָׁה  
עֲרִימָרְשָׁה יָבֹא כְּבוֹד יִשְׂרָאֵל

'Unto a (new) betrother will I conduct thee, O community of

Mareshah;

To Jerahmeel shall the glory of Israel come.'<sup>2</sup>

That in much later times a place with a name like Morasthi (?), distinct from Mareshah, was pointed out to Jerome, does not prove that this is the place intended in Mic. 1 14, or the place of which Micah was a native.

Robinson's reasons (*BR* 2423) for distinguishing Moresheth from Mareshah are, (1) the difference of the names, which come from different roots (but this is surely a mistake; Mareshah is properly מְאָרְשָׁה, Josh. 15 44), and (2) that they are both given in the same context (but the writer had an interest in pronouncing the name the second time Mareshah—*viz.*, to produce a fresh paronomasia). Robinson, however, may be right in thinking that the church which, according to Jerome, covered the site of the supposed sepulchre of Micah, was the church 20 minutes SSE. of Bēt Jibrin, the ruins of which are now called Sanda Hanna or St. Anne (see ELEUTHEROPOLIS). 'Close by,' he says, 'are the ruined foundations of a village, which may or may not be ancient.' This village may in truth have been early Christian, and have been called Morasthi to please pilgrims. Cp Che. *JQR* 10 576-580 (1898). T. K. C.

MORDECAI (מֹרְדֵכַי) [Baer, Ginsb.], §§ 43, 83, ΜΑΡΔΟΧΑΙΟΣ ὁ ἑραεὺς [BNAAL].

1. The cousin and foster-father of Esther, and one of the chief personages in the book of Esther [*q.v.*] (Est. 2 5, etc.). He is described as Jeminite (יְמִינִי), *i.e.*, virtually a Benjamite, and as descended from Jair, Shimei, and Kish, the last two of which are well-known Benjamite family names. His name, however, if correctly transmitted, is genuine Babylonian (cp Bab. *Mardukēa*), and means 'belonging to MARDUK' (see MERODACH).<sup>3</sup> The day of 'Mardocheus' (RV 'of Mordecai'<sup>4</sup> (2 Macc. 15 36, τῆς μαρδοχαίους [A, but μαρδοχοκαίους V] ἡμέρας) is a designation of the 14th of Adar, the first and greatest of the days of Purim; see ESTHER. The fact, however, that in Esth. 2 15 (cp 9 29) Mordecai's uncle is called Abihail<sup>5</sup> (אֲבִיחַיִל), which is most probably a popular corruption of Jerahmeel (see NABAL), that Shimei is an ethnic = Shimeoni, and that Kish probably = Cushi, makes it highly probable that Esther's foster-father derived his name not from Marduk but from Jerahmeel—*i.e.*, that he belonged to a family of old Jerahmeelite extraction. His true name may be Carmeli or some one of the parallel forms.

This result compels us to give serious consideration

<sup>1</sup> The alternative is, if we keep the text, to make גַּת a vocative: 'Therefore shalt thou, O Gath, bid farewell to Moresheth' (so We., Nowack), which seems to have no propriety in this context. G. A. Smith (1896) finds no satisfactory explanation of MT.

<sup>2</sup> A captivity in N. Arabia (here called Jerahmeel) is in the mind of the writer, who is probably not Micah, but a post-exilic writer. See MICAH ii. § 4.

<sup>3</sup> Tg., perhaps avoiding reference to a heathen deity, sees in the name מֹרְדֵכַי 'pure myrrh,' a figurative description of Mordecai.

<sup>4</sup> MARDOCHEUS is the form of the name in the AV apocrypha.

<sup>5</sup> B's 'Aminadab,' if we prefer this reading to 'Abihail,' is also an ethnic name = נַדָּב, cp NADAB.