

The New BIBLE Dictionary

 *Organizing Editor*
J. D. DOUGLAS, M.A., B.D., S.T.M., Ph.D.
Formerly Librarian, Tyndale House, Cambridge

Consulting Editors

F. F. BRUCE, M.A., D.D.
*Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism
and Exegesis, University of Manchester*

R. V. G. TASKER, M.A., D.D.
*Emeritus Professor of New Testament
Exegesis, University of London*

J. I. PACKER, M.A., D.Phil.
Librarian, Latimer House, Oxford

D. J. WISEMAN, O.B.E., M.A.
Professor of Assyriology, University of London

WM. B. EERDMANS PUBLISHING CO.
GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN

First Edition May 1962

© The Inter-Varsity Fellowship, 1962

EC
440
.073

*Printed in Great Britain by
Richard Clay and Company Ltd., Bungay, Suffolk*

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

Entries are made in alphabetical order of authors' initials

- | | | | |
|-----------|---|--------|--|
| A.A.J. | A. A. Jones, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Vicar of St. Silas', Nunhead, London. | B.L.S. | B. L. Smith, B.D., Th.Schol., Lecturer Moore Theological College, Sydney. |
| A.C. | R. A. Cole, B.A., M.Th., Ph.D., Lecturer, Moore Theological College, Sydney. | B.O.B. | B. O. Banwell, B.A., Methodist Minister in Fish Hoek, Cape Town. |
| A.E.W. | A. E. Willingale, B.A., B.D., M.Th., Romford, Essex. | C.D.W. | C. de Wit, Docteur en Philologie et Histoire Orientales, Bruxelles. Attaché aux Musées Royaux d'Art et d'Histoire de Belgique; Chef de la section de l'Égypte Pharaonique à la Fondation Égyptologique Reine Elisabeth, Bruxelles. |
| A.F. | A. Flavell, B.A., Minister of Mourne Presbyterian Church, Kilkeel, Co. Down. | C.F.P. | C. F. Pfeiffer, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Associate Professor of Old Testament, Gordon Divinity School, Beverly Farms, Massachusetts. |
| A.F.W. | A. F. Walls, M.A., B.Litt., Lecturer in Theology, Fourah Bay College, The University College of Sierra Leone, Freetown. | C.H.D. | C. H. Duncan, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Registrar of the Australian College of Theology; Senior Lecturer of Ridley College, Melbourne. |
| A.G. | A. Gelston, M.A., Curate of St. Mary's Church, Chipping Norton, Oxfordshire. | C.L.F. | C. L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D., Professor of Semitics and Old Testament and Dean of Talbot Theological Seminary, Los Angeles. |
| A.K.C. | A. K. Cragg, M.A., D.Phil., Warden of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury. | D.A.H. | D. A. Hubbard, Th.M., Ph.D., Chairman, Division of Biblical Studies and Philosophy, Westmont College, Santa Barbara, California. |
| A.P.W. | A. P. Waterson, M.D., M.R.C.P., Lecturer in Pathology, University of Cambridge. | D.B.K. | D. B. Knox, B.A., B.D., M.Th., D.Phil., Principal of Moore Theological College, Sydney; Canon of St. Andrew's Cathedral, Sydney. |
| A.R. | A. Ross, M.A., B.D., D.D., formerly Professor of New Testament, Free Church College, Edinburgh. | D.C. | D. Calcott, B.Sc., N.D.A., Tutor in charge of Commonwealth Bursars Course, University of Reading, Institute of Education. |
| A.R.M. | A. R. Millard, B.A., Temporary Assistant Keeper, Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities, The British Museum. | D.F. | D. Freeman, Ph.D., Orthodox Presbyterian Minister in Philadelphia. |
| A.S. | A. Saarisalo, Teol. Dr., Professor of Oriental Literature, University of Helsinki. | D.F.P. | D. F. Payne, M.A., Assistant Lecturer in Biblical History and Literature, University of Sheffield. |
| A.St. | A. Stuart, M.Sc., F.G.S., Emeritus Professor of Geology, University of Exeter. | D.G. | D. Guthrie, B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Lecturer in New Testament Language and Literature, London Bible College. |
| A.S.W. | A. S. Wood, B.A., Ph.D., F.R.Hist.S., Minister of Southlands Methodist Church, York. | D.G.S. | D. G. Stradling, M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford. |
| A. van S. | A. van Selms, D.D., Professor of Semitic Languages, University of Pretoria. | D.H.T. | D. H. Tongue, M.A., Vicar of Lockington, Somerset, and Lecturer in New Testament at Tyndale Hall, Bristol. |
| B.F.C.A. | B. F. C. Atkinson, M.A., Ph.D., formerly Under-Librarian in the University of Cambridge. | | |
| B.F.H. | B. F. Harris, M.A., B.D., Senior Lecturer in Classics, University of Auckland. | | |

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

- D.H.W. D. H. Wheaton, M.A., B.D., Tutor at Oak Hill College, London.
- D.J.V.L. D. J. V. Lane, B.D., Ll.B., Missionary with the China Inland Mission (O.M.F.) in Malaya.
- D.J.W. D. J. Wiseman, O.B.E., M.A., A.K.C., F.S.A., Professor of Assyriology, University of London.
- D.K.I. D. K. Innes, M.A., B.D., Curate of St. John's, Ealing Dean, London.
- D.O.S. D. O. Swann, B.A., B.D., Minister of Pontnewydd Congregational Church, Cwmbran, Monmouthshire.
- D.R.H. D. R. Hall, M.A., Methodist Minister in South Ferriby, Lincolnshire.
- D.W.B.R. D. W. B. Robinson, M.A., Vice-Principal of Moore Theological College, Sydney.
- D.W.G. D. W. Gooding, M.A., Ph.D., Lecturer in Classics, The Queen's University, Belfast.
- E.A.J. E. A. Judge, M.A., Senior Lecturer in History, University of Sydney.
- E.E.E. E. E. Ellis, Ph.D., Visiting Professor of New Testament Interpretation, Bethel Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota.
- E.M.B. E. M. Blaiklock, M.A., Litt.D., Professor of Classics, University of Auckland.
- E.M.B.G. E. M. B. Green, M.A., Lecturer, The London College of Divinity, Middlesex.
- E.S.P.H. E. S. P. Heavenor, M.A., B.D., Minister of the Abbey Church, North Berwick, East Lothian.
- E.J.Y. E. J. Young, B.A., Th.M., Ph.D., Professor of Old Testament, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.
- F.C.F. F. C. Fensham, M.A., Ph.D., D.D., University of Stellenbosch, South Africa.
- F.F. F. Foulkes, M.A., B.D., M.Sc., Principal, Vining Christian Leadership Centre, Akure, Nigeria.
- F.F.B. F. F. Bruce, M.A., D.D., Rylands Professor of Biblical Criticism and Exegesis, University of Manchester.
- F.H.P. F. H. Palmer, M.A., Chaplain of Fitzwilliam House, Cambridge.
- F.N.H. F. N. Hepper, B.Sc., F.L.S., The Herbarium, Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, London.
- F.R.S. F. R. Steele, Ph.D., Home Secretary of the American Branch, North Africa Mission; formerly Associate Curator, University Museum, Philadelphia.
- F.S.F. F. S. Fitzsimmonds, B.A., B.D., M.Th., Tutor in Biblical Languages and Exegesis, Spurgeon's College, London.
- G.C. G. S. Cansdale, B.A., B.Sc., F.L.S., formerly Superintendent, Zoological Society of London.
- G.C.D.H. G. C. D. Howley, Editor of *The Witness*.
- G.E.L. G. E. Ladd, Th.B., B.D., Ph.D., Professor at Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, California.
- G.I.E. Mrs. Grace I. Emerson, M.A., Dip.Heb., Fazakerley, Liverpool.
- G.O. G. Ogg, M.A., B.Sc., D.D., D.Litt., Minister at Anstruther Easter, Fife.
- G.S.M.W. G. S. M. Walker, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Lecturer in Church History, University of Leeds.
- G.T.M. The late G. T. Manley, M.A., sometime Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.
- G.W. G. Walters, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology, Gordon Divinity School, Beverly Farms, Massachusetts.
- G.W.G. G. W. Grogan, B.D., M.Th., Lecturer, Bible Training Institute, Glasgow.
- H.A.G.B. H. A. G. Belben, M.A., B.D., Tutor at Cliff College, Calver, Derbyshire.
- H.D.McD. H. D. McDonald, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Vice-Principal of London Bible College.
- H.L.E. H. L. Ellison, B.D., B.A., Lecturer and Writer on Old Testament.
- H.M.C. H. M. Carson, B.A., B.D., Vicar of St. Paul's, Cambridge.
- H.R. H. Ridderbos, Dr. Theol., Professor of New Testament, Kampen Theological Seminary, The Netherlands.
- I.H.M. I. H. Marshall, M.A., B.D., Assistant Tutor at Didsbury College, Bristol.
- J.A.B. J. A. Balchin, M.A., B.D., Lecturer in Old Testament and Hebrew, Bible Training Institute, Glasgow.
- J.A.M. J. A. Motyer, M.A., B.D., Vice-Principal of Clifton Theological College, Bristol.
- J.A.T. J. A. Thompson, M.A., B.Ed., M.Sc., B.D., Lecturer in the Baptist Theological College of New South Wales.
- J.B.J. J. B. Job, M.A., Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

- J.B.P.** J. B. Payne, M.A., Th.D., Associate Professor of Old Testament, Wheaton College, Illinois.
- J.B.T.** J. B. Torrance, M.A., B.D., Lecturer in Divinity and Dogmatics, New College, University of Edinburgh.
- J.B.TT.** J. B. Taylor, M.A., Vicar of Henham and Elsenham, Essex.
- J.C.C.** J. C. Connell, M.A., Lecturer in Biblical Exegesis, London Bible College.
- J.C.J.W.** J. C. J. Waite, B.D., Principal, South Wales Bible College.
- J.C.W.** J. C. Whitcomb, Jr., Th.D., Professor of Old Testament, Grace Theological Seminary, Winona Lake, Indiana.
- J.D.D.** J. D. Douglas, M.A., B.D., S.T.M., British Editorial Associate, *Christianity Today*.
- J.G.G.N.** J. G. G. Norman, B.D., M.Th., Minister of George Road Baptist Church, Birmingham.
- J.G.S.S.T.** J. G. S. S. Thomson, M.A., B.D., B.A., Ph.D., Minister of St. David's, Knightswood, Glasgow.
- J.H.** J. W. L. Hoad, M.A., Methodist Chaplain to the University College of the West Indies.
- J.H.H.** J. H. Harrop, M.A., Lecturer in Classics, Fourah Bay College, The University College of Sierra Leone.
- J.H.P.** J. H. Paterson, M.A., Lecturer in Geography, University of St. Andrews.
- J.H.S.** J. H. Skilton, Th.B., A.M., Ph.D., Associate Professor of New Testament, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.
- J.H.Sr.** J. H. Stringer, M.A., B.D., Methodist Minister in Ventnor, Isle of Wight.
- J.I.P.** J. I. Packer, M.A., D.Phil., Librarian, Latimer House, Oxford.
- J.L.K.** J. L. Kelso, Th.D., Ll.D., Professor of Old Testament History and Biblical Archaeology, Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- J.M.** J. Murray, M.A., Th.M., Professor of Systematic Theology, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.
- J.M.H.** J. M. Houston, M.A., B.Sc., D.Phil., Lecturer in Geography, University of Oxford.
- J.N.B.** J. N. Birdsall, M.A., Ph.D., Lecturer in Theology, University of Birmingham.
- J.N.G.** J. N. Geldenhuys, B.A., B.D., Th.M., Manager of Publications of the Dutch Reformed Church, South Africa.
- J.P.** J. Philip, M.A., Minister of Holyrood Abbey Church, Edinburgh.
- J.P.U.L.** J. P. U. Lilley, M.A., A.C.A., Master of Magdalen College, Oxford.
- J.R.** J. Rea, Th.D., Moody Bible Institute, Chicago, Illinois.
- J.S.W.** J. S. Wright, M.A., Principal of Tyndale Hall, Bristol.
- J.T.** J. A. Thompson, B.A., Th.M., Ph.D., Professor of Old Testament Language in the Evangelical Theological Seminary, Cairo, Egypt.
- J.W.C.** J. W. Charley, M.A., Assistant Curator of All Souls', Langham Place, London.
- J.W.M.** J. W. Meiklejohn, M.A., Secretary of the Scripture Union Inter-School Fellowship in Scotland.
- K.A.K.** K. A. Kitchen, B.A., Lecturer in Egyptian and Coptic, University of Liverpool.
- K.L.McK.** K. L. McKay, M.A., Senior Lecturer in Classics, School of General Studies, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.
- L.C.A.** L. C. Allen, M.A., Tutor in Hebrew, London Bible College.
- L.M.** L. L. Morris, B.Sc., M.Th., Ph.D., Warden of Tyndale House, Cambridge.
- M.A.M.** M. A. MacLeod, M.A., Minister of Tarbert Free Church of Scotland, Argyll.
- M.G.** Miss M. Gray, B.A., B.D., Senior Lecturer in Divinity, Cheshire County Training College, Alsager.
- M.G.K.** M. G. Kline, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Old Testament, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.
- M.H.C.** M. H. Cressey, M.A., Minister of St. Columba's Presbyterian Church, Coventry, England, Coventry.
- M.J.S.R.** M. J. S. Rudwick, M.A., Ph.D., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.
- M.R.G.** M. R. Gordon, B.D., Principal of the Bible Institute of South Africa, Kimberley, South Africa.
- M.R.W.F.** M. R. W. Farrer, M.A., Tutor in Clifton Theological College, Bristol.
- M.T.F.** M. T. Fermer, B.A., B.Sc., A.R.C.S., Vicar of Tamerton Foliot, Plymouth.

LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>N.H.R. N. H. Ridderbos, D.D., Professor of Old Testament, Free University, Amsterdam.</p> <p>P.A.B. P. A. Blair, M.A., Chaplain and Assistant Master, Oundle School.</p> <p>P.E. P. Ellingworth, M.A., Tutor at École Pastorale Évangélique, Porto-Novu, Dahomey, West Africa.</p> <p>P.E.H. P. E. Hughes, M.A., B.D., D.Litt., Editor of <i>The Churchman</i>.</p> <p>P.W. P. Woolley, Th.M., Professor of Church History, Westminster Theological Seminary, Philadelphia.</p> <p>R.A.F. R. A. Finlayson, M.A., Professor of Systematic Theology, Free Church College, Edinburgh.</p> <p>R.A.H.G. R. A. H. Gunner, M.Th., B.A., Assistant Lecturer in Brooklands Technical College, Weybridge, Surrey.</p> <p>R.A.S. R. A. Stewart, M.A., B.D., M.Litt., Minister of Victoria Tollcross, Glasgow.</p> <p>R.E.N. R. E. Nixon, M.A., Tutor in Cranmer Hall, Durham.</p> <p>R.F.H. R. F. Hosking, B.A., Assistant Keeper, Department of Oriental Printed Books and Manuscripts, The British Museum.</p> <p>R.H.M. R. H. Mounce, B.A., B.D., Th.M., Ph.D., Associate Professor of Biblical Literature and Chairman of the Department of Christianity, Bethel College and Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota.</p> <p>R.J.A.S. R. J. A. Sheriffs, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., formerly Lecturer in Old Testament, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, Cape Province.</p> <p>R.J.C. R. J. Coates, M.A., formerly Warden of Latimer House, Oxford.</p> <p>R.J.McK. R. J. McKelvey, B.A., M.Th., D.Phil., Lecturer at Adams United Theological School, Modderpoort, Orange Free State.</p> <p>R.J.T. R. J. Thompson, B.A., B.D., Dr.Theol., Th.M., New Zealand Baptist Theological College, Auckland.</p> | <p>R.J.W. R. J. Way, M.A., Westminster College, Cambridge.</p> <p>R.K.H. R. K. Harrison, M.Th., Ph.D., Professor of Old Testament, Wycliffe College, University of Toronto.</p> <p>R.N.C. R. N. Caswell, M.A., Ph.D., Principal of Belfast Bible College.</p> <p>R.P.M. R. P. Martin, M.A., Lecturer in Theology, London Bible College.</p> <p>R.S.W. R. S. Wallace, M.A., B.Sc., Ph.D., Minister of Lothian Road Church, Edinburgh.</p> <p>R.T.B. R. T. Beckwith, M.A., Tutor in Tyn-dale Hall, Bristol.</p> <p>R.V.G.T. R. V. G. Tasker, M.A., D.D., Emeritus Professor of New Testament Exegesis, University of London.</p> <p>S.S.S. S. S. Smalley, M.A., B.D., Chaplain of Peterhouse, Cambridge.</p> <p>T.C.M. T. C. Mitchell, M.A., Research Assistant, Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities, The British Museum.</p> <p>T.H.J. T. H. Jones, B.A., B.D., Scripture Specialist, King Edward VII Grammar School, Coalville, Leicestershire.</p> <p>W.G. W. H. Gispén, D.Theol., Doctorandus Semitic Languages, Professor of Old Testament Exegesis, The Free University, Amsterdam.</p> <p>W.G.P. W. G. Putman, B.A., B.D., Methodist Minister in Dudley, Worcestershire.</p> <p>W.J.C. W. J. Cameron, M.A., B.D., Professor of New Testament Language, Literature and Theology, Free Church College, Edinburgh.</p> <p>W.J.M. W. J. Martin, M.A., Ph.D., Senior Rankin Lecturer in Hebrew and Ancient Semitic Languages, University of Liverpool.</p> <p>W.W.W. W. W. Wessel, Ph.D., Professor of Biblical Literature, North American Baptist Seminary, Sioux Falls, South Dakota.</p> |
|--|---|

COUNSELLOR

objection that Paul would not have agreed to communicate these conditions to his Gentile converts (as he is said to have done in Acts xvii. 4). Where basic principles were not compromised, Paul was the most conciliatory of men, and he repeatedly urges on his converts this very duty of respecting the scruples of others in such matters (cf. Rom. xiv. 1 ff.; 1 Cor. viii. 1 ff.).

After a generation or two, the situation which called forth the Jerusalem Council and the apostolic letter of Acts xv. 23–29 disappeared, and the Western Text of Acts adapts the letter to a new situation by altering its requirements in a more purely ethical direction—requiring abstinence from idolatry, bloodshed, and fornication. But the requirements in their original form were observed by Christians in Gaul and North Africa late in the 2nd century, and were incorporated by Alfred the Great in his English law-code towards the end of the 9th century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. W. L. Knox, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1948, pp. 40 ff.; C. S. C. Williams, *The Acts of the Apostles*, 1957, pp. 177 ff. F.F.B.

COUNSELLOR (Heb. *yô'ēš*, 'one who gives advice or counsel'). The basic idea appears in Pr. xxiv. 6b. The word is used as a designation of the Messiah in Is. ix. 6, where in respect to the giving of counsel He is said to be a wonder (*pele*). This attribute is applied to Him in order to emphasize His ability wisely to administer the government which is placed upon His shoulders so as by means of justice and righteousness to achieve and to maintain everlasting peace.

E.J.Y.

COURAGE. The Heb. word *hāzaq* means literally 'to show oneself strong'. Other words, e.g. *ruāḥ*, 'spirit' (Jos. ii. 11), *lēbāb*, 'the heart' (Dn. xi. 25), and *āmaš*, 'to be quick' or 'alert', exhibit the basic attitude from which courage flows. Courage is, therefore, a quality of the mind, and, as such, finds a place among the cardinal virtues (Wisdom viii. 7). Its opposite, cowardice, is found among the mortal sins (Ecclus. ii. 12, 13). The quality can be seen only in its manifestations and especially, in the Old Testament, on the battlefield (Judges, Samuel, Chronicles). The moral idea is not entirely absent. Those who are objects of God's special care are 'fear not' (Is. xli. 13, 14; Je. i. 8; Ezk. ii. 6).

The absence of the word from the New Testament is striking. The noun *tharsos* occurs only once (Acts xxviii. 15). The ideal for the Christian is not the Stoic *aretē* (virtue), but a quality of life based on faith in the present Christ. Here is no 'grin and bear it' attitude, but a more than natural one which sees an occasion for victory in every opposition (cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 9).

H.D.McD.

COURT. A word used in the AV to translate five different words. 1. *hāšēr* (*hāšir*, Is. xxxiv. 13), 'an enclosure or court', as found in a private house

(2 Sa. xvii. 18) or a palace (1 Ki. vii. 8), or in a garden (Est. i. 5). It is very commonly used of the court of the tabernacle (*q.v.*; e.g. Ex. xxvii, xxxv, xxxviii); of the main courts, the Inner (*hehāšēr happⁿnimit*, e.g. 1 Ki. vi. 36) and the Outer (*hehāšēr haḥšōnā*, e.g. Ezk. x. 5) of the Temple of Solomon; and the courts of the Temple in the vision of Ezekiel (Ezk. xl–xlv). See 4 below, and TEMPLE.

2. **zārā*, a word of rare occurrence, and therefore uncertain meaning, but evidently used in the sense of 'court' and so translated in 2 Ch. iv. 9, vi. 13. 3. *bayit*, 'house', rendered '(king's) court' in AV of Am. vii. 13 (*bēt mamlākā*), but RV and RSV give variant translations. 4. *ir*, 'city' in 2 Ki. xx. 4, and so translated in RV, but AV and RSV follow some MSS, the *Q^{erē}*, and the Ancient Versions in reading (*ha*)*šer*, 'court' (see (1) above). 5. *aulē*, an open enclosure, once (Rev. xi. 2) translated 'court' (see PALACE).

In Herod's Temple, which is not systematically described in the Bible, there were four courts, those of the Gentiles, the Women, the Men (Israel), and the Priests, in ascending order of exclusiveness (see TEMPLE and fig. 15). See also ARCHITECTURE. T.C.M.

COUSIN. The AV rendering in Lk. i. 36 and i. 58 (plural) of Gk. *syngenēs*, 'one of the same race'. Because of the modern restricted use of the Eng. word 'cousin', a more accurate translation would be 'kinswoman' (so RV, RSV). See KIN. In Col. iv. 10 *anepsios* ('sister's son' in AV) means 'cousin' (so RV, RSV).

COVENANT. In Heb. 'covenant' is designated by the term *b'rit* and the making of a covenant by *kāraṭ b'rit*. In Gk. the term is *diathēkē* and the corresponding verb is *diatithēmi* (cf. Acts iii. 25; Heb. viii. 10, ix. 16, x. 16).

I. THE PRE-DILUVIAN NOAHIC COVENANT

The first occurrence of the term in Scripture is Gn. vi. 18, where the reference is to the pre-diluvian Noahic covenant. In this brief reference we have already an intimation of what a covenant is. The thought is as far removed as can be from that of compact, contract, or agreement between God and Noah. God announces to Noah that He will establish His covenant with him. It is a sovereign dispensing of grace on God's part, and the security arises from the action of God. It is God's covenant, and He establishes it. Flowing from this dispensation to Noah there are corresponding obligations. Noah and his family were to come into the ark and he was to bring with him the specified number of animals and birds and creeping things (Gn. vi. 18b–21). Thus there is no conflict between sovereign administration of grace and ensuing obligation.

II. THE POST-DILUVIAN NOAHIC COVENANT

This is recorded in Gn. ix. 9–17, and shows us more clearly than any other instance what the essential nature of a covenant is, and it advises us

again how alien to the covenant-concept is any notion of compact or contract between two parties. The thought of bilateral agreement is wholly excluded. The keynote here is: 'And I, behold I, am establishing my covenant with you' (see Gn. ix. 9). The salient features should be noted.

a. It is conceived and established by God Himself.

b. It is universal in its scope; it embraces not only Noah but his seed after him and every living creature. The scope demonstrates that the grace bestowed is not dependent upon intelligent understanding or favourable response on the part of the beneficiaries.

c. This covenant is unconditional; no commandment or requirement is appended which could be construed as the condition upon which the grace bestowed is contingent. In fact, there is no ensuing obligation for Noah and his seed which could be regarded as the means through which the grace promised is to be realized. Hence the thought of breaking the covenant is irrelevant.

d. The divine monergism is intensely exhibited in this covenant; there is no human contribution to the agency by which the promises are fulfilled. The sign does not even take the form of an ordinance to be performed by man at the divine behest. The bow in the cloud is for the purpose of attesting the faithfulness of God and, in anthropomorphic terms, is to bring to God's remembrance His covenant promise. It is not a sign over which men exercise any control.

e. The covenant is everlasting. The perpetuity is correlative with the unilateral character and with the divine monergism. No uncertainty or mutability can belong to God's unconditional promise.

The covenant is, therefore, a sovereign administration of grace and forbearance, divine in its origin, disclosure, confirmation, and fulfilment.

III. THE ABRAHAMIC COVENANT

The Noahic covenants provide us with the concept of sovereign dispensation on God's part. When we study the Abrahamic covenant we find no deviation from this governing definition. But we do discover new features. Hence it is necessary to take account of the generic characteristics and the specific.

a. Generic features

(i) Promises were given. The three expressly mentioned in connection with the covenant are the possession of the land of Canaan, the multiplying of Abraham's seed, and the promise that God would be a God to him and his seed after him (Gn. xv. 8, 18, xvii. 6-8). But we cannot exclude the promise that in him and his seed all the nations of the earth would be blessed (Gn. xii. 3; cf. Acts iii. 25). (ii) Divine monergism is distinctly in the forefront (Gn. xv. 18, xvii. 1-8). (iii) Perpetuity is emphasized as much as in the post-diluvian Noahic (Gn. xvii. 7, 8, 19). (iv) Confirmation is given by a sanction which is irrevoc-

able in its import (Gn. xv. 9-17). These features indicate that the covenant is divinely devised, administered, confirmed, and executed.

b. Specific features

(i) The promises have specific character; they are soteric in their intent and effect, having their centre in the promise that God will be the God of Abraham and his seed (Gn. xvii. 7, 8). (ii) In scope the covenant is particularistic to the extent of excluding Ishmael (Gn. xvii. 18-21). All nations are to be blessed in Abraham's seed. But it is not a covenant with all flesh as in Gn. ix. 9-17. It is not a covenant that is to yield its benefits to all indiscriminately. (iii) The sanction by which it is confirmed is one of peculiar solemnity (Gn. xv. 9-17). This is of the nature of a self-maledictory oath on the part of God (cf. Je. xxxiv. 18-20; *ANET*, pp. 353 f.). Nothing could more effectively certify the security and immutability of the promise of the inheritance of the land of Canaan. And the other promises of the covenant, since they are so closely bound up with this particular promise, must be regarded as guaranteed by the same sanction. (iv) In this case the necessity of keeping the covenant devolves upon Abraham and his seed (Gn. xvii. 10-14). The person failing to comply with the requirement breaks the covenant and is cut off from the people. This feature is co-ordinate with the added richness of the covenant promises and blessings in distinction from those of the Noahic. The intense spirituality of the relation constituted demands consecration on the part of those embraced in the covenant. And the particularism likewise is correlative with the keeping. A covenant that yields its blessings to all indiscriminately cannot be kept or broken. (v) The sign of the covenant is circumcision, and therefore an ordinance to be observed by men (Gn. xvii. 11). Circumcision is the sign or seal of the covenant in the highest reaches of its spirituality; it is even called the covenant (Gn. xvii. 10). Circumcision signifies the purification (cf. Ex. vi. 12, 30; Lv. xix. 23, xxvi. 41; Dt. x. 16, xxx. 6; Je. iv. 4, vi. 10, ix. 25) indispensable to that communion with God which is the central blessing of the covenant (Gn. xvii. 7).

The emphasis which falls upon the unilateral character of the covenant as a dispensation of grace on God's part and the obligation devolving upon men to keep the covenant might appear to be incompatible. Careful consideration, however, shows that these are complementary. In the Abrahamic covenant we have grace on the highest level because it contemplates the apex of spiritual relationship. The greater the grace, the more accentuated becomes the sovereignty of the bestowal. But, likewise, the greater the grace and the more intimate the relation constituted, the more intensified become the demands of that relationship. The necessity of keeping the covenant is the expression of the spirituality involved. Keeping is the condition of continuance in this grace and of its consummating fruition;

COVENANT

it is the reciprocal response apart from which communion with God is impossible.

IV. THE MOSAIC COVENANT

This was made with Israel as a people who had been sovereignly chosen in love unto redemption and adoption. The elements of this proposition and the evidence in support of each should be noted. Israel was sovereignly chosen (Ex. ii. 25; Dt. iv. 37, vii. 6-8, viii. 17, 18, ix. 4-6, xiv. 2; Ho. xiii. 5; Am. iii. 2). The covenant was made with a redeemed people (Ex. vi. 6-8, xv. 13, xx. 2; Dt. vii. 8, ix. 26, xiii. 5, xxi. 8). Israel had been adopted into a filial relation to God (Ex. iv. 22, 23; Dt. viii. 5, xiv. 1, xxxii. 6; 1 Ch. xxix. 10; Is. lxiii. 16, lxiv. 8; Je. iii. 19, xxxi. 9; Ho. xi. 1; Mal. i. 6, ii. 10).

Of equal significance for the interpretation of the Mosaic covenant is the fact that it was made with Israel in pursuance and fulfilment of the Abrahamic covenant (Ex. ii. 24, iii. 16, vi. 4-8; Pss. cv. 8-12, 42-45, cvi. 45).

These facts conspire to show that the Mosaic covenant is not to be construed in a way that would place it in sharp contrast with the Abrahamic and indicate that the same concept of sovereign administration of grace rules in this case as in the earlier covenants. This construction is confirmed by other considerations. The spiritual relationship which is at the centre of the Abrahamic covenant is also at the centre of the Mosaic. 'And I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God: and ye shall know that I am the Lord your God' (Ex. vi. 7; cf. Dt. xxix. 13). Like the other covenants, sovereign dispensation occupies the forefront (Ex. xix. 5-8, xxiv. 3, 4; Dt. iv. 13, 14).

The feature which has influenced interpreters to construe the Mosaic covenant in legalistic terms is the fact that the necessity of keeping the covenant is given such prominence in connection with the dispensing of the covenant and that the people entered into solemn engagement to be obedient (Ex. xix. 5, 6, xxiv. 7, 8). That the demand for obedience and the keeping of the covenant does not place the Mosaic in a different category and does not make it a conditional covenant of works is demonstrated by several considerations.

a. As found already, the necessity of keeping the covenant is as patent in the Abrahamic as in the Mosaic (cf. Gn. xvii. 9-14, xviii. 18, 19). If this condition interferes with the gracious character of the Mosaic, it must have the same effect in the Abrahamic.

b. Since the covenant contemplated no less intimate a relationship than that of being the adopted people of God, then it is inconceivable that the demands of God's holiness should not come to expression as governing and regulating that fellowship and as conditioning the continued enjoyment of its privileges. This principle is frequently asserted (Dt. vi. 4-15; Lv. xi. 44, 45, xx. 7, 26, xxi. 8). It is summed up in Lv. xix. 2, 'Ye shall be holy: for I the Lord your God am

holy' (cf. 1 Pet. i. 15; Heb. xii. 14). And the holiness demanded by the covenant fellowship is expressed concretely in obedience to God's commandments.

c. Holiness was an integral aspect of the covenant blessing. Israel had been redeemed to be a holy people, that is, separated unto the Lord.

d. Holiness, concretely illustrated in obedience, was the means through which the covenant relationship continued to bestow its blessings and proceeded to its fruition. Both negatively and positively this is the burden of Lv. xxvi.

e. It is a mistake to read Ex. xix. 5, 6, xxiv. 7, 8 as if the making of the covenant had to wait for the promise of obedience on the part of the people. In the keeping of the covenant and in obeying God's voice the covenant is conceived of as dispensed, as in operation, and as constituting a certain relation. What is conditioned upon obedience is the enjoyment of the blessing which the covenant contemplates. And the promise of obedience (Ex. xxiv. 7) was the only proper response on the part of the people to the grace which the covenant disclosed. The demand for obedience in the Mosaic covenant is identical in principle with the same demand in the new covenant. Believers do not continue in the grace which the covenant dispenses irrespective of perseverance and obedience. These are indeed blessings of the new covenant, but they are also the means through which the covenant favour and fellowship go on to consummating fruition (cf. Rom. xi. 22; Col. i. 23; Heb. iii. 6, 14; 1 Pet. i. 5). The failure to construe the demand for obedience in the Mosaic covenant as in principle identical with the same demand under the gospel arises from misconception as to the relations of law and grace in the new covenant.

V. THE DAVIDIC COVENANT

This is enunciated in such passages as Pss. lxxxix. 3, 4, 26-37, cxxxii. 11-18. Although the term covenant is not used in 2 Sa. vii. 12-17, it is apparent from the other relevant passages that this is the basic annunciation to David of the covenant concerned. These references show that no covenant administration expresses more plainly the concept of sovereign dispensation of grace. The most patent features are the security, determinateness, and immutability of the promises given (cf. Ps. lxxxix. 3; 2 Sa. xxiii. 5).

The Davidic covenant is messianic in its ultimate reference (cf. Is. xlii. 1, 6, xlix. 8, lv. 3, 4; Mal. iii. 1; Lk. i. 32, 33; Acts ii. 30-36). The striking feature of the Isaianic passages is that the Servant of the Lord is given to be a covenant of the people. The Messiah is Himself the covenant because the blessings and provisions of God's covenant with the people of God are to such an extent bound up with the Messiah that He is Himself the embodiment of these blessings and of the presence of the Lord with His people which the covenant ensures. No consideration certifies the grandeur of the covenant conception, the richness of its grace, the security of its

provisions, and the assurance of its promises more than the fact that Christ Himself is the angel of the covenant and is given as the covenant of the people. What could disclose more effectively the sovereign grace of which covenant is the epitome than that He in whom the promises of God are yea and amen should be given as a covenant?

VI. THE NEW COVENANT

This is the covenant of the fulness of the time, of the consummation of the ages (*cf.* Gal. iv. 4; Heb. ix. 26), and is, for this reason, the everlasting covenant (*cf.* Heb. xiii. 20, xii. 28). It is everlasting not for the purpose of negating the perpetuity which belongs essentially to the covenant grace exemplified in the older covenants but because it brings that grace to its fullest exhibition and bestowal; it is God's covenant relationship on the highest level of achievement. And it is everlasting because it is not to be displaced by any other more complete realization of what covenant grace embodies. Covenant grace has now attained the finale of its revelation. Consummated bliss for the people of God will be in pursuance of the new covenant. It could not be otherwise. For the new covenant is correlative with the grace which Christ is and brings.

The New Testament data bear out these conclusions. Certain references clearly establish the recognition of continuity in the history of covenant administration. Gal. iii. 17-22 is explicitly concerned with the relation of the Mosaic to the Abrahamic. Several facts are apparent. The Mosaic did not make void the Abrahamic; the promise of the latter is not brought to nought. The Mosaic was an addition, not a suspension, an addition subserving the interests of the promise which found its focal point in the seed that was to come. The Mosaic was not against the promissory character of the Abrahamic; it was not governed by or directed to an antithetical principle. The Mosaic did not propound a law-method of justification—the Mosaic revelation is included in that Scripture which provides for the method of faith. The Mosaic is, therefore, for these reasons, to be construed as supplementing the Abrahamic and organized upon the same principles of promise and faith.

Lk. i. 72 shows that Zacharias saw in the redemptive events which form the subject of his thanksgiving the fulfilment of the Abrahamic covenant, and Paul finds in Christ as the promised seed the fulfilment of the promises made to Abraham and to his seed, promises which are to be identified with the covenant (Gal. iii. 15, 16).

When our Lord said that His blood was the blood of the covenant shed for the remission of sins and that the cup of the Last Supper was the new covenant in His blood (Mt. xxvi. 28; Mk. xiv. 24; Lk. xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25), the new covenant will have to be regarded as referring to the grace secured and the relationship established by the blood which He shed. The covenant

is the sum-total of the grace, blessing, truth, and relationship comprised in that redemption which was secured by Jesus' blood.

In 2 Cor. iii. 6-18 Paul reflects on some of the characteristic benefits ministered by the new covenant; it ministers the Spirit as the Spirit of life; it is the ministration of righteousness and of liberty, and, above all, of the transfiguration by which we are conformed to the image of the Lord Himself. These are the highest of blessings, culminating in what is the crown and goal of redemptive accomplishment.

In Heb. ix. 16, 17 the writer uses the testamentary notion of a last will. This is an exceptional use of the term for covenant. But it is introduced at this point for the purpose of emphasizing the definitive effectiveness of the death of Christ in securing and ensuring the benefits of the covenant. There is no more possibility of voiding the effective application of the blessings of the covenant than there is of making void the provisions of a last will and testament after the testator has died. Here we have the most express witness to the fact that the new covenant is to be interpreted as a unilateral disposition and, therefore, totally foreign to the idea of mutual contract.

The foregoing summary review of the evidence shows that in Scripture God's covenants with men are always sovereign administrations of grace and of promise. This central concept is applied, however, to different circumstances and conditions, and thus the precise character of the grace and promise is determined by the historical situation in view. From the time of Abraham the covenants are specifically redemptive in content and purpose. This does not mean that redemptive grace began with Abraham, nor does it mean that the Noachic covenants had no redemptive reference. Even the post-diluvian, though not redemptive in itself, can be understood only in the broader context of God's redemptive purposes respecting mankind and in its relation to Noah as a man of God. But it is with the Abrahamic that specifically redemptive grace and promise are administered in the form of covenant, and covenant grace is redemptive at its core. Beginning with Abraham, the successive covenants are coeval with the successive epochs in the progressive unfolding of God's redemptive will and purpose. Not only are they coeval, they are also correlative. Covenant revelation and redemptive accomplishment are virtually identical. There is, therefore, progressive enrichment of the successive covenants. This enrichment, however, is not a retraction of or deviation from the central and governing features of covenant. The enrichment is a fuller development of what is present from the outset. So the apex of grace and relationship achieved in redemption does not go beyond the ambit of covenant. The climax of redemption is the climax of covenant administration, and sovereign grace reaches the zenith of its manifestation and realization. At the centre of all the covenants of redemptive grace was the promise,

COVENANT, BOOK OF THE

'I will be your God, and ye shall be my people.' In this respect also the new covenant brings this relationship to the highest level of achievement, and there will be no further expansion or enrichment than that which the new covenant provides. Christ's blood secured its provisions; Christ is its mediator and surety. And He is the covenant. Nothing more ultimate is conceivable.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. G. Vos; *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments*, 1948; 'Hebrews, the Epistle of the Diatheke' in *Ptr*, XIII, pp. 587-632, XIV, pp. 1-61; G. A. Mendenhall, *Law and Covenant in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, 1955; J. Murray, *The Covenant of Grace*, 1954; R. Campbell, *Israel and the New Covenant*, 1954; Meredith G. Kline, 'The Two Tables of the Covenant' in *WTJ*, XXII, 2, pp. 123-146, 'Dynastic Covenant', XXIII, 1, pp. 1-15.

J.M.

COVENANT, BOOK OF THE. In Ex. xxiv. 7 'the book of the covenant' (*sefer habberit*) is read by Moses as the basis of Yahweh's covenant with Israel, at its ratification at the foot of Sinai. Probably this 'book' was the Decalogue of Ex. xx. 2-17. It has, however, become customary to give the designation 'The Book of the Covenant' to Ex. xx. 22-xxiii. 33 (which may at one time have occupied a later position in the record). In 2 Ki. xxiii. 2, 21; 2 Ch. xxxiv. 30 'the book of the covenant' is the Deuteronomic law. (See **DEUTERONOMY.**)

Here we are concerned with Ex. xx. 22-xxiii. 33, conventionally called 'The Book of the Covenant' and in any case the oldest extant codification of Israelite law. It comprises 'judgments' (*mišpāṭim*, 'precedents') and 'statutes' (*ḏbārīm*, lit. 'words'). The 'judgments' take the form of case-laws: 'If a man do so-and-so, he shall pay so much.' The 'statutes' take the categorical or 'apodictic' form: 'Thou shalt (not) do so-and-so.' Intermediate between those types are the participial laws (so called because they are expressed by means of the Hebrew participle), of the type: 'He that doeth so-and-so shall surely be put to death.' This type frequently replaces the 'If a man . . .' type when the death penalty is prescribed.

The principle on which the laws in this code are arranged does not lie on the surface, but it has been persuasively argued that each section falls within the scope of one of the Ten Commandments: the code could thus be described as 'a running midrash to the decalogue' (E. Robertson, *The Old Testament Problem*, 1950, p. 95; cf. A. E. Guilding, 'Notes on the Hebrew Law Codes', *JTS*, XLIX, 1948, pp. 43 ff.).

I. CULTIC REGULATIONS

The code begins with two cultic regulations: the making of gods of silver or gold is forbidden (Ex. xx. 22 f.) and an 'altar of earth' is prescribed (xx. 24-26), neither manufactured of hewn stones nor approached by steps, like the more elaborate altars of Israel's neighbours.

II. JUDGMENTS

There follows a series of case-laws (xxi. 1-xxii. 17). These cover such civil and criminal cases as the treatment of Hebrew slaves (xxi. 2-6), the sale of one's daughter into slavery (xxi. 7-11), murder and manslaughter (xxi. 12-14), injury to parents (xxi. 15, 17), kidnapping (xxi. 16), assault and battery (xxi. 18-27, incorporating the *lex talionis*, xxi. 23-25), a goring ox (xxi. 28-32), accidents to animals (xxi. 33 f.), killing of one ox by another (xxi. 35 f.), theft (xxii. 1-4), damage to crops (xxii. 5 f.), deposits and loans (xxii. 7-15), seduction (xxii. 16 f.).

It is this section of the code that presents affinities with the other ancient law-codes of the Near East—those of Ur-nammu of Ur, Lipit-ishtar of Isin, Bilalama (?) of Eshnunna, and Hammurabi of Babylon, for example. These are constructed on the same general lines as the Israelite case-law. The Hittite code, too, in several points of detail and arrangement, shows resemblances to these Israelite laws, although the general outlook of the Hittite code differs from that of other Near Eastern codes, reflecting the Indo-European principle of compensation for injury done rather than the Semitic insistence on *talio* (retaliatory punishment).

While the Israelite case-laws are comparable to these other codes, they reflect a simpler way of life. A settled agricultural community is presumed, and people live in houses, but there is nothing of the rather elaborate urban organization or social stratification of Hammurabi's code. Full-grown men in the Israelite community are either citizens or serfs, whereas in Hammurabi's code the punishment for physical injury, for example, is graduated according as the injured person is a superior, an equal, a 'vassal' or a serf. If the case-laws of Ex. xxi. 1-xxii. 17 were derived from a Canaanite code, we should expect the city-state culture of Canaan to be more clearly reflected.

A life-setting in the early days of agricultural settlement in Israel suggests itself, and we may recall that such settlement began before the crossing of the Jordan—if not at Kadesh-barnea, then certainly in Transjordan, where the conquered kingdoms of Sihon and Og, with their cities, were occupied by Israelites (Nu. xxi. 25, 35).

In Ex. xviii we have a picture of Israelite case-law in formation; Moses and his assistants adjudicate on cases which are submitted to them. With this we may associate the alternative name of Kadesh given in Gn. xiv. 7, En-mishpat, i.e. the spring where judgment is given.

III. STATUTES

The 'apodictic' laws which constitute the remaining part of the code have the form of directions (*tôrâ*) given by God through one of His spokesmen (cf. the function of the priest in Mal. ii. 7), preferably at a sanctuary—in the first instance, through Moses at Sinai or Kadesh. They have no