

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>A.A.J. A. A. Jones, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., Vicar of St. Silas', Nunhead, London.</p> <p>A.C. R. A. Cole, B.A., M.Th., Ph.D., Lecturer, Moore Theological College, Sydney.</p> <p>A.E.W. A. E. Willingale, B.A., B.D., M.Th., Romford, Essex.</p> <p>A.F. A. Flavelle, B.A., Minister of Mournie Presbyterian Church, Kilkeel, Co. Down.</p> <p>A.F.W. A. F. Walls, M.A., B.Litt., Lecturer in Theology, Fourah Bay College, The University College of Sierra Leone, Freetown.</p> <p>A.G. A. Gelston, M.A., Curate of St. Mary's Church, Chipping Norton, Oxfordshire.</p> <p>A.K.C. A. K. Cragg, M.A., D.Phil., Warden of St. Augustine's College, Canterbury.</p> <p>A.P.W. A. P. Waterson, M.D., M.R.C.P., Lecturer in Pathology, University of Cambridge.</p> <p>A.R. A. Ross, M.A., B.D., D.D., formerly Professor of New Testament, Free Church College, Edinburgh.</p> <p>A.R.M. A. R. Millard, B.A., Temporary Assistant Keeper, Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities, The British Museum.</p> <p>A.S. A. Saarisalo, Teol. Dr., Professor of Oriental Literature, University of Helsinki.</p> <p>A.St. A. Stuart, M.Sc., F.G.S., Emeritus Professor of Geology, University of Exeter.</p> <p>A.S.W. A. S. Wood, B.A., Ph.D., F.R.Hist.S., Minister of Southlands Methodist Church, York.</p> <p>A. van S. A. van Selms, D.D., Professor of Semitic Languages, University of Pretoria.</p> <p>B.F.C.A. B. F. C. Atkinson, M.A., Ph.D., formerly Under-Librarian in the University of Cambridge.</p> <p>B.F.H. B. F. Harris, M.A., B.D., Senior Lecturer in Classics, University of Auckland.</p> | <p>B.L.S. B. L. Smith, B.D., Th.Schol., Lecturer Moore Theological College, Sydney.</p> <p>B.O.B. B. O. Banwell, B.A., Methodist Minister in Fish Hoek, Cape Town.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>C.F.P. C. F. Pfeiffer, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Associate Professor of Old Testament, Gordon Divinity School, Beverly Farms, Massachusetts.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>C.L.F. C. L. Feinberg, Th.D., Ph.D., Professor of Semitics and Old Testament and Dean of Talbot Theological Seminary, Los Angeles.</p> <p>D.A.H. D. A. Hubbard, Th.M., Ph.D., Chairman, Division of Biblical Studies and Philosophy, Westmont College, Santa Barbara, California.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>D.C. D. Calcott, B.Sc., N.D.A., Tutor in charge of Commonwealth Bursars Course, University of Reading, Institute of Education.</p> <p>D.F. D. Freeman, Ph.D., Orthodox Presbyterian Minister in Philadelphia.</p> <p>D.F.P. D. F. Payne, M.A., Assistant Lecturer in Biblical History and Literature, University of Sheffield.</p> <p>D.G. D. Guthrie, B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Lecturer in New Testament Language and Literature, London Bible College.</p> <p>D.G.S. D. G. Stradling, M.A., Magdalen College, Oxford.</p> <p>D.H.T. D. H. Tongue, M.A., Vicar of Locking, Somerset, and Lecturer in New Testament at Tyndale Hall, Bristol.</p> |
|---|--|

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, 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. Gispen, 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> |
|---|--|

Acts viii. 9-24), where he has 'swept the Samaritans off their feet with his magical arts' (NBB, verse 9). Luke does not suggest that Simon was himself a Samaritan. In essence a Levantine mountebank, Simon cultivated the legend that he was a divine emanation—'that Power of God which is called the Great Power'. The concept and the title were pagan enough (cf. for analogies Ramsay, *BRD*, p. 117; Deissmann, *BS*, p. 336 n.), but the Samaritans would by 'God' intend 'Yahweh', and Simon must have acclimatized himself to his religious surroundings. He already represents, then, a significant syncretism of magical, Hellenistic, and erratic Jewish elements.

In the mass movement attending Philip's preaching Simon professed conversion and was baptized. Luke uses his regular expression 'believed', and there is no reason to doubt Simon's sincerity thus far. The sequel, however, shows that his basic attitudes were still those of the magician. So impressed is he with the visible manifestations of the Holy Spirit following the apostles' laying on of hands, that he applies to them, as to higher proficient in the same trade, for the formula at an appropriate price. Peter's crushing rebuke evidently terrified him, for he begged the apostles' intercession to avert the threatened peril. Simon is obsessed with the idea of *power*: throughout he conceives of it as residing in the apostles as super-magicians.

Here, rather abruptly, Luke leaves Simon; but a tangle of traditions about his later career survive in primitive Christian literature. If they include incongruities and legends there is no need, with de Faye, to discount the patristic descriptions, or to deny a connection between the Simon of Acts and the Simonian sect. Even Lucian's rascally oracle-monger Alexander discoursed on the errors of Epicurus: and there is nothing incredible in Simon, with striking ability and personality, and real psychic powers, and perhaps some education, combining the charlatan and the heresiarch.

Justin (*Apology* xxvi, cf. lvi, and *Trypho* cxx), himself from Samaria, says that Simon was born in the village of Gitta; that his companion Helen, a former prostitute, was widely regarded as his first divine 'idea', while he himself was acclaimed by multitudes in Samaria and Rome as a divinity. Indeed, Roman adulation had erected a statue inscribed *Simoni Deo Sancto*, 'to Simon the Holy God'. (This statue may actually have been erected to the Sabine deity Semo Sancus, but the Simonians, who worshipped at statues, perhaps saw opportunities in this one.)

Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* i. 16, Harvey), Hippolytus (*Philos.* vi. 7 ff.) and Epiphanius (*Panar.* xxi. 2 ff.) describe Simonian doctrine, the two latter employing publications which they allege, perhaps erroneously in Hippolytus's case, to emanate from the sect of Simon. He seems to have developed his old theme of 'the Great Power of God' into a Trinitarian scheme: Simon appeared to the Samaritans as the Father, to the Jews as the Son (he only seemed to suffer) and to

the world at large as the Holy Spirit. He had a Redemption myth in which he rescued Helen ('the lost sheep') from the bondage of successive transmigrations in various female bodies; and he preached salvation by grace, requiring faith in Helen and himself, but allowing unrestrained liberty in morals afterwards. But Simon also borrowed heavily from Greek paganism and Greek philosophy, and some concepts appear which recur in more sophisticated Christian Gnosticism (q.v.). Irenaeus and the others regard him as the first major heretic, the initiator of a long chain of interrelated errors. The modern association of Gnostic origins with heretical forms of Judaism may suggest that their instinct was not far wrong.

Literature such as the Clementine romance and the *Acts* of Peter has many imaginative stories of encounters between Simon and Peter in Rome. (The once-popular idea that in the Clementines Simon is a cipher for Paul need no longer be taken seriously.) According to Hippolytus, his final exhibition misfired. He was buried alive, promising to reappear in three days; but he did not, for, in Hippolytus' laconic phrase, 'he was not the Christ'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. R. P. Casey in *BC*, V, 1933, pp. 151 ff.; E. de Faye, *Gnostiques et Gnosticisme*, 1925, pp. 413 ff.; R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and Early Christianity*, 1960, chapter 3. A.F.W.

SIN.

I. DEFINITION

The biblical terms for sin are varied. In Hebrew the most common are *ḥaṭṭā'* (in several forms of the same root), *ʾāwōn*, *peša'*, *ra'*, and in the Greek *hamartia*, *hamartēma*, *parabasis*, *paraptōma*, *ponēria*, *anomia*, *adikia*. There are distinctions expressed in these terms; they reflect the different aspects from which sin may be viewed. Sin is failure, error, iniquity, transgression, trespass, lawlessness, unrighteousness. It is an unmitigated evil. But the definition of sin is not to be derived simply from the terms used in Scripture to denote it. The most characteristic feature of sin in all of its aspects is that it is directed against God. David expressed this in his confession, 'Against thee, thee only, have I sinned' (Ps. li. 4), and Paul in his indictment, 'the carnal mind is enmity against God' (Rom. viii. 7). This orientation must be kept in view when we consider the different terms. Any conception of sin which does not have in the forefront the contradiction which it offers to God is a deviation from the biblical representation. The common notion that sin is selfishness betrays a false assessment of its nature and gravity. From the outset and throughout its development sin is directed against God, and this analysis alone accounts for the diversity of its forms and activities. When the Scripture says that 'sin is the transgression of the law' (1 Jn. iii. 4) it is to this same concept that our attention is drawn. Law is the transcript of God's perfection; it is His

SIN

holiness coming to expression for the regulation of thought and action consonant with that perfection. Transgression is violation of that which God's glory demands of us and is, therefore, in its essence the contradiction of God.

II. ORIGIN

Sin was present in the universe before the fall of Adam and Eve. This is evident from the presence and allegations of the tempter in Eden. It was upon the occasion of temptation that our first parents fell. But it is the origin of sin in the human family which concerns us. The Bible provides information on this subject, but no data bearing upon the fall of the devil and his angels.

Gn. iii describes for us the process, and 1 Tim. ii. 14 is the inspired comment (*cf.* Jas. i. 13, 14). When we read: 'And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise' (Gn. iii. 6) we are not justified in inferring that sin began with sensuous lust or even with the lust of the eyes. This fails to appreciate the genius of the tempter's assault and of the deception by which Eve had been ensnared. Satan's attack was directed against the integrity and veracity of God (*cf.* Gn. iii. 4), and the allegation by which he seduced the woman was that she and her husband would be as God, knowing good and evil (*cf.* Gn. iii. 5). It is to this godless aspiration that the attention of the woman was drawn, and it is particularly in her reaction indicated by the words 'a tree to be desired to make one wise' that we find the movement of defection and apostasy in Eve's heart and mind. This reaction shows that the tempter had gained her confidence, that she had acceded to his assault upon God's veracity, and that she desired that which the tempter averred, to be as God knowing good and evil. It is, therefore, to this type of lust that the narrative traces the origin of sin. She gave to the tempter the place that belonged to God only; she accepted the most blasphemous assault upon the integrity of God; she coveted for herself divine prerogatives. In her willingness to parley with the tempter, in her failure to react with horror against his suggestions, and in her acquiescence there is disclosed the process that preceded the act of eating the forbidden fruit. Here we have the origin of sin and we are pointed to its true character. Sin does not originate in overt action; it proceeds from the heart and mind. Depravity of heart registered itself in the transgression of the commandment; Adam and Eve became first estranged from God and then they committed actual transgression. They were drawn away of their own lust and enticed. How this could happen in their case is the mystery of the origin of sin.

The gravity of the first sin appears in the fact that the command violated was the summary exhibition of the authority, goodness, wisdom, justice, faithfulness, and grace of God. Transgression meant the repudiation of His authority, doubt of His goodness, dispute with His wisdom,

rejection of His justice, contradiction of His veracity, and the spurning of His grace. Along the whole line of God's perfections sin was the contradiction. And this ever continues to be the character of sin.

III. CONSEQUENCES

The sin of Adam and Eve was not an isolated event. The consequences for them, for posterity, and for the world are immediately apparent.

a. Man's attitude to God

The changed attitude to God on the part of Adam and Eve evinces the revolution that took place in their minds. They 'hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden' (Gn. iii. 8), and the covering of themselves with aprons (Gn. iii. 7) is no doubt to be associated with the same complex of emotion. Made for the presence and fellowship of God, they now dreaded encounter with Him (*cf.* Jn. iii. 20). Shame and fear were now the dominant emotions (*cf.* Gn. ii. 25, iii. 7, 10), indicating the disruption that had taken place.

b. God's attitude to man

Not only was there a change in our first parents' attitude to God but also in God's attitude to them. Reproof, condemnation, curse, expulsion from the garden are all indicative of this revolution in God's relation to them. Sin is one-sided, but its consequences are not. Aspects of the divine character are turned towards Adam and Eve of which there is no intimation prior to their disobedience. Sin elicits God's wrath and displeasure, and necessarily so, because it is the contradiction of what He is. For God to be complacent towards sin is an impossibility. He cannot deny Himself.

c. Consequences for the human race

The unfolding history of man furnishes the catalogue of vices (Gn. iv. 8, 19, 23, 24, vi. 2, 3, 5). The sequel of abounding iniquity finds its issue in the destruction of mankind with the exception of eight persons (Gn. vi. 7, 13, vii. 21-24). The fall had abiding effect not only upon Adam and Eve but upon all who descended from them; there is racial solidarity in sin and evil.

d. Consequences for creation

The effects of the fall extend to the physical cosmos. 'Cursed is the ground for thy sake' (Gn. iii. 17; *cf.* Rom. viii. 20). Man is the crown of creation, made in God's image and, therefore, God's vicegerent (Gn. i. 26). The catastrophe of man's fall brought the catastrophe of curse upon that of which he was the crown and over which he was given dominion. Sin was an event in the realm of the human spirit, but it has its repercussions in the whole of creation.

e. The appearance of death

Death is the epitome of sin's penalty. This was the warning attached to the prohibition of Eden

(Gn. ii. 17), and it is the infliction that emanates from the curse (Gn. iii. 19). Death in the phenomenal realm consists in the separation of the integral elements of man's being. This dissolution exemplifies the principle of death, namely, separation, and it comes to its most extreme expression in separation from God, illustrated at the beginning in expulsion from the garden (Gn. iii. 23, 24), Eden being the symbol of God's presence and favour.

IV. IMPUTATION

The first sin of Adam had unique significance for the whole human race (Rom. v. 12, 14-19; 1 Cor. xv. 22). Here there is sustained emphasis upon the one trespass of the one man as that by which sin, condemnation, and death came to reign over the whole of mankind. The sin is identified as 'the transgression of Adam', 'the trespass of the one', 'one trespass', 'the disobedience of the one', and there can be no doubt but that the first trespass of Adam is intended. Hence the clause in Rom. v. 12, 'for that all have sinned', cannot refer to the actual sins of all men, far less to the hereditary depravity with which all are afflicted, but to the sin of all in the sin of Adam. For in verse 12 the clause in question clearly states the reason why 'death passed upon all men', and in the succeeding verses 'the one trespass' is stated to be the reason for the universal reign of death. If the same sin were not intended, Paul would be affirming two different things with reference to the same subject in the same context. This we cannot suppose. The only explanation of the two forms of statement is that all sinned in the sin of Adam. The same inference is to be drawn from 1 Cor. xv. 22, 'in Adam all die'. Death is the wages of sin and only of sin (Rom. vi. 23). If all die in Adam, it is because all sinned in Adam.

According to Scripture, the kind of solidarity with Adam which explains this participation of all in Adam's sin is the kind of solidarity which Christ sustains to those united to Him. The parallel in Rom. v. 12-19; 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45-49 between Adam and Christ indicates the same type of relationship in both cases, and we have no need or warrant to posit anything more ultimate in the case of Adam and the human race than we find in the case of Christ and His people. In the latter it is representative headship, and this is all that is necessary to ground the solidarity of all in the sin of Adam. Adam sinned, therefore all sinned. To say that the sin of Adam is imputed to all is but to say that all were involved in his sin by reason of his representative headship.

There are good reasons for insisting that this imputation of Adam's sin was immediate. When Paul reiterates that it was by the trespass and disobedience of the one that the many were made sinners, that the judgment of condemnation was pronounced upon all, and that the sentence of death passed upon all, there is immediate conjunction of the trespass of Adam, on the one

hand, and the sin, condemnation, and death of all, on the other. We may not intrude any other sin between the sin of Adam and the sin of all as the reason for the involvement of all in Adam's sin and its consequences. The only ground is the union established between Adam and his posterity. The sin of Adam sustains as direct a relation to the condemnation and death of all as it sustained to Adam's own condemnation and death. This is the import of Rom. v. 12, 15-19; 1 Cor. xv. 22.

Rejection of this doctrine betrays not only failure to accept the witness of the relevant passages but also failure to appreciate the close relation which exists between the principle which governs our relation to Adam and the governing principle of the economy of salvation. The parallel between Adam as the first man and Christ as the last Adam shows that the accomplishment of salvation in Christ is based on the same operating principle as that by which we have become sinners and the heirs of death. The history of mankind is subsumed under two complexes, sin-condemnation-death and righteousness-justification-life. The former arises from our union with Adam, the latter from union with Christ. These are the only two orbits within which we live and move. God's government of men is directed in terms of these relationships. If we do not reckon with Adam we are thereby excluded from a proper understanding of Christ. All who die die in Adam; all who are made alive are made alive in Christ.

V. DEPRAVITY

Sin never consists merely in a voluntary act of transgression. Every volition proceeds from something that is more deep-seated than the volition itself, and so it is with sinful volition. A sinful act is the expression of a depraved heart (*cf.* Mk. vii. 20-23; Pr. iv. 23, xxiii. 7). Sin must always include, therefore, the perversity of heart, mind, disposition, and will. This was true, as we found, in the case of the first sin, and it applies to all sin. The imputation to posterity of the sin of Adam must, therefore, carry with it involvement in the perversity apart from which Adam's sin would be meaningless and its imputation an impossible abstraction. Paul says that 'by one man's disobedience many were made sinners' (Rom. v. 19). The depravity which sin entails and with which all men come into the world is for this reason a direct implicate of our solidarity with Adam in his sin. We come to be as individuals by natural generation, and as individuals we never exist apart from the sin of Adam reckoned as ours. Therefore David said, 'Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me' (Ps. li. 5), and our Lord, 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh' (Jn. iii. 6).

The witness of Scripture to the pervasiveness and totality of this depravity is explicit. Gn. vi. 5, viii. 21 provide a closed case. There is the *intensity*—'the wickedness of man was great in the earth'; there is the *inwardness*—the 'imagination

of the thoughts of his heart', an expression unsurpassed in the usage of Scripture to indicate that the most rudimentary movement of thought was evil; there is the *totality*—'every imagination'; there is the *constancy*—'continually'; there is the *exclusiveness*—'only evil'; there is the *early manifestation*—'from his youth'. That the indictment of Gn. vi. 5 was not restricted to the period before the flood is shown by Gn. viii. 21. It is a permanent condition that no external catastrophe can remedy. There is no escape from the implications of this witness inscribed on the early pages of divine revelation. It leaves no loophole for any other verdict than that this depravity is total both intensively and extensively. It extends to the deepest movements of the human heart and characterizes all mankind.

Later assessments of our sinful condition are to the same effect. The Lord searches the heart and tries the reins (*cf.* Je. xvii. 10), and His judgment is, 'The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?' (Je. xvii. 9). In Rom. iii. 10–18 Paul reproduces various Old Testament passages drawn particularly from Pss. xiv and liii, in which the severest indictments are brought against men. That there is no exception appears both from the context and from the indictments themselves. In Rom. iii. 9 it is clear that the verses which follow are adduced to support the proposition that all, both Jews and Greeks, are under sin and to demonstrate what this sin involves. In terms of negation the charges are that 'there is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God . . . there is none that doeth good, no, not one . . . there is no fear of God before their eyes'. From whatever angle man is viewed there is the total absence of that which is good and well-pleasing to God. Considered more positively, all have turned aside from God's way, they have all together become corrupted, and the bodily members are the instruments of iniquity. Thus the wide range of human function and activity is covered and the most determinative exercises of the human personality instanced in order to show the complete absence of good and the total presence of evil. Nothing else than the judgment of total depravity is the sum of this passage. In Rom. viii. 5–7 Paul speaks of the mind of the flesh, and flesh, when used ethically as is obvious here, means human nature directed and governed by sin. That flesh thus characterized belongs to all who are naturally precreated is the pronouncement of our Lord: 'That which is born of the flesh is flesh' (Jn. iii. 6). Hence when Paul says that 'the carnal mind is enmity against God' (Rom. viii. 7) he is characterizing 'the mind' that belongs to all men by nature; it is enmity against God. No stronger condemnatory judgment could be made, for it means that the thinking of the natural man is conditioned and governed by enmity directed against God; not only this—it is identified with this enmity. This is its native and characteristic exercise. At the point where the demands of

God's glory are most manifest, at that point is hostility is most violent.

There are no degrees of depravity. There are, however, degrees of cultivation and expression. Depravity is not registered in actual transgression to an equal extent in all. There are multiple restraining factors. God does not give over all men to uncleanness, to vile affections, and to a reprobate mind in the way of which Paul speaks in Rom. i. 24, 26, 28. Total depravity is not incompatible with the exercise of the natural virtues and the promotion of civil righteousness. Unregenerate men are still endowed with conscience, and the work of the law is written upon their hearts so that they do the things of the law (Rom. ii. 14, 15). These 'works done by unregenerate men' are 'of good use both to themselves and others' (*Westminster Confession of Faith*, xvi. 7). Failure to do these things involves greater sin (Ps. xiv. 4; Mt. xxiii. 23). But the doctrine of depravity means that these works, though formally in accord with what God commands, are not good and well-pleasing to God in terms of the only criteria by which God's judgment of the good, the holy, and the pure is determined. These criteria are love to God as the animating motive, the law of God as the directing principle, and the glory of God as the controlling purpose. Although depraved men may do the things of the law, yet they are not subject to the law of God, and enmity against God rather than love governs their hearts (Rom. viii. 7; 1 Cor. ii. 14; *cf.* Mt. vi. 2, 5, 16; Mk. vii. 6, 7; Rom. xiii. 4; 1 Cor. x. 31, xiii. 3; Tit. i. 15, iii. 5; Heb. xi. 4, 6).

VI. INABILITY

Inability is concerned with the incapacity arising from the nature of depravity. If depravity is total, then inability for what is good and well-pleasing to God is complete. We are not able to change our character or act differently from it. The witness of Scripture is clear to this effect. In the matter of understanding the natural man cannot know the things of the Spirit of God because they are spiritually discerned (1 Cor. ii. 14). In respect of obedience to the law of God he is not only not subject to the law of God but he cannot be (Rom. viii. 7). They who are in the flesh cannot please God (Rom. viii. 8). A corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit (Mt. vii. 18). The impossibility in each case is undeniable. It is our Lord who affirms that even faith in Him is an impossibility apart from the gift and efficacious drawing of the Father (Jn. vi. 44, 45, 65). His witness on His part is to the same effect as His insistence that apart from the supernatural birth of water and of the Spirit no one can have intelligent appreciation of or entrance into the kingdom of God (Jn. iii. 3, 5, 6, 8; *cf.* Jn. i. 13; 1 Jn. ii. 29, iii. 9, iv. 7, v. 1, 4, 18). The necessity of so radical and momentous a transformation and re-creation as regeneration is proof of the hopelessness of our sinful condition. The upshot of the whole witness of Scripture to the bondage of sin is that it is a psychological, moral, and

spiritual impossibility for the natural man to receive the things of the Spirit of God, to love God and do what is well-pleasing to Him, or to believe in Christ to the salvation of his soul. It is this enslavement that is the premise of the gospel, and the glory of the gospel is that it provides for release from the bonds of our servitude. It is the gospel of grace and power for the helpless.

VII. LIABILITY

Since sin is against God, He cannot be complacent towards it or indifferent to it. He must react against it. This reaction is specifically and pre-eminently His wrath. The frequency with which Scripture mentions the wrath of God compels us to take account of its reality and meaning. Various terms are used in the Old Testament. In Hebrew 'āp in the sense of anger, and intensified in the form ḥārôn 'āp to express the fierceness of God's anger, is very common (cf. Ex. iv. 14, xxxii. 12; Nu. xi. 10, xxii. 22; Jos. vii. 1; Jb. xlii. 7; Ps. xxi. 9; Is. x. 5; Na. i. 6; Zp. ii. 2); ḥēmā is likewise frequent (cf. Dt. xxix. 23; Pss. vi. 1, lxxix. 6, xc. 7; Je. vii. 20; Na. i. 2); 'ēbrā (cf. Ps. lxxviii. 49; Is. ix. 19, x. 6; Ezk. vii. 19; Ho. v. 10) and qeṣep (cf. Dt. xxix. 28; Ps. xxxviii. 1; Je. xxxii. 37, l. 13; Zc. i. 2) are used with sufficient frequency to be worthy of mention; za'am is also characteristic and expresses the thought of indignation (cf. Pss. xxxviii. 3, lxxix. 24, lxxviii. 49; Is. x. 5; Ezk. xxii. 31; Na. i. 6). It is apparent that the Old Testament is permeated with references to the wrath of God. Often more than one of these terms appear together in order to strengthen and confirm the thought expressed. There is intensity in the terms themselves and in the constructions in which they occur to convey the notions of hot displeasure, fiery indignation, and holy vengeance.

The Greek terms are *orgē* and *thymos*, the former frequently predicated of God in the New Testament (cf. Jn. iii. 36; Rom. i. 18, ii. 5, 8, iii. 5, v. 9, ix. 22; Eph. ii. 3, v. 6; 1 Thes. i. 10; Heb. iii. 11; Rev. vi. 17) and the latter less frequently (cf. Rom. ii. 8; Rev. xiv. 10, 19, xvi. 1, 19, xix. 15; see *zēlos* in Heb. x. 27).

The wrath of God is, therefore, a reality, and the language and teaching of Scripture are calculated to impress upon us the severity by which it is characterized. There are three observations which particularly require mention. First, the wrath of God must not be interpreted in terms of the fitful passion so commonly associated with anger in us. It is the deliberate, resolute displeasure which the contradiction of His holiness demands. Secondly, it is not to be construed as vindictiveness but as holy indignation; nothing of the nature of malice attaches to it. It is not malignant hatred but righteous detestation. Thirdly, we may not reduce the wrath of God to His will to punish. Wrath is a positive outgoing of dissatisfaction as surely as that which is pleasing to God involves complacency. We must not eliminate from God

what we call emotion. The wrath of God finds its parallel in the human heart, exemplified in a perfect way in Jesus Himself (cf. Mk. iii. 5, x. 14).

The epitome of sin's liability is, therefore, the holy wrath of God. Since sin is never impersonal, but exists in and is committed by persons, the wrath of God consists in the displeasure to which we are subjected; we are the objects. The penal inflictions which we suffer are the expressions of God's wrath. The sense of guilt and torment of conscience are the reflections in our consciousness of the displeasure of God. The essence of final perdition for the reprobate will consist in the unrestrained infliction of God's indignation (cf. Is. xxx. 33, lxvi. 24; Dn. xii. 2; Mk. ix. 43, 45, 48).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. J. Müller, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, 1877; J. S. Candlish, *The Biblical Doctrine of Sin*, 1896; TWNT, I, pp. 267-339 (E.T. by J. R. Coates, *Bible Key Words*, 1951); C. R. Smith, *The Bible Doctrine of Sin*, 1953; J. Orr, *Sin as a Problem of Today*, 1910; F. R. Tennant, *The Concept of Sin*, 1912; J. Owen, *Temptation and Sin*, 1958; J. Tulloch, *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*, 1876; J. Murray, *The Imputation of Adam's Sin*, 1959. J.M.

SIN. The Egyp. *slnw*, *swn*, 'fortress', is connected later with Egyp. *sln*, 'clay, mud', hence its Greek name Pelusium, 'mud-city'. A fortress-city, it is now Tell Farama, on the seashore about 20 miles south-east of Port Said; an Egyptian key defence-post against invasion from the East through Palestine. Emendation in Ezk. xxx. 15, 16 to Seven(ah) (= Aswan) is unnecessary. On the name Sin, see Gardiner, *JEA*, V, 1918, pp. 253, 254. K.A.K.

SIN, WILDERNESS OF. A wilderness through which the Israelites passed between Elim and Mt. Sinai (Ex. xvi. 1, xvii. 1; Nu. xxxiii. 11, 12). It is usually identified with Debbet er-Ramleh, a sandy tract below Jebel et-Tih in the south-west of the Sinai peninsula; but another suggested location is on the coastal plain of el-Markhah. As its position depends on the fixing of Mt. Sinai, which is uncertain (see following article), it is impossible to determine the exact site. J.M.H.

SINAI, MOUNT.

I. SITUATION

The location of this mountain is uncertain. The following mountains are regarded by various scholars as Mt. Sinai: Ġebel Mûsa, Ras eṣ-ṣafāfeh, Ġebel Serbāl and a mountain near al-Hrob. The tradition in favour of Ġebel Serbāl can be traced back as far as Eusebius; the tradition in favour of Ġebel Mûsa only as far as Justinian. The situation of Ġebel Serbāl, e.g. the fact that there is no wilderness at its foot, makes it improbable as the mountain of the covenant. The once widely accepted view of A. Musil that the volcanic mountain near al-Hrob is to be