

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

of the Jewish People, div. ii. vol. iii. pp. 270–292, containing a full bibliography; and Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la Divination*, vol. ii. 93–199. It may be worth while to compare the old edition of the Sibylline Books by Gallæus (A.D. 1689) which is followed by an Appendix containing a collection of other ancient Oracles by Opsopœus.

J. B. MAYOR.

THE TESTIMONY OF ST. JOHN TO THE VIRGIN BIRTH OF OUR LORD.

IN recent discussions on the Virginal Birth of our Lord it has been felt to be a difficulty that there is no direct mention of it in the Fourth Gospel. The silence of St. John on this momentous point has been admitted as an undoubted fact both by those who accept in their literal sense the accounts of the nativity in St. Matthew and St. Luke, and by those who reject or explain away these accounts. Bishop Harvey Goodwin, for instance, goes so far as to say: "Here also (in St. John's Gospel) the birth into the world is simply and absolutely omitted," meaning of course that there is no circumstantial account of it; for he proceeds to say: "As a matter of fact, the birth is omitted altogether, as has been already noticed; but can it be seriously maintained that the omission in any way prejudices the truth of the miraculous story?"¹ And in a recent work on the Fourth Gospel² the author argues that the tradition of the Virgin Birth must have been known to St. John, but that he deliberately passed it over for reasons which the author proceeds to state. It appears, however, to the present writer that a deeper examination of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel will demonstrate that although St. John gives no

¹ *The Foundations of the Creed*, p. 104.

² *The Fourth Gospel, its Purpose and Theology*, by Ernest F. Scott.

historical and circumstantial record of the Virgin Birth, his language carries the conviction that he accepted the truth of it; and that he practically re-states and re-affirms the narratives of the earlier Gospels.

Two preliminary points must be borne in mind : (1) First that the Prologue was addressed to readers already familiar with the witness of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and that therefore it was not necessary to repeat circumstantially the story of Nazareth and Bethlehem ; (2) secondly that St. John approaches the truth of the Incarnation from the divine side. A narrative of the Birth as an event in human history such as we have in the Synoptic Gospels would be alien to the purpose and style of the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel. But an allusion to that momentous fact as a point in the divine history of the manifestation of the Word is precisely what might have been expected of St. John. This is what we find ; and the following remarks are directed to discover the significance of the allusion.

The words in which St. John conveys the fact of the Incarnation are contained in the fourteenth and eighteenth verses of the first chapter of his Gospel. They are thus rendered in the Revised Version : 14, " And the Word became (*ἐγένετο*) flesh, and dwelt among us (and we beheld His glory, glory as of the only begotten (*μονογενοῦς*) from the Father), full of grace and truth . . . 18, No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son (*marg.* many very ancient authorities read *God only begotten*), which is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."

As the present argument is concerned only with St. John's testimony to the Virgin Birth, deeply interesting points in this passage which are irrelevant to the argument will be passed over. What is important to notice is that the expressions used here refer to the moment and to the effects of the Incarnation and to the incarnate Christ, whose pre-

existence and equality with God have been described in the preceding verses. It is the neglect of this point that has impaired the value of the Johannine testimony to the Virgin Birth.

This restriction to the moment of the Incarnation is marked by the use of the word ἐγένετο ("became" R.V.; "was made" A.V.). It is a term that could not be applied to the pre-existent Word. It could not be said of the Word that He "became" or "was made" in the beginning. It is suggestive, of course, of a new genesis or creation. Indeed the whole chapter is a "Book of Genesis,"¹ that is, of the new Creation in contrast to and in co-ordination with the first Creation.

It is further to be noted that in the historic accounts of the Incarnation γίγνεσθαι or its cognate γεννᾶσθαι is the term used. In Luke i. 35 we read: "That which is to be born (τὸ γεννώμενον) shall be called holy, the Son of God"; in Matthew i. 20: "That which is conceived in her (τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθέν) is of the Holy Ghost." Compare with these passages Philippians ii. 7, "being made (γενόμενος) in the likeness of men"; Galatians iv. 4, "God sent forth His Son born (γενόμενον) of a woman."

The evidence from the primitive creeds is to the same effect. In the third creed of St. Irenaeus the truth of the Incarnation is expressed: ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ; and in the first form of the Nicene Creed: τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς μονογενῆ.²

From these examples it seems to be a certain deduction that the important compound form ὁμογενής is also to be referred to the birth in time of the eternal Son of God.

The expression "the Word was created flesh" is one

¹ The verb γίγνεσθαι occurs twelve times in this chapter, in addition to the twice-repeated μονογενής.

² See Lumby, *History of the Creeds*, pp. 43, 50.

which suggests an event absolutely different from ordinary human generation. It is inconceivable that an ordinary human birth could be so described. The words which follow confirm this impression: "We beheld His glory, glory as of the only begotten of the Father." We dismiss the marginal version, (1) as conveying no intelligible meaning. For why should glory be ascribed in a special sense to an only begotten son of an (earthly) father? And (2) as an inadequate translation of what was doubtless a Christian formula of the Christ the Son of God.

St. John then takes care to explain that the glory which he and the other Apostles witnessed was a "glory of the only begotten of the Father"—an expression not only perfectly consistent with belief in the Virgin Birth and in the Divine generation of Christ, but plainly indicating it. If the thought of an earthly father had entered into the Evangelist's mind, this would have been the moment to declare it. But he describes a wholly exceptional beginning of life—a creation of the second Adam by the act of God corresponding to the creation of the first Adam. Once more God "made man in His own image."

The remarkable variant from the received text in verse 18 is now to be considered. In place of "the only begotten Son (*ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός*) which is in the bosom of the Father," many very ancient authorities, as stated in the margin of R.V., read, "God only begotten" (*μονογενὴς θεός*). Among these very ancient authorities are the Sinaitic *Σ*, Vatican *B*, and Alexandrian *A* codices, belonging to the fourth and fifth centuries. The reading is adopted by Tregelles and by Westcott and Hort. Certainly the substitution of the somewhat startling phrase "God only begotten" for the more usual expression "the only begotten Son" is far less probable than the reverse change. As Westcott and Hort remark, "both readings intrinsically

are free from objection." For the purposes of this article we accept the reading, based on exceptionally strong evidence and adopted by these eminent editors. "The text, though startling at first," Westcott and Hort remark, "simply combines in a single phrase the two attributes of the *Logos* marked before (*θεός* v. 1, *μονογενής* v. 14). Its sense is, One who is both *θεός* and *μονογενής*." ¹

We have already seen that verse 14 describes a point in the revelation of the Word who is God, when "He took flesh," an expression inapplicable to ordinary human birth, and that the description of the glory of the incarnate *Logos* as "glory of the only begotten of the Father" bears witness to the unique generation of Christ. We have also seen that the term *μονογενής* (only born) refers not to the pre-existent Christ, but to the incarnate Christ. This point is so important that it may be well to refer to other passages where this word, confined in its use to St. John, occurs. These are, in the Gospel, chapter iii. vv. 16 and 18, and in the First Epistle, chapter iv. 9. In the first and last of these passages the order of words is τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν μονογενῆ, "His Son, His only Son," thus distinguishing, as in this passage, the pre-existent from the incarnate Son of God.

It now remains to consider the significance of the expressions in these texts in regard to the definite fact of our Lord's Nativity. And here it is contended that the term *μονογενής* (only born) placed in close connexion with *θεός* (God) excludes the supposition of a human father. The word signifies "unique in generation," and therefore that our Lord was the One only begotten Son of the Father in that special sense which is exclusive of human paternity. This, we maintain, can be deduced from the words used by St. John independently of the Synoptic evidence of the Virgin Birth. But if for the sake of argument we accept the

¹ Westcott and Hort, *The N. T. in Greek*, vol. ii. p. 74.

Synoptic evidence, how intelligible the Johannine expressions are seen to be !

From this point of view the expressions used by St. John are in fact not only a confirmation, but a re-statement in all their particulars of the Synoptic accounts of the Virgin Birth. For the significance of a statement must be judged in reference to those to whom it was first made. And to readers acquainted with the fact of the Virginal Birth of Christ the expression "God only begotten" or "unique in generation" would convey a distinct meaning. A single phrase sometimes introduces a flood of recollection, and is in itself equivalent to a long chain of reasoning or to a whole chapter of national history, as when a judge concurs in the argued decision of a brother judge, or as when a poet or an orator recalls a famous passage in history or romance to his readers or listeners.

Thus for those who can place themselves mentally in the position of St. John's first readers this testimony by allusion is proof of a more convincing character, and much more unmistakably genuine than proof conveyed in a narrative. It not only amounts to a restatement of facts, but implies universal acceptance in the Church of the truth of the Virgin Birth of our Lord. ARTHUR CARR.

THE DEMONOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.

THE subject of Demonology is one upon which a great deal has been written, and the special department of the subject known as Gospel Demonology, with the very difficult questions which it raises, has exercised the minds of many able writers ; but it may well be questioned whether the Demonology of the *Old Testament* has received the full attention that it deserves. The matter is dismissed with a somewhat

brief reference in our great Bible Dictionaries, and in a series of articles on the general subject, which are otherwise second to none in their wide grasp of details and masterly treatment of the subject, by Mr. F. C. Conybeare in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*,¹ the writer, in referring to that section which it is now proposed to deal with, makes a statement which the facts do not seem to justify; he says: "It is singular that the Old Testament is free from Demonology, hardly containing more than one or two examples thereof." If this should actually [prove to be the case, it would be not only singular, but simply incomprehensible. While willingly granting that the actual, direct references to the different categories of demons in the Old Testament are far fewer than one would expect, being perhaps not more than forty to fifty in number, the *indirect* references which testify to the popular belief seem to be very considerable.

It is not proposed to deal here with the subject fully, that would, one feels, require a regular treatise; what we hope to attempt is to *illustrate* it by a few examples. The present article will be occupied with a brief Introduction to the subject; two subsequent articles will deal respectively with "Demonology as illustrated in the prophetic writings," and "Demonology as illustrated by the ninety-first psalm."

As regards *Literature*, we shall confine ourselves to the mention of a few standard works from which details have been gathered for the purpose of illustrating the views here set forth. As references to these works will be frequent, abbreviations are used, as indicated in brackets below.

Morris Jastrow, jun., *Die Religion Babylonians und Assyriens*, Giessen, 1902 (Jastrow).

A. Jeremias, *Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients*, Leipzig, 1904 (Jeremias).

¹ Vols. viii. ix. (1896, 1897).

O. Weber, *Dämonenbeschwörung bei den Babyloniern und Assyern*, in "Der alte Orient," vii. 4. Leipzig, 1906. (OW.)

O. Weber, *Die Literatur der Babylonier und Assyrer*, Leipzig, 1907 (OWlit.).

J. Wellhausen, *Reste Arabischen Heidenthums*, Berlin, 1897 (Wellh.).

W. Robertson Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*, London, 1894 (RS.).

P. M. Lagrange, *Études sur les religions Sémitiques*, Paris; 1903 (Lagrange).

F. Weber, *Jüdische Theologie auf Grund des Talmud und verwandter Schriften*, Leipzig, 1897 (FW.).

W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judenthums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, Berlin, 1903 (Bousset).

B. Stade, *Biblische Theologie des alten Testaments*, I. Tübingen, 1905 (Stade).

I.

There are certain considerations of a general character which show that one would naturally *expect* to find a system of Demonology in the Old Testament.

1. The belief in harmful (this is chronologically a more correct term than "evil") spirits is characteristic of a certain stage in the evolution of the religious beliefs of every race of men. It is so ineradicable an element in popular superstition that even among the most civilized nations of the present day there are numerous practices which testify to the universal belief in the activity of demons which existed even within quite recent times.¹ That Demonology is the necessary concomitant of Animism must be obvious to every student of Anthropology; and that there are many indications in the Old Testament of the remains of animistic conceptions is incontrovertible; one has but to recall the frequent allusions to holy trees, holy wells and holy stones, one has but to remember the original significance of such words as Elohim, Baal, Bethel, Nabi, etc., to realize at once that Animism and Polydaemonism were once as much at home in Syria (as they are indeed to a great extent at the

¹ It is well known that such beliefs are prevalent in the country districts of most, if not all, European countries even at the present day.

present time) as everywhere else.¹ And therefore one might reasonably expect to find traces of a more or less developed Demonology in the Old Testament.

2. Among those nations which are, racially, closely connected with the Israelites we find a very extended belief in demons. The Canaanites at the time of the Israelite invasion were in the stage of Polydaemonism ; they practised ancestor-worship and venerated the ancient tribal heroes at their traditional tombs, as well as under holy trees and beside holy wells.² Like other Semites they recognized the activity of a spirit, sometimes kindly disposed, at other times harmful (corresponding roughly to the later good and evil spirits,—angels and demons), in the storm, in the desert, in the tree, well and stone, in the heat of summer and cold of winter, in the clouds and stars, as well as in animals. They did not make the same clear distinction between gods, demons, men and animals that is characteristic of later and more civilized communities ; in a word, Polydaemonism, but not as yet Polytheism, was in vogue.³ In the same way the Phœnicians, though owing to special causes they had attained a far higher civilization than the other Canaanite nations, practised a religion which had a like origin, a religion which, like that of the Canaanites, was developed from conceptions of a primitive character, and whose content was most probably very similar to that which the early Arabs practised.⁴ The belief of the Arabs concerning demons is, however, more significant, for the great Arabian peninsula was the primeval home of the Semitic race,⁵ and Arab belief and practice,

¹ Cf. Stade, 98, 114 ff.

² RS. 168, 172.

³ Cf. Stade, 48 ff. ; A. v. Gall, *Altisraelitische Kultstätten*, passim (Giessen, 1898).

⁴ Pietschmann, *Geschichte der Phönizier*, 155 ff. (Berlin, 1889) ; W. v. Landau, *Die Phönizier*, pp. 5 ff. (in "Der alte Orient," ii. 4, Leipzig, 1901).

⁵ O. Weber, *Arabien vor dem Islam*, pp. 2 ff. (in "Der alte Orient," iii. 1).

even as found at the present day, go back to a hoary antiquity ; Mohammedanism scarcely affected the popular superstitions concerning the *Ginn* at all.¹ Lastly, the demonology of the Babylonians and Assyrians was of a very elaborate and important character, and owing to the immense influence which Babylonian thought and practice had both upon the ancient Israelites as well as upon the Jews of the post-exilic period, Babylonian demonology is of the greatest importance in connexion with our present investigation. So that, secondly, the fact that an elaborate system of demonology existed among the Canaanites, the Arabs and the Babylonians, all closely connected, racially, with the Israelites, raises the natural presumption that these latter, too, had a like system, and that we should therefore expect to find traces of it in their literature.

3. Then, again, in the Judaism of post-biblical times we find a system of demonology which is simply colossal.² One would reasonably suppose that this had its roots in the beliefs of earlier times within the nation itself ; but it is usually objected that the demonology of later Judaism is really the product of Babylonian, Persian, and Greek influence. Nobody can for a moment doubt that these influences have been very strong, and that Jewish demonology owes much to them, but the question is whether *all* (Babylonian, Persian, Greek and Jewish) do not trace their beliefs on this subject back to a common, very early source, of which the ancestors of all these nations possessed a common stock, varying of course in details, but identical in fundamentals ? It seems difficult to doubt this in view of what we know of the religion of ancient Phœnicia and of the Canaanites generally, and more especially in view of what

¹ It only propounded a new theory as to the origin of demons, in that it was taught that the gods of the heathen were demons.

² FW. 251 ff. ; Bousset, 331 ff.

we know of Arab demonology. While, as we shall see, there is great similarity in the details of all these systems, there is sufficient difference in those of Babylonians, Arabs and Jews to admit of a certain amount of matter proper to each, sufficient individuality in each of the three systems to warrant exclusive proprietorship. If this is so, if the demonology of later Judaism can lay claim to a character of its own, then there is at least a justification (of course it does not amount to proof) for believing that it is based in part upon earlier teaching, and that signs of this ought to be found in the Old Testament.

We have approached the subject so far with our eyes entirely turned away from the Old Testament, having regard only to what external facts might lead one to expect in reference to the presence or otherwise of a system of demonology in the Old Testament. In *turning* to the Old Testament our first feeling is one of surprise that apparently there is so little of such a system to be found; further study, however, reveals the fact that the absence of references to demons is not so great as appears at first sight; one becomes convinced, on the contrary, that many things which upon the surface seem to have nothing to do with the subject, do as a matter of fact bear witness to its wide prevalence among the people; words and phrases, which for the people of the time bore an obvious reference to popular beliefs concerning demons, have for us lost much or all of their significance, and it is only by the comparative method that their real meaning, for those to whom they were addressed, can be revealed.

It is willingly conceded that the number of references to the subject is not nearly so great as one would expect this is most likely to be accounted for by the fact that the teachers of Israel conceived that any power which was ascribed to demons might tend to detract from the single and

unique might of Jahwe ; the practices and beliefs of the surrounding nations afforded ample proof that demonology was a danger to Monotheism. The prophets themselves believed in the activity of demons ; the problem was how to safeguard monotheistic conceptions in presence of the, to them, undoubted existence of demons. The procedure was, as far as we can gather, a two-fold one ; to some extent, though it is impossible to say to how great an extent, passages in the Old Testament writings in which a reference to demons seemed to be a danger to pure Jahwe-worship were altered, in some instances this process may be seen at work, Genesis xiv. 3, 8, 10, e.g., where עִמְקֵי הַשְּׂדִיִּים should in all probability be pointed עַל הַשְּׂדִיִּים, “the valley of the Shēdim” = “evil spirits” (see on these further below) ;¹ the LXX, instead of transliterating the proper name Siddim, uses the adjective ἀλυσκή ; that there was some doubt as to what the word really meant is seen from the fact that the Samaritan, Aquila and the Targum of Onkelos all differ from the Hebrew and the Greek, and read עַל הַשְּׂדִיִּים, “the valley of the fields,” a rendering which (*pace* Dillmann)² does not seem to commend itself in view of verse 10, which tells us that “the vale of Siddim was full of slime pits.” Again, in Hosea xii. 12 (E.v. 11) בְּנֵי לַשְּׂדִיִּים זָבָחוּ should assuredly be בְּנֵי לַשְּׂדִיִּים זָבָחוּ,³ “in Gilgal they sacrifice to the demons” ;⁴ the LXX reads Γαλαὰδ ἄρχοντες (= שָׂרִים) θυσιάζοντες ; in the Hebrew, שָׂרִים at the end of the verse might well have been a word-play. A somewhat similar emendation of the original text is found in 2 Kings xxiii. 8 ; . . . וַנִּתֵּן אֶת-בְּמוֹת הַשְּׂעִרִים . . .

¹ Cf. Stade, 189.

² *Die Genesis*, p. 234 (Leipzig, 1886).

³ Cf. Nowack, *Die Kleinen Propheten*, p. 76 (Göttingen, 1897).

⁴ Cf. Deut. xxxii. 17, וַיִּזְבְּחוּ לַשְּׂרִים ; the same phrase is found in Ps. cvi.

(“And brake down the high places of the gates”) does not give good sense, the suggested form of what was originally written *בְּמַת הַשְּׁעָרִים* (“the high-place, or sanctuary, of the desert-demons” [lit. he-goats])¹ gives perfect sense and accords far better with the context (on *שְׁעָרִים* see below); this worship is prohibited in Leviticus xvii. 7, “And they shall no more sacrifice their sacrifices unto the he-goats” (*שְׁעָרִים*).

In the second place, actions which most likely were originally ascribed to demons working independently were explained, on the one hand, as showing that all spirits, whether good or bad, were but the agents of Jahwe, on the other, that there was no intermediary and that Jahwe Himself acted directly. It is only on some such supposition that one can understand a passage like 1 Samuel xvi. 14 *וּבְעַתְּמוֹ רִיחַדְרָעָה מֵאֵת יְהוָה*: (“And an evil spirit from Jahwe troubled him”); the word *בְּעַת* clearly shows that the evil spirit (*πνεῦμα πονηρόν* as it is called in the LXX here, precisely as in the Gospels) is really to be differentiated from Jahwe in its action, for it is an intensive form meaning to “make afraid,” “inspire terror”; it is not Jahwe who does this but the evil spirit; the words *מֵאֵת יְהוָה* would, one feels, be better away, and were probably not there originally. Or again, to illustrate this further, according to Exodus xi. 4 ff., xii. 23a, it is Jahwe Himself who slays the firstborn in Egypt, while in xii. 23b it is the “destroyer” who is to do this; in Numbers xxii. 22 ff., it is at one time Jahwe, at another His “messenger” who threatens Balaam.² It may be stated as not improbable that the evolution of thought passed through the following stages: an original animistic stage, in which some spirits were harmful, others

¹ See Kittel's edition (*Biblia Hebraica*) in loc. Cf. Stade, 188.

² See Stade, 98 ff.

more kindly disposed ; then followed the introduction of Jahwe-worship, in which Jahwe was originally *primus inter pares*, and finally issued as supreme ; hereupon came a stage in which it became difficult to decide in how far it was consonant with the dignity of Jahwe to believe Him personally active among His people, and in how far it was permissible to countenance the belief in intermediary agents ; for the danger would always exist in this stage of these latter becoming objects of worship ; last of all came the stage in which the sole worship of Jahwe—Monotheism—had become so firmly established that there was little danger of His having any real rival, so that the popular belief in demons might now go on unchecked. To be sure, these stages can never have been definitely marked off from each other, one must have run into another, so that the inconsequent statements which we find on the subject in the Old Testament are the most natural thing in the world, and precisely what we should expect to find ; and the text-adaptations referred to above were demanded by the different conceptions which were characteristic of these stages, and therefore perfectly legitimate. But this would account to a great extent for the, comparatively speaking, few *direct* references to demons, though the actual number we believe to be far greater than is usually supposed.

It was stated just now that it was only by the comparative method that the real meaning of many passages, i.e. a reference to demons, could be revealed ; as both, our examination of passages from the prophetic writings, as well of the ninety-first psalm, will be illustrated by Arab and Babylonian demonology, as well as by that of later Judaism, here will be the place to give a brief *résumé* of some of the many points common to all three ; and this will go far towards offering an *a priori* presumption that an Old Testament system of demonology exists. For the Arab beliefs go, confessedly,

back to a very hoary antiquity, to a time when the common stock of Semitic demonology was the property of a race which had not yet been so widely dispersed as when it appears upon the horizon of history. Babylonian demonology, again, while inheriting the common stock, developed conceptions of a special character which exercised a strong influence upon early Israel as well as upon the post-exilic Jews. Later Judaism, finally, while owing much to external, must surely reflect, as well, elements which must have been national property for many centuries. If then we find elements of a specific character common to these three systems of demonology, systems which existed respectively before, during and after the biblical period, the presumption will be very strong that a demonology should also exist in the Old Testament, could we but uncover it.

II.

We proceed now to indicate certain beliefs concerning demons which are common to Arab, Babylonian and Jewish demonology.

(a) All three systems insist on the immense numbers of demons that exist in the world. The Arabic term *Ginn* is a collective word; the singular *Gánn* is a derivative from this.¹ Among the Babylonians the large number of proper names for demons points to their multiplicity; in one text it is said that the demons cover the whole world, in another that "they cover the earth like grass."² The Rabbis taught that the demons gather themselves together in companies (*Berachoth* 51a); according to *Tanchuma Mishpatim* 19 the whole world is full of these "harmful spirits" ("Mazikin"); the number is given by one Rabbi as seven and a half millions, and elsewhere it is stated that every man has

¹ Wellh. 148, 149.

² Jastrow, 355, 357; OWlit. 148.

ten thousand of them at his right hand, and a thousand at his left.¹

(b) According to Arab teaching the *Ginn* are the ghostly shadows of nations that have perished; certain ruined sites, such as Higr and Niçibin,² were pointed out as being inhabited by the spirits of those who in days gone by lived there. All burial-places were believed to be full of demons.³ This connexion between the demons and the spirits of the departed is likewise a strongly marked characteristic in Babylonian belief; here it was taught, for example, that the demons were the messengers of Ereshkigal, queen of the realm of the dead; Namtaru, one of the worst demons, issued, it was said, from the nether-world; Utukku, "who harms those who dwell in the wilderness," is also a spirit of the dead; and closely connected with him is Ekimmu, "the departed soul," who for some reason or other can find no rest, and wanders over the earth injuring men whenever opportunity offers; his anger is especially directed against those with whom he has had any relations while on earth, and it is supposed to be partly their fault that he is unable to re-enter the realm of the dead and find rest.³ If, for any reason, the spirits of the departed were unable to enter the realm of the dead, they had to wander about the earth until the hindrance was taken away; while thus banished from their rightful abode they made it their business to harm all those with whom they had had any connexions while on earth, especially relatives; for, according to Babylonian ideas, it was owing to the neglect of those who were left that the departed spirits were unable to get to rest. Ekimmu would thus appear to have been regarded as a kind of champion or leader of these. It is not clear what, precisely,

¹ FW. 254 ff.; cf. Mk. v. 9, Luke viii. 30. See the writer's art. on "Demons" in Hastings' *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*.

² Wellh. 150.

³ OWlit. 148, 167.

were the causes which hindered the departed from entering into rest ; but among them must certainly have been neglect of the prescribed burial rites, more especially when a body remained unburied, or lay in foreign soil ; neglect to bring the proper offerings for the dead would also, doubtless, have been considered another cause of the restlessness of departed spirits. That Jewish teaching regarding the connexion between the departed and demons ran on the same lines is clear from the fact that the head of the demons, Sammael (identical with Satan) was known as the " Angel of death." ¹ Among the Jews, too, cemeteries were one of the favourite spots in which demons congregated.² It is, moreover, possible that a faint echo of this connexion is to be seen in the drinking of the cup of mourners in modern synagogues ; that this is the remnant of some ancient custom concerning offerings for the dead can scarcely be doubted.³

(c) All sickness is due to demons ; thus the Arabs taught that fainting fits, epilepsy, gout, fever, epidemics of every kind, and above all madness, were every one of them the result of the harmful activity of evil-disposed demons.⁴ The same is found in the Babylonian and Jewish systems ; thus, among the Babylonians there was a demon of headache, Labartu and Namtaru were pest-demons, and there were many storm-demons by whom men were harmed ⁵ ; Ashakku was the demon of burning fever, and Dimetum was " the evil curse." ⁶ Among the Jews Shabiri was the demon who brought blindness, while there was another demon of leprosy, another of heart-disease, another of fever, and there was also the storm-demon.⁷

¹ FW. 253.

² Cf. Luke. viii. 27, etc.

³ For the connexion between demons and departed spirits see *Bk. of Jubilees*, xxii. 17 ; *Syb. Orac.*, Proem. 20-22. (Ed. Kautsch ; Tübingen, 1900) ; cf. also Targum of Onkelos, Lev. xvii. 7.

⁴ Wellh. 155.

⁵ Jastrow, 350.

⁶ OWLit. 148, 165.

⁷ Bousset, 334.

(d) All three systems agree that at night the power of demons is greatest ; for this reason the Arabs covered the children's faces at night-time,—presumably this was to avert the evil eye,—every vessel was covered over, lights were lit, and the doors were locked. It was only at the rising of the morning star that the demons dispersed. Among the Babylonians we read that Alu wanders about at nights ; he is to be found in ruins, where he hides, waiting to fall upon any luckless passer-by ; he creeps into bedrooms and robs the weary of their sleep ; he is described as running about at nights “like a dog.”¹ In the same way, the demon Gallu sweeps through the streets after dark making every place insecure.² So, too, in the Jewish system it is taught that demons are most harmful from dusk until cock-crowling ; at nights they surround houses and injure every one that falls into their hands ; they slay children if found out after dark. As soon as the cock crows their power is at an end (*Bereshith rabba* c. 36).³

(e) Again, according to all three systems, it was believed that demons had a special predilection for certain places. As we have already seen, the Arabs held that desert places,⁴ burial-grounds and ruined sites where men used to live were the special kinds of places where demons loved to congregate. With this Babylonian teaching agrees ; Namtaru, it is said, “rushes over the wilderness like a storm-wind,” Utukku and Ekimmu with their followers hover about in desert places and in mountainous regions, they are also to be found near tombs and in cemeteries.⁵ This is entirely in accordance with Jewish belief on the subject ; they dwell mostly

¹ Cf. Ps. lix. 6, 14. ² OW. 11, OWlit. 148.

³ FW. 255. One cannot help recalling the account of St. Peter's denial, Matt. xxvi. 34, etc.

⁴ They believed that the weird moaning of the wind in the wilderness was the voice of demons, which “caused the locality to speak” (Wellh. 150) ; cf. “the howling wilderness,” Deut. xxxii. 10.

⁵ Cf. OWlit. 148.

in the wilderness (*Berachoth* 3a), in waterless spots and among the tombs.¹ They are also to be found in all unclean places, e.g. in the *בית הכנסת*; the same is true of Arab belief.²

(f) Further, the Arabs teach that demons have the power of becoming visible or invisible at will; a generic term for them is "the hidden ones"; they have also the power of assuming various forms.³ Among the Babylonians it is said that "Ashakku places himself by the side of a man, and nobody sees him";⁴ all demons could render themselves invisible; when they appeared in visible form it was usually in some animal that they did so⁵ (see below). This power of becoming invisible and of assuming different shapes, whether animal or human, is likewise true of Jewish demonology; Satan, the head of the demons, is said, for example, to appear in the form of a beautiful woman (*Kiddushin* 81a) or of a beggar (*Ibid.*), Shēija appears in the shape of a bull (*Baba Kamma* 21a); one is never safe from demons on account of their thus appearing suddenly, or because of their unseen presence.⁶

(g) Another striking feature common to all three systems is the relation believed to exist between demons and certain animals. Concerning Arab belief the following details are of interest; some animals scent out the approach of demons when as yet men are unaware of their presence; thus, when a donkey brays or a cock crows it is a warning of the approach of a demon. Demons appear in the form of wild beasts in the wilderness;⁷ even domestic animals are sometimes in league with them. Between some birds and demons there exists quite a friendship; such birds are crows, wood-

¹ FW. 254; cf. Mk. v. 2, Luke viii. 29, xi. 20.

² FW. 171; Wellh. 150. ³ Wellh. 149, 150; RS. 120. ⁴ OW. 16.

⁵ Jastrow, 281. ⁶ FW. 252 ff.; Bousset, 333.

⁷ In this connexion it is worth noting that among the Phœnicians the lion was regarded as the incarnation of a demon (Pietschmann, *Op. cit.* p. 193).

peckers, owls and others ; owls are regarded as incarnations of the spirits of the departed ; ostriches ¹ are used by the demons for riding upon, this is also true of foxes. But the closest connexion of all is that between the demons and *serpents* ; *Gann* and *Ghul* have become synonymous for "serpent" ; this applies also to *Shaitân* (=Satan).² It is no exaggeration when Wellhausen says that "the zoology of Islam is at once a demonology." Then, as regards Babylonian belief, it was believed that Utukku, Ekimmu and Alu appeared in the form of bulls ; the same applies to Shedu, one of the foremost demons. Indeed, all demons were conceived of as normally dwelling in animals ; it was the way in which the Babylonians explained to themselves the problem as to where the permanent abode of demons was, seeing that they were excluded from the realms of the dead. Among such animals those were chosen which were the most likely to inspire sudden fear, more especially serpents, which appeared suddenly, one knew not whence, and disappeared as suddenly, one knew not whither ; or again, scorpions, which were very injurious, and hid in spots where they often could not be noticed until too late. Many demons were also supposed to appear in bird form, or they were conceived of as hybrid monsters, birds with the heads of lions or donkeys, and the like ³ ; there were similar conceptions among the Arabs.⁴ In the Jewish system it was taught that bulls, mosquitoes, donkeys and, above all, serpents were in league with the demons ; in *Pesachim* 112*b* there is the warning : "Do not stand still when a bull comes from the field, for Satan dances between his horns." Satan is, of course, identical with the serpent in the garden of Eden (*Sifre* 138*b*,

¹ RS. 129 *note*.

² Wellh. 152 ff. ; RS. 120, 121, 133.

³ Jastrow, 281, and compare the representation of these hybrid monsters in Babylonian religious art.

⁴ Wellh. 152.

Beresh. rabba c. 22, *Shabbath* 55*b*) ; and, according to *Baba Kamma* 16*a*, the *Shedim* were originally serpents, and became what they are by a process of evolution.¹

(*b*) Lastly, a very significant *trait* common to all three systems is the belief in different *species* of demons. The Arabs regarded them as being divided into clans and tribes much in the same way as they themselves were.² Examples of the same kind of thing among the Babylonians are : the followers of Utukku, who form a different category from the followers of Ekimmu. So, too, the Jews reckoned, among the various species of demons, the *Shedim* (from the root שׁוּר, "to be violent"), the *Lilîn* (from *Lilith*, "the night-hag," whose followers they were [see further below]), and the *Ruchin* (from the root רָחַרַח, "wind"); all these, however, come under the general term *Mazzikin*, which includes all the "harmful" spirits.³

These details form a very brief *résumé* of elements common to Arab, Babylonian and Jewish Demonology ; they will be supplemented by some illustrations when we deal with the ninety-first psalm.

III.

The foregoing considerations certainly seem to offer some *a priori* grounds for expecting to find a system of demonology in the Old Testament. But, strictly speaking, there are some other considerations which ought to be taken into account in order to see how strong the case is for believing that numbers of indirect and covert references to demonology are to be found there. It is, however, possible to do no more here than make a mere reference to these. The whole subject of *Serpents* ought to be studied in reference to the Old Testament in this connexion ; we have briefly alluded to the relation supposed to exist between these and demons in

¹ FW. 252, 254, 256. ² Wellh. 149 ; RS. 120 ff. ³ FW. 254 ff.

the Arab, Babylonian and Jewish systems ; a thorough study would probably show that in such passages as Exodus vii. 9 ff., Numbers xxi. 6 ff., Deuteronomy viii. 15, xxxii. 24, Isaiah xiv. 29, xxx. 6, lix 5, Jeremiah viii. 17, the idea of demons was originally present.¹ Another and altogether larger subject is that of Old Testament Angelology ; the very clear indications of this in the Old Testament amounts *ipso facto* to a proof that a corresponding demonology also existed there. Finally, and most important of all, there are the Old Testament conceptions concerning the departed, together with the mourning customs, details of which abound in the Old Testament ; many of these latter can be shown to be closely connected with belief in demons.² We referred above to the connexion between demons and departed spirits ; one has but to recall the mention of the *Rephaim*, and to remember that indications as to ancestor-worship are not wanting in the Old Testament, to realize the extended scope for a demonology which such beliefs offer.

How ineradicable the belief in demons is, and what an all-embracing part they play, in the everyday life of the Arabs, who according to the best authorities have retained their ancient Semitic beliefs and practices from time immemorial, can be seen by the study of such works as Doughty's *Arabia Deserta* and Curtiss' *Primitive Semitic Religion To-day*.

W. O. E. OESTERLEY.

A FURTHER NOTE ON THE CRETANS.

IN the EXPOSITOR for last October I drew attention to a possible explanation of the severe language which is employed in the Epistle of Titus (Tit. i. 12) with regard to the

¹ See, for example, the interesting article "The subtle Serpent," by Mr. G. St. Clair in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, vii. pp. 40 ff. (Oct. 1905).

² E.g. rending the clothes, wailing, and the conception of the "unclean-ness" of dead bodies ; cf. the writer's art. "The uncleanness of dead bodies" in *Church and Synagogue*, ix. 16 ff.