

**CYCLOPÆDIA**  
**OF**  
**BIBLICAL LITERATURE**

**EDITED BY**

**JOHN KITTO, D.D., F.S.A.,**

**EDITOR OF 'THE PICTORIAL BIBLE,' AUTHOR OF 'THE HISTORY AND PHYSICAL  
GEOGRAPHY OF PALESTINE,' &c. &c.**

**ILLUSTRATED BY NUMEROUS ENGRAVINGS**

---

**IN TWO VOLUMES.**

**VOL. I.**

---

**NEW YORK:**  
**MARK H. NEWMAN, 199 BROADWAY.**  
**CINCINNATI:**  
**WILLIAM H. MOORE & CO., 110 MAIN STREET.**  
**1846.**

(Lev. xi. 16); Joseph is called 'a fruitful bough whose daughters (branches) run over the wall,' (Gen. xlix. 22).

The significations of the word 'daughter' in its scriptural use might be more minutely distinguished; but they may all be referred to one or other of these heads.

Respecting the condition of daughters in families, see art. WOMEN and MARRIAGE.

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

Ample as are at first sight the materials for his history, a closer examination shows that great judgment and caution are needed in the use of them. His battle with Goliath, it is well known, involves difficulties of an embarrassing kind. In fact, it represents Saul and Abner as unacquainted with the person of David (1 Sam. xvii. 55-58), while the preceding chapter makes David the favourite attendant and musician of Saul. The Vatican Sept. employs the bold remedy of cutting out from ch. xvii. the twenty verses, 12-31, and the last four, 55-58, as well as the five first verses of the next chapter. But even so, David's unacquaintance with arms and preference of the sling to the sword and spear, which remains in vers. 33-40, is in conflict with ch. xvi. 18, which represents him as 'a mighty valiant man, and a man of war,' and Saul's 'armour-bearer' (ver. 21). It is, moreover, morally impossible that the verses wanting in the Vatican Sept. can have been added to the Hebrew text *after* its first translation into Greek. The same codex has extirpated vers. 9-11 of ch. xviii., and has re-modelled ver. 28, obviously in order to give continuity and consistency to the narrative. We must, then, look on the text here contained in our common version as having neither more nor less *external* authority than all the rest of the first book of Samuel. As a softer remedy, mere transposition may be attempted; but it will not succeed. The jealousy instantly kindled in Saul's bosom by the songs of the women when David was returning from slaying the Philistines, is inconsistent with the unsuspecting affection felt by Saul towards the simple shepherd in ch. xvi. 19-22. It has been argued from ch. xvii. 12-14, where David is introduced to us as if anew, that the original writer of these

words did not also pen the preceding chapter. There is some weight in this; yet it is not so decisive as the contradictory representation of David above alluded to. On the other hand, ch. xvii. 15 was written by one who had ch. xvi. before his eyes, and wished to account for David's not being with Saul, though he was his armour-bearer. So, indeed, Josephus distinctly perceived. 'Saul,' says he, 'sent David to his father Jesse; being satisfied with his three sons,' &c. &c. (Joseph. *Antiq.* vi. 9, 2). Once more, even the Vatican codex of the Sept. leaves, in xvii. 54, the startling statement that David brought the head of the Philistine to Jerusalem. At that time not Jerusalem only, but its suburbs also, were in the power of the Jebusites, who, in 1 Chron. xi. 4, are called 'the inhabitants of the land.' Now, even allowing that in time of peace Israelites were admissible into Jerusalem, there is no conceivable reason why David should have carried his trophy thither, while it was a foreign and heathenish city. On the other hand, a late writer who was accustomed to think of Jerusalem as the metropolis of Judæa, might easily introduce such a statement. These difficulties, collectively, have induced some to regard the whole seventeenth chapter as from a later hand than the rest; but it is evident that if we omit it, we lose the clue to the rapid elevation of David and the jealousy of Saul, to say nothing of ch. xix. 5 and xxi. 9. Every theory, in short, is intrinsically unphilosophical, which fancies that it may cut out what it finds to be inconsistent, and then imagines that the authority of what is left is unimpaired; for the same hand which has introduced the passages which we reject, may have taken many liberties with that which we receive.

We learn from 1 Chron. xxix. 29 that the life of David was written by Sathuel, Nathan, and Gad; also, from 2 Sam. i. 18 it may be probably inferred that other information concerning him was contained in the poems of Jasher. None of these works are before us in their original form. Materials from them have, however, been worked up by a later hand, which, it would seem, has sometimes adopted whole passages from them, sometimes has modified them and added connecting parts and explanations. Such, at least, is the conclusion to which every one will find himself strongly pressed by a close criticism of the whole narrative. The change of name from *Ishui* to *Ishbosheth* (1 Sam. xiv. 49 and 2 Sam. ii. 8, &c.) appears to indicate that compositions by different hands have been put together. That a duplicate account is found of the origin of the proverb, 'Is Saul also among the prophets?' seems undeniable (ch. x. 1-12 and xix. 20-24); and if a single clear case of this sort is admitted to exist, various others must probably fall under the same head. On this ground, doubtless, it is, that the Vatican Sept. has omitted ch. xviii. 10-11, since this attack of Saul on David's life 'on the morrow' is hard to reconcile with all that follows, and the verses appear to be a duplicate of ch. xix. 9, 10. Less certain duplicates, and yet not free from difficulty, are the following. The men of Ziph twice betray David to Saul (ch. xxiii. 19 and xxvi. 1); David twice spares Saul's life under circumstances highly unlikely to recur (ch. xxiv. and xxvi.), and on each occasion Saul is melted into tenderness. The former event ends with an

oath of David to Saul, which appears like a final termination of hostility; while the opening of ch. xxvii. embarrasses us by its extreme abruptness, when the very opposite result might have been expected from that which immediately precedes. Comparing also ch. xxi. 10-15 with ch. xxvii., it may seem that David's sojourn at Gath has been told twice over; for though each pair of events separately might, without physical impossibility, happen twice, yet, viewed collectively, the repetition of so many pairs surpasses all human probabilities. It has been necessary to premise so much, to show why we are disposed to be satisfied with rough results from the accounts of David's earlier life; which, as happens with all celebrated men who rise from a humble station, can hardly have been chronicled with the same precautions as those of his reign.

Even in regard to matters properly public, obscurity attaches both to the *numbers* which we read in our text, and occasionally to the *order* of events. On the difficulties found in the chronology of this period some remarks will be needed under the article SAUL. It more properly belongs to this place to observe that David is made thirty years old, and Ishbosheth forty, when Jonathan, elder brother of Ishbosheth, dies (2 Sam. ii. 10, 11); which appears to make too great a disparity of age between Jonathan and David. A sort of fatality seems attached to the number forty, which constantly occurs very inopportunistically. In 2 Sam. xv. 7 this number is extravagantly erroneous; yet the reading is at least older than the Sept. version, and Van der Hooght gives no various reading of the Hebrew. We seem justified in doubting whether forty years can have been the real age of Ishbosheth: twenty would agree better with the probabilities of the case. Again, Ishbosheth reigned two years, though David reigned over the tribe of Judah alone in Hebron for seven years and a half; where is the interval of five years and a half to be placed? Since it is certain that a *part* of David's reign over all Israel was spent by him at Hebron (for Jerusalem was not conquered by him till after all the tribes had joined him, 1 Chron. xi. 4). The easiest and perhaps a necessary solution is this, that the words in 2 Sam. ii. 11 and v. 5 are lax, and ought to be re-written thus: 'In Hebron he reigned seven years and six months, at first over the tribe of Judah only [viz. for two or three years], and afterwards over all Israel.'

Three chapters in the second book of Samuel chiefly contain the military successes of David; but there is some reason to believe that we cannot adhere to the order of the events there given. The mention of the Ammonites in ch. viii. 12 seems to be by anticipation; for in the opening of ch. x. we find that relations of personal friendship still subsisted between David and the king of the Ammonites. Reasons will shortly be stated for thinking that his first campaign against the king of Zobah has been placed too early; and the numbers of the chariots and horsemen engaged in the war can scarcely be defended. Of this further notice will be taken. Again, when the tribes of Israel came to Hebron to welcome David to the kingdom, his own tribe of Judah, in the midst of which Hebron lay, brought only 6800 men, less than those of the insignificant tribe of Simeon, who are reckoned there at 7100 (1 Chron. xii. 24, 25), while of the equally petty tribe of Dan there

are 28,000. It has been said in defence of these numbers that Judah had been miserably reduced by the proximity of the Philistines; but why should Simeon and Dan have suffered less? Nor would that account for the fact, that in the celebrated numbering of the people by Joab (2 Sam. xxiv. 9) there are 800,000 warriors in Israel, and 500,000 in Judah alone; or, according to 1 Chron. xxi. 5, in Israel 1,100,000, and in Judah 470,000. The two results in Kings and in Chronicles are here inconsistent; in both also we see the marks of a later narrator, who is accustomed to use the words Israel and Judah to mean *the ten* and *the two* tribes. Abundant illustration might be accumulated to the same effect, if this were the proper place for it.

The life of David naturally divides itself into three portions:—I. The time which he lived under Saul. II. His reign over Judah in Hebron. III. His reign over all Israel.

I. In the first period we may trace the origin of all his greatness. His susceptible temperament, joined to his devotional tendencies, must, at a very early age, have made him a favourite pupil of the prophets, whose peculiar mark was the harp and the psalm (1 Sam. x. 1-12 and xix. 20-24; see also 2 Kings iii. 15). His hospitable reception, when in distress, by Ahimelech the priest, and the atrocious massacre innocently brought by him on Nob, the city of the priests (1 Sam. xxi. and xxii. 9-19), must have deeply affected his generous nature, and laid the foundation of his cordial affection for the whole priestly order, whose ministrations he himself helped to elevate by his devotional melodies. At an early period he attracted the notice of Samuel; and if we are to arrange events according to their probable connection, we may believe that *after* David had been driven away from Saul and his life several times attempted, Samuel ventured on the solemn step of anointing him king. Whenever this took place, it must have produced on David a profound impression, and prepared him to do that in which Saul had so eminently failed, viz. to reconcile his own military government with a filial respect for the prophets and an honourable patronage of the priesthood. Besides this, he became knit into a bond of brotherhood with his heroic comrades, to whom he was eminently endeared by his personal self-denial and liberality (1 Sam. xxx. 21-31; 1 Chron. xi. 18). This, indeed, drew after it one most painful result, viz. the necessity of enduring the turbulence of his violent but able nephew Joab; nor could we expect that of a band of freebooters many should be like David. Again, during his outlawry David became acquainted in turn not only with all the wild country in the land, but with the strongholds of the enemy all round. By his residence among the Philistines he must have learned all their arts and weapons of war, in which it is reasonable to believe the Israelites previously inferior (1 Sam. xiii. 19-23). With Nahash the Ammonite he was in intimate friendship (2 Sam. x. 2); to the king of Moab he entrusted the care of his parents (1 Sam. xxii. 3); from Achish of Gath he received the important present of the town of Ziklag (1 Sam. xxvii. 6). It must, however, be confessed that the details of the last passage, without professing to be miraculous, go beyond the limits of probability; for if we even suppose that David could

commit the massacres there described, merely in order to hide his own perfidy, it is still incredible that the secret could have been kept and Achish continue to trust him (xxviii. 2, and xxix. 3). That Ziklag was a strong place may be inferred from 1 Chron. xii. 1, 20. The celebrity acquired in successful guerilla warfare, even in modern days, turns the eyes of whole nations on a chieftain; and in an age which regarded personal heroism as the first qualification of a general (1 Chron. xi. 6) and of a king, to triumph over the persecutions of Saul gave David the fairest prospects of a kingdom. That he was able to escape the malice of his enemy was due *in part* to the direct help given him by the nations round, who were glad to keep a thorn rankling in Saul's side; *in part* also to the indirect results of their invasions (1 Sam. xxiii. 27).

The account transmitted to us of David's dangers and escapes in this first period is too fragmentary to work up into a history: nevertheless, it seems to be divisible into two parts, differing in character. During the former he is a fugitive and outlaw in the land of Saul, hiding in caves, pitching in the wilderness, or occasionally with great risk entering walled cities (1 Sam. xxiii. 7): in the latter he abandons his native soil entirely, and lives among the Philistines as one of their chieftains (xxvii. 1). While a rover in the land of Judah, his position (to our eyes) is anything but honourable; being a focus, to which 'all who were in distress, in debt, or discontented gathered themselves' (xxii. 2). Yet as the number of his followers became large (six hundred, we read, xxiii. 13), and David knew how to conciliate the neighbouring sheep-masters by his urbanity and kind services, he gradually felt himself to be their protector and to have a right of maintenance and tribute from them. Hence he resents the refusal of Nabal to supply his demands, as a clear injustice; and, after David's anger has been turned away by the prudent policy of Abigail, in blessing her for saving him from slaying Nabal and every male of his family, the thought seems not to have entered his mind that the intention of such a massacre was more guilty than Nabal's refusal to pay him tribute (xxv. 34). This whole narrative is characteristic and instructive. By his marriage with Abigail he afterwards probably became rich (for she seems to have been a widow at her own disposal), and on passing immediately after into the land of the Philistines, he was enabled to assume a more dignified place. Becoming possessed of the stronghold of Ziklag, he now appeared like a legitimate chieftain with fixed possessions, and no longer a mere vagabond and freebooter. This was accordingly a transition-state in which David was prepared for assuming the kingdom over Judah. In Ziklag he was joined, not, as before, by mere outcasts from Israelitish life, but by men of consideration and tried warriors (1 Chron. xii. 1-22), not only of the tribe of Judah, but from Gad, Manasseh, and even 'from Saul's brethren of Benjamin.' Respecting the arms of these some remarks will be made at the close of this article.

II. Immediately upon the death of Saul the tribe of Judah invited David to become their prince. Internal probabilities lead us to believe that this was acceptable to the Philistines, who, it would seem, must have had the means of hin-

dering it, if they had been disposed. We are not informed why they neglected to improve the decisive victory which they had gained in Mount Gilboa. They vanish from the scene, and Abner quietly hands over the kingdom of the eleven tribes to Ishbosheth, son of Saul. Among many conjectures which may be made, one is that they despaired of keeping the whole land under subjection, since their numbers were too few to keep up all their garrisons; and their superiority must have been that of weapons and discipline only. They may, therefore, have gladly acquiesced in a partition of the monarchy, foreseeing that the fame and popularity of David would soon bring on a civil war between him and the house of Saul; and as he was on excellent terms with Achish, and had long been ostensibly an adherent of the Philistine cause, it is not wonderful that during his early reign David was able to maintain peace with his most dangerous neighbours.

His first step, after his election, was to fix on Hebron as the centre of his administration—an ancient city, honourable by its association with the name of Abraham, and in the middle of his own tribe. He then strengthened himself by a marriage with Maacah, daughter of Talmai, king of Geshur (2 Sam. iii. 3); a petty monarch whose dominions were near the sources of the Jordan, and whose influence at the opposite end of the land must have added a great weight into David's scale. From Abigail, widow of the churlish Nabal, David, as we have already observed, seems to have received a large private fortune. Concerning his other wives we know nothing in particular; only it is mentioned that he had six sons by six different mothers in Hebron. The chief jealousy was between the two tribes of Benjamin and Judah, as Saul had belonged to the former; and a tournament was turned by mutual ill-will into a battle, in which Abner unwillingly slew young Asahel, brother of Joab. (On the synchronism of Abner and Asahel, see SAUL.) 'Long war,' after this, was carried on between 'the house of Saul and the house of David.' We may infer that the rest of Israel took little part in the contest; and although the nominal possession of the kingdom enabled the little tribe of Benjamin to struggle for some time against Judah, the skill and age of Abner could not prevail against the vigour and popular fame of David. A quarrel between Abner and Ishbosheth decided the former to bring the kingdom over to David. The latter refused to treat unless, as a preliminary proof of Abner's sincerity, Michal, daughter of Saul, was restored to David. The possession of such a wife was valuable to one who was aspiring to the kingdom. Accordingly, the unhappy Michal was torn away from a most affectionate husband, and passed over into the increasing harem of the man to whom in his earliest youth she had been a virgin bride; but who now cared not for *her*, but for her name and its political uses. It is not wonderful that she could not adapt herself to her new lord, and that as soon as he was firm in the kingdom he disgraced her. After giving her back, Abner proceeded to win the elders of Israel over to David; but Joab discerned that if this should be so brought about, Abner of necessity would displace him from his post of chief captain. He, therefore, seized the opportunity of murdering him when he was come on a peaceful embassy,

and covered the atrocity by pleading the duty of revenging his brother's blood. This deed was perhaps David's first taste of the miseries of royal power. He dared not proceed actively against his ruthless nephew, but he vented his abhorrence in a solemn curse on Joab and his posterity, and followed Abner to the grave with weeping. Anxious to purge himself of the guilt, he ordered a public wearing of sackcloth, and refused to touch food all the day. His sincere yet ostentatious grief won the heart of all Israel. The feeble Ishbosheth, left alone, was unequal to the government, and shortly suffered the same fate of assassination. David, following the universal policy of sovereigns (*Tac. Hist.* i. 44), and his own profound sense of the sacredness of royalty, took vengeance on the murderers, and buried Ishbosheth in Abner's tomb at Hebron. During this period, it is not stated against what people his marauding excursions were directed. It is distinctly alleged (2 Sam. iii. 22) that his men brought in a great spoil at the very time at which he had a truce with Abner; possibly it may have been won from his old enemies the Amalekites (1 Sam. xxx.).

3. The death of Ishbosheth gave to David supremacy over all Israel. The kingdom was not at first a despotic, but a constitutional one; for it is stated, 'David made a league with the elders of Israel in Hebron before Jehovah; and they anointed David king over Israel' (2 Sam. v. 3). This is marked out as the era which determined the Philistines to hostility (*ver.* 17), and may confirm our idea, that their policy was to hinder Israel from becoming united under a single king. Two victories of David over them follow, both near the valley of Rephaim: and these were probably the first battles fought by David after becoming king of all Israel.

Perceiving that Hebron was no longer a suitable capital, he resolved to fix his residence further to the north. On the very border of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin lay the town of Jebus, which with its neighbourhood was occupied by Jebusites, a remnant of the old Canaanitish nation so called. In spite of the great strength of the fort of Zion, it was captured, and the Jebusites were entirely expelled or subdued; after which David adopted the city as his new capital, greatly enlarged the fortifications, and gave or restored the name of Jerusalem [JERUSALEM]. In the account of this siege, some have imagined the Chronicles to contradict the book of Samuel, but there is no real incompatibility in the two narratives. Joab was, it is true, *already* David's chief captain; but David was heartily disgusted with him, and may have sought a pretence for superseding him, by offering the post to the man who should first scale the wall. Joab would be animated by the desire to retain his office, at least as keenly as others by the desire to get it; and it is credible that he may actually have been the successful hero of that siege also. If this was the case, it will further explain why David, even in the fulness of power, made no further effort to expel him until he had slaughtered Absalom. After becoming master of Jerusalem, David made a league with Hiram, king of Tyre, who supplied him with skilful artificers to build a splendid palace at the new capital. That the mechanical arts should have been in a very low state

among the Israelites, was to be expected; since, before the reign of Saul even smiths' forges were not allowed among them by the Philistines. Nothing, however, could have been more profitable for the Phœnicians than the security of cultivation enjoyed by the Israelites in the reigns of David and Solomon. The trade between Tyre and Israel became at once extremely lucrative to both, and the league between the two states was quickly very intimate.

Once settled in Jerusalem, David proceeded to increase the number of his wives, perhaps in part from the same political motive that actuates other Oriental monarchs, viz. in order to take *hostages* from the chieftains round in the least offensive mode. This explanation will not apply to the concubines. We know nothing further concerning David's family relations, than the names of eleven sons born in Jerusalem (2 Sam. v. 14, 15), of whom four were children of Bathsheba (1 Chron. iii. 6), and therefore much younger than the elder sons.

Jerusalem, now become the civil metropolis of the nation, was next to be made its religious centre; and the king applied himself to elevate the priestly order, to swell the ranks of attending Levites and singers, and to bring the ark to Jerusalem. The priests or Aaronites must, for a long time, have had little occupation in their sacred office; for the ark was at Kirjath-jearim, under the care of a private family. Indeed, during the reign of Saul, we find shewbread to have been set forth at Nob (1 Sam. xxi. 4-6), by Ahimelech the priest; and it is possible that many other ceremonies were performed by them, in spite of the absence of the ark. But after the dreadful massacre perpetrated on the priestly order by Saul, few Aaronites are likely to have felt at ease in their vocation. To wear an ephod—the mark of a priest who is asking counsel of Jehovah—had almost become a crime; and even after the death of Saul, it may seem that the Aaronites, like the other Israelites, remained organized as bands of soldiers. At least Jehoiada (who, according to 1 Chron. xxvii. 5, was high-priest at this time, and joined David at Hebron with 3700 Aaronites) was father of the celebrated warrior Benaiah, afterwards captain of David's body-guard; a man whose qualities were anything but priest-like; and Zadok, afterwards high-priest, who joined David 'with twenty-two captains of his father's house' at the same time as Jehoiada, is described as 'a young man mighty of valour' (1 Chron. xii. 27, 28). How long Jehoiada retained the place of high-priest is uncertain. It is probable that no definite conception then existed of the need of having one high-priest; and it is certain that David's affection for Abiathar, because of his father's fate, maintained him in chief place through the greater part of his reign. Not until a later time, it would seem, was Zadok elevated to a co-ordinate position. (A difficulty, indeed, exists about Abiathar, which can hardly be removed, except by supposing that 'Ahimelech, son of Abiathar,' has several times been inadvertently written for 'Abiathar, son of Ahimelech'; viz. in 2 Sam. viii. 17; 1 Chron. xxiv. 3, 6, 31. A similar error of 'Jehoiada, the son of Benaiah,' we shall afterwards have to remark on, in 1 Chron. xxvii. 34. We find Abiathar in the place of chief-priest in 1 Kings i. 7, &c., without any notice of his having

a son called Ahimelech.) Any further remarks concerning the orders and courses of the **PRINCE** will be better reserved for the article on that subject. It is enough here to add, that the slaughter suffered from Saul by the Aaronites of the line of Ithamar, whom Abiathar now represented, naturally gave a great preponderance of numbers and power to the line of Eleazar, to which Zadok belonged. We must also refer to the article **LEVITES** for further information concerning them. The bringing of the ark from Kirjath-jearim to Jerusalem established the line of high-priests in direct service before it; and from this time we may presume that the ceremonies of the great day of Atonement began to be observed. Previously, it would appear, the connection between the priesthood and the tabernacle had been very loose. The priests fixed their abode at Nob, when the ark was at Kirjath-jearim, a very short distance; yet there is nothing to denote that they at all interfered with Abinadab in his exclusive care of the sacred deposit. (Concerning the chronological difficulties involved in the stay of the ark at Kirjath-jearim, see the article **SAUL**.)

When the ark entered Jerusalem in triumph, David put on a priest's ephod and danced before it. This proved the occasion of the rupture between him and his royal spouse, Michal, which sooner or later was inevitable. Accustomed to see in her father's court a haughty pre-eminence of the monarch over the priest, she could not sympathize with the deeper piety which led the royal Psalmist to forget his dignity in presence of the ark. The words of David to her, 'Jehovah chose me before thy father and before all his house' (2 Sam. vi. 21), sufficiently show Michal to have felt that she had been taken from her husband Phaltiel, merely to give colour to David's claim to the kingdom, and that David scorned to allow that he was in any way indebted to her for it. After this event, the king, contrasting his cedar palace with the curtains of the tabernacle, was desirous of building a temple for the ark; such a step, moreover, was likely to prevent any future change of its abode. The prophet Nathan, however, forbade it, on pious and intelligible grounds. The prohibition has been ascribed by some learned men to a cunning policy in Nathan; but it is not clear how the building of a temple would have injured the interest of the prophets. There are no indications that the prophets as yet regarded the priests with jealousy, nor that it was likely to increase the king's power over both. Great as might appear the advantage of establishing the same city as the religious and civil metropolis, the effect was, in one respect, most unfortunate: it offended the powerful and central tribe of Ephraim. They had been accustomed to regard Shiloh as the rightful abode of the ark. Against Kirjath-jearim no envy was felt, especially while the ark and its priests were in obscurity. But when so much honour attended it; when it became a peculiar glory to Judah and Benjamin—tribes already too much favoured; when a magnificent edifice was erected to receive it; the seeds were sown of that disaffection which ended in a rending of the tribes apart. Nor was the argument unreasonable, that a more central spot was needed for Israel to assemble at year by year.

David's further victories are narrated in the following order—Philistines, Moab, Zobah, Edom,

Northern League stirred up by the Aramites, Ammon. 1. The short and dry notice concerning the Philistines just gives us to understand that this is the era of their decisive, though not final, subjugation. Their towns were despoiled of their wealth (2 Sam. viii., xii.), and doubtless all their arms and munitions of war passed over into the service of the conqueror. 2. The Moabites were a pastoral people, whose general relations with Israel appear to have been peaceful. The slight notice of Saul's hostilities with them (1 Sam. xiv. 47) is the only breach recorded since the time of Eglon and Ehud. In the book of Ruth we see them as friendly neighbours, and much more recently (1 Sam. xxii. 3, 4) David committed his parents to the care of the king of Moab. We know no cause, except David's strength, which now drew his arms upon them. A people long accustomed to peace, in conflict with a veteran army, was struck down at once, but the fierceness of his triumph may surprise us. Two-thirds of the population (if we rightly interpret the words, 2 Sam. viii. 2) were put to the sword; the rest became tributary. 3. Who are meant by the Syrians of Zobah, is still a problem [**ZOBAB**]. We here follow the belief that it was a power of northern Syria, then aiming at extensive empire, which had not only defeated and humbled the king of Hamath, but had obtained homage beyond the Euphrates. The trans-Jordanic tribes in the time of Saul had founded a little empire for themselves by conquering their eastern neighbours, the Hagarenes; and, perhaps, occasionally overran the district on the side of the Euphrates, which Hadadezer, king of Zobah, considered as his own. His efforts to recover his border at the river Euphrates first brought him into collision with David, perhaps by an attack which he made on the roaming Eastern tribes. David defeated not merely his army, but those of Damascus too, which came, too late, with succour; and put Israelite garrisons into the towns of the Damascenes. In this career of success, we see, for the first time in history, the uniform superiority over raw troops of a power which is always fighting; whose standing army is ever gaining experience and mutual confidence. Nevertheless, the details of this victory over Hadadezer exceed all ordinary possibilities. It is not easy even to form a conception of the nature of the war. As the Eastern tribes of Israel had taken in abundance (for they are said to have taken 50,000 from the Hagarenes, 1 Chron. v. 21), David did not want the means of transporting an army of infantry and its baggage (see 1 Sam. xxx. 17). But with what troops are we to suppose him to fight against the powerful cavalry of the enemy? We may imagine horsemen to have been *repulsed* either by archers or by a phalanx of spearmen; of which, however, no mention is made, nor does it appear probable that the Israelites fought in phalanx. But neither by these nor by a squadron of camels—if any one supposes David to have used such a force, as Cyrus against Croesus—can 1000 chariots and 700 horsemen (which the Chronicler makes 7000, 1 Chron. xviii. 4) have been defeated and *captured*; to say nothing of the 20,000 captive footmen, or of the 22,000 Damascenes slain immediately after. 4. Another victory, gained 'in the valley of salt,' ought, perhaps, to be read, as in 1 Chron. xviii. 12, and in the superscription of Ps. lx., 'over the *Edomites*,' not 'over the

*Syrians.* The difference of the Hebrew textual letters is very slight,  $\text{דָּוִד}$  and  $\text{דָּוִד}$ . The verse which follows (2 Sam. viii. 14) seems to tell the result of this victory, viz. the complete subjugation and garrisoning of Edom, which, like Moab, was incorporated with David's empire. Immediately before this last conquest, as would appear, he wrote the 60th Psalm; and as that Psalm gives no hint of his achievements against the king of Zobah and the Damascenes, this is a strong ground for believing that those successes were not gained till somewhat later in time. 5. After David had become master of all Israel, of the Philistine towns, of Edom, and of Moab, while the Eastern tribes, having conquered the Hagarenes, threatened the Ammonites on the north, as did Moab on the south, the Ammonites were naturally alarmed, and called in the powers of Syria for their help against a foe who was growing dangerous even to them. The coalition against David is described as consisting of the Syrians of Bethrehab and of Maschah, of Zobah and of Tob. The last country appears to have been in the district of Trachonitis, the two first immediately on the north of Israel. In this war, we may believe that David enjoyed the important alliance of Toi, king of Hamath, who, having suffered from Hadadazer's hostility, courted the friendship of the Israelitish monarch (2 Sam. viii. 9, 10). We are barely informed that one division of the Israelites under Abishai was posted against the Ammonites; a second under Joab met the confederates from the north, 30,000 strong, and prevented their junction with the Ammonites. In both places the enemy was repelled, though, it would seem, with no decisive result. The spirit of exaggeration is certainly displayed in the statement—whoever is answerable for it—(1 Chron. xix. 7), that the Syrian confederates brought with them 32,000 chariots, which are not noticed in the parallel place of 2 Sam. Perhaps the text is corrupt; for 1000 talents of silver (ver. 6) appears a small sum to hire such a force with. A second campaign took place. The king of Zobah brought in an army of Mesopotamians, in addition to his former troops, and David found it necessary to make a levy of all Israel to meet the pressing danger. A pitched battle on a great scale was then fought at Helam—far beyond the limits of the twelve tribes—in which David was victorious. He is said to have slain, according to 2 Sam. x. 18, the men of 700 chariots, and 40,000 horse-men; or, according to 1 Chron. xix. 18, the men of 7000 chariots, and 40,000 footmen. Here, as on the former occasion, the Chronicler multiplies by 10 the number found in the older book. If we had access to the court-records of Hamath, we should probably find that Toi had assembled his whole cavalry to assist David, and that to him was due the important service of disabling or destroying the enemy's horse. Such foreign aid may explain the general result, without our obtruding a miracle, for which the narrative gives us not the least warrant. The Syrians henceforth left the Ammonites to their fate, and the petty chiefs who had been in allegiance to Hadadazer hastened to do homage to David. 6: Early in the next season Joab was sent to take vengeance on the Ammonites in their own home, by attacking their chief city, or Rabbah of Ammon. The natural strength of their border could not keep out veteran

troops and an experienced leader; and though the siege of the city occupied many months (if, indeed, it was not prolonged into the next year), it was at last taken. It is characteristic of Oriental despotism, that Joab, when the city was nearly reduced, sent to invite David to command the final assault in person. David gathered a large force, easily captured the royal town, and despoiled it of all its wealth. His vengeance was as much more dreadful on the unfortunate inhabitants than formerly on the Moabites, as the danger in which the Ammonites had involved Israel had been more imminent. The persons captured in the city were put to death by torture; some of them being sawed in pieces, others chopped up with axes or mangled with barrows, while some were smothered in brick-kilns (2 Sam. xii. 31; 1 Chron. xx. 3). This cruelty was perhaps effectual in quelling future movements of revolt or war; for, until insurrections in Israel embolden them, foreign foes after this remain quiet.

During the campaign against Rabbah of Ammon the painful and never-to-be-forgotten outrage of David against Bathsheba and her husband Uriah the Hittite took place. It is principally through this narrative that we know the tediousness of that siege; since the adultery with Bathsheba and the birth of at least one child took place during the course of it.

The latter years of David's reign were afflicted by the inevitable results of polygamy and despotism, viz. the quarrels of the sons of different mothers, and their eagerness to seize the kingdom before their father's death. Of all his sons, Absalom had naturally the greatest pretensions, being, by his mother's side, grandson of Talmai, king of Geshur; while through his personal beauty and winning manners he was high in popular favour. It is evident, moreover, that he was the darling son of his father. When his own sister Tamar had been dishonoured by her half-brother Amnon, the eldest son of David, Absalom slew him in vengeance, but, in fear of his father, then fled to his grandfather at Geshur. Joab, discerning David's longings for his son, effected his return after three years; but the conflict in the king's mind is strikingly shown by his allowing Absalom to dwell two full years in Jerusalem before he would see his face.

The insurrection of Absalom against the king was the next important event; in the course of which there was shown the general tendency of men to look favourably on young and untried princes, rather than on those whom they know for better and for worse. Absalom erected his royal standard at Hebron first, and was fully prepared to slay his father outright, which might probably have been done, if the energetic advice of Abiathophel had been followed. While they delayed, David escaped beyond the Jordan, and with all his troop met a most friendly reception, not only from Barzillai and Machir, wealthy chiefs of pastoral Gilead, but from Shobi, the son of the Ammonite king Nahash, whose power he had destroyed, and whose people he had hewed in pieces. We likewise learn on this occasion that the fortunes of David had been all along attended by 600 men of Gath, who now, under the command of Ittai the Gittite, crossed the Jordan with all their households, in spite of David's generous advice that they would return to their

own country. Strengthened by the warlike eastern tribes, and surrounded by his experienced captains, the king no longer hesitated to meet Absalom in the field. A decisive victory was won at the wood of Ephraim, and Absalom was slain by Joab in the retreat. The old king was heart-stricken at this result, and, ignorant of his own weakness, superseded Joab in the command of the host by Amasa, Absalom's captain. Perhaps Joab on the former occasion, when he murdered Abner, had blinded the king by pleading revenge for the blood of Asahel; but no such pretence could here avail. The king was now probably brought to his determination, partly by his disgust at Joab, partly by his desire to give the insurgents confidence in his amnesty. If Amasa is the same as Amasai, David may likewise have retained a grateful remembrance of the cordial greeting with which he had led a strong band to his assistance at the critical period of his abode in Ziklag (1 Chron. xii. 18); moreover, Amasa, equally with Joab, was David's nephew, their two mothers, Abigail and Zeruiah, being sisters to David by at least one parent (2 Sam. xvii. 25; 1 Chron. ii. 13, 16). The unscrupulous Joab, however, was not so to be set aside. Before long, catching an opportunity, he assassinated his unsuspecting cousin with his own hand; and David, who had used the instrumentality of Joab to murder Uriah, did not dare to resent the deed.

A quarrel which took place between the men of Judah and those of the other tribes in bringing the king back, had encouraged a Benjamite named Sheba to raise a new insurrection, which spread with wonderful rapidity. 'Every man of Israel,' are the strong words of the text, 'went up from after David, and followed Sheba, the son of Bichri,' a man of whom nothing besides is known. This strikingly shows that the later despotism of David had already exhausted the enthusiasm once kindled by his devotion and chivalry, and that his throne now rested on the rotten foundation of mere military superiority. Amasa was collecting troops as David's general at the time when he was treacherously assassinated by his cousin, who then, with his usual energy, pursued Sheba, and blockaded him in Beth-maachah before he could collect his partisans. Sheba's head was cut off, and thrown over the wall; and so ended the new rising. Yet this was not the end of trouble; for the intestine war seems to have inspired the Philistines with the hope of throwing off the yoke. Four successive battles are recorded (2 Sam. xxi. 15-22), in the first of which the aged David was nigh to being slain. His faithful officers kept him away from all future risks, and Philistia was once more, and finally, subdued.

The last commotion recorded took place when David's end seemed nigh, and Adonijah, one of his elder sons, feared that the influence of Bathsheba might gain the kingdom for her own son Solomon. Adonijah's conspiracy was joined by Abiathar, one of the two chief priests, and by the reprobated Joab; upon which David took the decisive measure of raising Solomon at once to the throne. Of two young monarchs, the younger and the less known was easily preferred, when the sanction of the existing government was thrown into his scale; and the cause of Adonijah immediately fell to the ground. Amnesty was pro-

posed to the conspirators, yet it was not very faithfully observed [SOLOMON].

Numerous indications remain to us that, however eminently David was imbued with faith in Jehovah as the national God of Israel, and however he strove to unite all Israel in common worship, he still had no sympathy with the later spirit which repelled all foreigners from co-operation with Jews. In his early years necessity made him intimate with Philistines, Moabites, and Ammonites: policy led him into league with the Tyrians. He himself took in marriage a daughter of the king of Geshur: it is the less wonderful that we find Uriah the Hittite (2 Sam. xi.), Gether the Ishmaelite (1 Chron. ii. 17), and others, married to Israelitish wives. The fidelity of Ittai the Gittite, and his six hundred men, has been already alluded to. It would appear, on the whole, that in tolerating foreigners Solomon did not go beyond the principles established by his father, though circumstances gave them a fuller development.

It has been seen that the reign of David began, as that of a constitutional monarch, with a league between him and his people: it ends as a pure despotism, in which the monarch gives his kingdom away to whomsoever he pleases, and his nominee steps at once into power without entering into any public engagements. The intensity of the despotism is strikingly shown in the indirect and cautious device by which alone Joab dared to hint to the king the suitability of recalling Absalom from banishment, though he believed the king himself to desire it (2 Sam. xiv.). All rose necessarily out of the standing army which David kept up as an instrument of conquest and of power, by the side of which constitutional liberty could not stand. The maintenance of this large force perhaps was not oppressive, since rich tributes were received from the surrounding nations, and the civil government was not yet become very expensive [SOLOMON]. We nevertheless need not wonder that those who joyfully welcomed David as their heroic deliverer were sick of heart when forced to address him with unmanly adulation.

One more dreadful tragedy is recorded in this reign—the immolation of seven sons of Saul (2 Sam. xxi.), on the occurrence of three years' bad harvests. A priestly response imputed the famine to Saul's violation of the oath of Joabab, with the Gibeonites, and used the name and authority of Jehovah in proof. It has been suspected that the whole was contrived by the revenge of the priesthood for the barbarous massacre perpetrated by Saul on the priestly city of Nob; and that David the more easily acquiesced, since it was desirable, for the peace of his successors, that the house of Saul should be exterminated. Both suspicions are too probable to be easily set aside; and the latter receives painful confirmation from the cold injustice of David towards Mephibosheth, son of Jonathan, whom he first stripped of his whole patrimony, on a false and most improbable accusation, and afterwards, instead of honourably redressing the injury, restored to him the half only of his estate (2 Sam. xvi. 3; xix. 24-30). Such conduct proves that he was conscious of his own wrong, but was too desirous of weakening the house of Saul to renounce entirely the opportunity of damaging it, at

which he had snapt. That David did not give up Mephibosheth to be hanged by the Gibeonites is imputed to the oath between him and Jonathan; but it does not appear that their covenant was or could be more binding than his most explicit oath to Saul on the very same matter (1 Sam. xxiv. 21, 22). Five of the innocent men thus 'hanged up before Jehovah' as if he had been a Moloch, are stated in the common Hebrew and Greek text, and in our received version, to be children of Michal, David's youthful spouse; and Josephus imagines that they were born of her after a second divorce from David. But it is certain, from 1 Sam. xviii. 19, that *Michal* is here a mistake for *Merab*; which name De Wette has introduced into his version. The touching description of the other bereaved mother, Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah, is in refreshing contrast to the rest of the history, and shows the sympathy of the narrator's heart, while he had evidently no suspicion that the name of Jehovah could have been wrongly used to command the deed. Even after this atonement, it was thought that a thorough cleansing of the land was not yet effected. The bones of Saul and his three sons were disinterred from Jabesh-Gilead, and were buried in the sepulchre of Kish, in Benjamin; as if to obliterate every monument that Saul and his sons had ever been leaders of the hosts of Israel. After this the famine was removed.

It has been seen that, on one occasion (2 Sam. viii. 3), David fought against Hadadzezer about a district on the river Euphrates. Yet it is not to be imagined that he had any fixed possession of territory so distant, which indeed could have had no value to him. A warrior from his youth, he seems to have had little perception of the advantages of commerce; and although the land of Edom was long under his power, he made no effort to use its ports of Esiongeber and Elath for maritime traffic. Much less was he likely to value the trade of the Euphrates, from which river he was separated by a tedious distance of desert land, over which, without the possession of superior cavalry, he could not maintain a permanent sovereignty. No attempt seems to have been made in David's reign to maintain horses or chariots for military purposes. Even chieftains in battle, as Absalom on his fatal day, appear mounted only on mules. Yet horses were already used in state equipages, apparently as a symbol of royalty (2 Sam. xv. 1).

That in the opening of Saul's reign the Philistines had deprived the Israelites of all the most formidable arms, is well known. It is probable that this may have led to a more careful practice of the sling and of the bow, especially among the southern tribes, who were more immediately pressed by the power of the Philistines. Such weapons cannot be kept out of the hands of rustics, and must have been essential against wild beasts. But, from causes unknown, the Benjamites were peculiarly celebrated as archers and slingers (Judg. xx. 16; 1 Chron. viii. 40; xii. 2; 2 Chron. xiv. 8; xvii. 17), while the pastoral tribes beyond the Jordan were naturally able to escape all attempts of the Philistines to deprive them of shield, spear, and sword. Hence the Gadites, who came to David at Ziklag, are described as formidable and full-armed warriors, 'with faces like lions, and swift as mountain roes' (1 Chron. xii. 8).

The standing army which Saul had begun to maintain was greatly enlarged by David. An account of this is given in 1 Chron. xxvii.; from which it would seem that 24,000 men were constantly maintained on service, though there was a relieving of guard every month. Hence, twelve times this number, or 288,000, were under a permanent military organization, with a general for each division in his month. Besides this host, the register proceeds to recount twelve princes over the tribes of Israel, who may perhaps be compared to the lord-lieutenants of English counties. The enumeration of these great officers is remarkable, being as follows:—1, of the Reubenites; 2, of the Simeonites; 3, of the Levites; 4, of the Aaronites; 5, of Judah; 6, of Issachar; 7, of Zebulun; 8, of Naphthali; 9, of Ephraim; 10, of Manasseh; 11, of Manasseh beyond the Jordan; 12, of Benjamin; 13, of Dan. Here the names of Gad and Asher are omitted, without explanation. On the other hand, the Levites and Aaronites are recounted as though they were tribes coordinate to the rest, and Zadok is named as prince of the Aaronites. It is not to be supposed that the Levites or Aaronites were wholly forbidden from civil and military duties. It has been already remarked that Zadok (here chief of the Aaronites) was described, in the beginning of David's reign, as 'a mighty man of valour' (1 Chron. xii. 28), and the same appellation is given to the sons of Shemaiah, a Levite (xxvi. 6). Benaiah also, now captain of David's body-guard, was son of the late high-priest Jehoiada (xxvii. 5, and xii. 27).

The body-guard of David, to which allusion has just been made, was an important appendage to his state, and a formidable exhibition of the actual despotism under which, in fulfilment of the warning of Samuel, Israel had now fallen. [CARRHITES and PLETHINGS.]

The cabinet of David (if we may use a modern name) is thus given (1 Chron. xxvii. 32-34) with reference to a time which preceded Absalom's revolt:—1, Jonathan, David's uncle, a counsellor, wise man, and scribe; 2, Jehiel, son of Hachmoni, tutor (?) to the king's sons; 3, Ahithophel, the king's counsellor; 4, Hushai, the king's companion; 5, after Ahithophel, *Jehoiada, the son of Benaiah*; 6, Abiathar the priest. It is added, 'and the general of the king's army was Joab.' At this period Benaiah was in the early prime of his military prowess; and it is incredible that he can have had a son, Jehoiada, old enough to be the second counsellor of the king, next to the celebrated Ahithophel. If the text is here corrupt, the corruption is older than the time of the Sept. However, De Wette has introduced, *Benaiah the son of Jehoiada*. We cannot look on this as certain; for Benaiah may have been the name of the father as well as of the son of Jehoiada the high-priest. Yet as it was very rare with the Hebrews for names to recur in alternate generations, De Wette's reading is at least highly probable. If so, it is striking to observe that Benaiah, as captain of the life-guards, is reckoned next to Ahithophel in rank as a counsellor; while Joab, general of the army, scarcely seems to have been a member of the cabinet. Zadok was above named as prince of the Aaronites; but was not yet so closely connected with the administration as Abiathar.

Twelve royal bailiffs are recited as a part of David's establishment (1 Chron. xxvii. 25, 31), having the following departments under their charge: 1, The treasures of gold, silver, &c.; 2, the magazines; 3, the tillage (wheat, &c.); 4, the vineyards; 5, the wine-cellar; 6, the olive and sycamore trees; 7, the oil-cellar; 8, the herds in Sharon; 9, the herds in the valleys; 10, the camels; 11, the asses; 12, the flocks. The eminently prosperous state in which David left his kingdom to Solomon appears to prove that he was on the whole faithfully served, and that his own excellent intentions, patriotic spirit, and devout piety (measured, as it must be measured, by the standard of those ages), really made his reign beneficial to his subjects. If it reduced them under despotism, yet it freed them from a foreign yoke and from intestine anarchy; if it involved them in severe wars, if it failed of uniting them permanently as a single people, in neither of these points did it make their state worse than it found them. We must not exact of David either to reign like a constitutional monarch, to uphold civil liberty, or by any personal piety to extract from despotism its sting. Even his most reprobate offence has no small palliation in the far worse excesses of other Oriental sovereigns; and his great superiority to his successors justifies the high esteem in which his memory was held. Concerning the closing scenes of David's life no more need here be said: the celebrated enumeration of the people by Joab, will be noticed under the article POPULATION.—F. W. N.

**DAY.** The earliest measure of time on record is the day:—The evening and the morning were the first day' (Gen. i. 5). Here the word 'day' denotes the civil or calendar day of twenty-four hours, including 'the evening,' or natural night, and 'the morning,' or natural day. It is remarkable that in this account 'the evening,' or natural night, precedes 'the morning,' or natural day. Hence the Hebrew compound ערב וקדם, 'evening-morning,' which is used by Daniel (viii. 14) to denote a civil day. In fact, the Jewish civil day began, as it still does, not with the morning, but the evening—thus the Sabbath commences with the sunset of Friday, and ends with the sunset of Saturday. Indications of this primeval order exist among many nations, and even we have 'seven-night,' 'fortnight,' to signify seven days and fourteen days. Under this arrangement the night seems to have been regarded not as belonging to and terminating the preceding day, but as belonging to and ushering in the day, that follows—Nox ducere diem videtur (Tacit. Germ. ii.).

The inconveniences resulting from a variable commencement of the civil day, earlier or later, according to the different seasons of the year, as well as the equally varying duration of the natural day and night, must have been very considerable, and are sensibly felt by Europeans when travelling in the East, where the ancient custom in this matter is still observed. These inconveniences must be less obvious to the people themselves, who know no better system; yet they were apparent to several ancient nations—the Egyptians (Plin. Hist. Nat. ii. 77), the Ausonians, and others—and induced them to reckon their civil day from midnight to midnight, as from a fixed invariable point; and this usage has been adopted by most of the modern

nations of Europe. We thus realize the advantage of having our divisions of the day, the hours, of equal duration, day and night, at all times of the year; whereas among the Orientals the hours, and all other divisions of the natural day and night, are of constantly varying duration, and the divisions of the day vary from those of the night, excepting at the equinoxes.

The natural day was at first divided into three parts, morning, noon, and evening, which are mentioned by David as hours or times of prayer (Ps. lv. 17).

The natural night was also originally divided into three parts, or watches (Ps. lxxiii. 6; xc. 4). The first, or beginning of the watches, is mentioned in Lam. ii. 19; the middle watch, in Judg. vii. 19; and the morning watch, in Exod. xiv. 24. Afterwards the strictness of military discipline among the Greeks and Romans introduced an additional night-watch. The second and third watches of the night are mentioned in Luke xii. 38, and the fourth in Matt. xiv. 25. The four are mentioned together by our Lord, in Mark xiii. 35, and described by the terms ὀψέ, 'the late watch'; μεσονυκτίου, 'the midnight'; ἀλεκτοροφωνίας, 'the cock-crowing'; and πρωί, 'the morning.' The precise beginning and ending of each of the four watches is thus determined:

1. Ὀψέ, the late, began at sunset and ended with the third hour of the night, including the evening dawn, or twilight. It was also called ὀψία ἕρα, 'even-tide' (Mark xi. 11), or simply ὀψία 'evening' (John xx. 19.)

2. Μεσονυκτίου, 'the midnight,' lasted from the third hour till midnight.

3. Ἀλεκτοροφωνίας, 'the cock-crowing,' lasted from midnight till the third hour after, or to the ninth hour of the night. It included the two cock-crowings, with the second of which it ended.

4. Πρωί, 'early,' lasted from the ninth to the twelfth hour of the night, or sunrise, including the morning dawn, or twilight. It was also called πρωία, 'morning,' or 'morning-tide,' ἕρα being understood (John xviii. 28).

The division of the day into twelve hours was common among the Jews after the captivity in Babylon. The word hour first occurs in the book of Daniel (iv. 19); and it is admitted by the Jewish writers that this division of the day was borrowed by them from the Babylonians. Our Lord appeals to this ancient, and then long-established, division, as a matter of public notoriety: 'Are there not twelve hours in the day?' (John xi. 9).

This, however, was the division of the natural day into twelve hours, which were therefore variable according to the seasons of the year, at all places except the equator; and equal, or of the mean length, only at the vernal and autumnal equinoxes; being longer in the summer half-year, and shorter in the winter. The inconvenience of this has already been intimated.

The first hour of the day began at sunrise; the sixth hour ended at mid-day, or noon; the seventh hour began at noon; and the twelfth hour ended at sunset.

The days of the week had no proper names among the Hebrews, but were distinguished only by their numeral order [WEEK].

**DEACON.** This word is derived from the Greek term Διάκονος, and in its more extended