

THE
INTERNATIONAL STANDARD
BIBLE ENCYCLOPAEDIA

JAMES ORR, M.A., D.D., GENERAL EDITOR

JOHN L. NUELSEN, D.D., LL.D.

EDGAR Y. MULLINS, D.D., LL.D.

ASSISTANT EDITORS

MORRIS O. EVANS, D.D., PH.D., MANAGING EDITOR

VOLUME II
CLEMENT—HERESH

CHICAGO
THE HOWARD-SEVERANCE COMPANY

1915

ANDOVER-HARVARD
THEOLOGICAL LIBRARY
OCT 10 1916
ANDOVER
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

A 66,965

**COPYRIGHT, 1915, BY
THE HOWARD-SEVERANCE COMPANY**

**All Rights of Translation and
Reproduction Reserved**

International Copyright Secured

The Publishers supply this Encyclopaedia only through
authorized sales-agents. Booksellers cannot obtain it.

**Printed by the Lakeside Press
Types cast and set by the University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.**

most frequent is the name "God" (Θεός, *Theós*) occurring over 1,000 t, and corresponding to El, Elohim, etc, of the OT. It may, as

1. Theos, "God" Elohim, be used by accommodation of heathen gods; but in its true sense it expresses essential Deity, and as expressive of such it is applied to Christ as to the Father (Jn 20 28; Rom 9 5).

Five t "Lord" is a tr of δεσπότης, *despótēs* (Lk 2 29; Acts 4 24; 2 Pct 2 1 AV; Jude ver 4; Rev 6 10 AV). In each case there is evi-

2. Kurios, "Lord" dent emphasis on sovereignty and correspondence to the 'Ādhōn of the OT. The most common Gr word for

Lord is Κύριος, *Kúrios*, representing both Jeh and 'Adhōnai of the OT, and occurring upwards of 600 t. Its use for Jeh was in the spirit of both the Heb scribes, who pointed the consonants of the covenant name with the vowels of Adhōnai, the title of dominion, and of the LXX, which rendered this combination as *Kurios*. Consequently quotations from the OT in which Jeh occurs are rendered by *Kurios*. It is applied to Christ equally with the Father and the Spirit, showing that the Messianic hopes conveyed by the name Jeh were for NT writers fulfilled in Jesus Christ; and that in Him the long hoped-for appearance of Jeh was realized.

As in the OT, so in the NT various attributive, descriptive or fig. names are found, often correspond-

3. Descriptive and Figurative Names ing to those in the OT. Some of these are: The "Highest" or "Most High" (ὕψιστος, *hypsistos*), found in this sense only in Lk (1 32.35.76; 2 14, etc), and equivalent to Elyon (see III, 3, above); "Almighty," Παντοκράτωρ, *Pantokrátōr*

(2 Cor 6 18; Rev 1 8, etc), corresponding to Shad-day (see II, 8 above; see also ALMIGHTY); "Father," as in the Lord's Prayer, and elsewhere (Mt 6 9; 11 25; Jn 17 25; 2 Cor 6 18); "King" (1 Tim 1 17); "King of kings" (1 Tim 6 15); "King of kings," "Lord of lords" (Rev 17 14; 19 16); "Potentate" (1 Tim 6 15); "Master" (*kurios*, Eph 6 9; 2 Pet 2 1; Rev 6 10); "Shepherd," "Bishop" (1 Pet 2 25).

LITERATURE.—*Theology of OT* by various authors: Oehler, Schultz, Davidson; Delitzsch, *Psychology of the OT*; H. P. Smith, "Theophorous Names of OT" in *OT and Sem Studies*; Gray, *HPN*; "God" in *HDB* and *EB*.

EDWARD MACK

GOD, SON (SONS) OF. See **SONS OF GOD** (OT); **SONS OF GOD** (NT).

GOD, THE FATHER. See **FATHER, GOD THE.**

GOD, THE UNKNOWN. See **UNKNOWN.**

GODDESS, god'ēs (אֱלֹהִים, 'ēlōhīm, θεά, *thēd*): There is no separate word for "goddess" in the OT. In the only instance in which the word occurs in EV (1 K 11 5.33), the gender is determined by the noun—"Ashtoreth, the god [goddess] of the Sidonians." In the NT the term is applied to Diana of Ephesus (Acts 19 27.35.37).

GODHEAD, god'hed: The word "Godhead" is a simple doublet of the less frequently occurring "Godhood." Both forms stand side by side in the *Ancien Rivle* (about 1225 AD), and both have survived until today, though not in equally common use. They are representatives of a large class of abstract substs., formed with the suffix -head or -hood, most of which formerly occurred in both forms almost indifferently, though the majority of them survive only, or very preponderatingly (except in Scottish speech), in the form -hood. The two suffixes appear in Middle Eng. as *-hēde* and *-hōd*, and presuppose in the Anglo-Saxon which

lies behind them a fem. *hæda* (which is not actually known) by the side of the masc. *hād*. The Anglo-Saxon word "was originally a distinct subst., meaning 'person, personality, sex, condition, quality, rank'" (Bradley, in *A New Eng. Dict. on a Historical Basis*, s.v. "-hood"), but its use as a suffix early superseded its separate employment. At first *-hēde* appears to have been appropriated to adjs., *-hōd* to substs.; but, this distinction breaking down and the forms coming into indiscriminate use, *-hēde* grew obsolete, and remains in common use only in one or two special forms, such as "Godhead," "maidenhead" (Bradley, as cited, s.v. "-head").

The general elimination of the forms in -head has been followed by a fading consciousness, in the case of the few surviving instances in this form, of the qualitative sense inherent in the suffix. The words accordingly show a tendency to become simple denotatives. Thus "the Godhead" is frequently employed merely as a somewhat strong synonym of "God," although usually with more or less emphasis upon that in God which makes Him God. One of its established usages is to denote the Divine essence as such, in distinction from the three "hypostases" or "persons" which share its common possession in the doctrine of the Trinity. This usage is old: Bradley (op. cit.) is able to adduce instances from the 13th cent. In this usage the word has long held the rank of a technical term, e.g. the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, 1571, Art. I: "And in the unities of this Godhead, there be three persons" (cf the Irish Articles of 1615, and the Westminster Confession, II, 3); Westminster Shorter Catechism, Q. 6: "There are three persons in the Godhead." Pursuant to the fading of the qualitative sense of the word, there has arisen a tendency, when the qualitative consciousness is vivid, to revive the obsolescent "Godhood," to take its place; and this tendency naturally shows itself esp. when the contrast with humanity is expressed. Carlyle, for example (*French Revolution*, III, Book vi, ch iv, § 1), speaking of the posthumous reaction against Marat, writes: "Shorter godhood had no divine man"; and Phillips Brooks (*Sermons*, XIII, 237) speaks of Christ bridging the gulf "between the Godhood and the manhood." "Godhood" seems, indeed, always to have had a tendency to appear in such contrasts, as if the qualitative consciousness were more active in it than in "Godhead." Thus it seems formerly to have suggested itself almost as inevitably to designate the Divine nature of Christ, as "Godhead" did to designate the common Divine essence of the Trinity. Bradley cites instances from 1563 down.

The fundamental meaning of "Godhead" is, nevertheless, no less than that of "Godhood," the state, dignity, condition, quality, of a god, or, as monotheists would say, of God. As manhood is that which makes a man a man, and childhood that which makes a child a child, so Godhead is that which makes God, God. When we ascribe Godhead to a being, therefore, we affirm that all that enters into the idea of God belongs to Him. "Godhead" is thus the Saxon equivalent of the Lat "Divinity," or, as it is now becoming more usual to say, "Deity." Like these terms it is rendered concrete by prefixing the article to it. As "the Divinity," "the Deity," so also "the Godhead" is only another way of saying "God," except that when we say "the Divinity," "the Deity," "the Godhead," we are saying "God" more abstractly and more qualitatively, that is with more emphasis, or at least with a more lively consciousness, of the constitutive qualities which make God the kind of being we call "God."

The word "Godhead" occurs in AV only 3 t (Acts 17 29; Rom 1 20; Col 2 9), and oddly enough it translates in these 3 passages, 3 different, though

closely related, Gr words, *to theion* (τὸ θεῖον), *theiōtēs* (θεϊότης), *theōtēs* (θεότης).

To theion means "that which is Divine," concretely, or, shortly, "the Deity." Among the Greeks it was in constant use in the sense of "the Divine Being," and particularly as a general term to designate the Deity apart from reference to a particular god. It is used by Paul (Acts 17 29) in an address made to a heathen audience, and is inserted into a context in which it is flanked by the simple term "God" (*ho theos, o theos*) on both sides. It is obviously deliberately chosen in order to throw up into emphasis the qualitative idea of God; and this emphasis is still further heightened by the direct contrast into which it is brought with the term "man." "Being, then, the offspring of God, we ought not to think that it is to gold or silver or stone graven by art and device of man that the Godhead is like." In an effort to bring out this qualitative emphasis, RVm suggests that we might substitute for "the Godhead" here the periphrastic rendering, "that which is Divine." But this seems both clumsy and ineffective for its purpose. From the philological standpoint, "the Godhead" is a very fair equivalent for *to theion*, differing as it does from the simple "God" precisely by its qualitative emphasis. It may be doubted, however, whether in the partial loss by "Godhead" of its qualitative force in its current usage, one of its synonyms, "the Divinity" (which is the rendering here of the Rhemish version) or "the Deity," would not better convey Paul's emphasis to modern readers.

Neither of these terms, "Divinity," "Deity," occurs anywhere in AV, and "Deity" does not occur in RV either; but RV (following the Rhemish version) substitutes "Divinity" for "Godhead" in Rom 1 20. Of the two, "Divinity" was originally of the broader connotation; in the days of heathendom it was applicable to all grades of Divine beings. "Deity" was introduced by the Christian Fathers for the express purpose of providing a stronger word by means of which the uniqueness of the Christians' God should be emphasized. Perhaps "Divinity" retains even in its Eng. usage something of its traditional weaker connotation, although, of course, in a monotheistic consciousness the two terms coalesce in meaning. There exists a tendency to insist, therefore, on the "Deity" of Christ, rather than his mere "Divinity," in the feeling that "Divinity" might lend itself to the notion that Christ possessed but a secondary or reduced grade of Divine quality. In Acts 17 29 Paul is not discriminating between grades of Divinity, but is preaching monotheism. In this context, then, *to theion* does not lump together "all that is called God or is worshipped," and declare that all that is in any sense Divine should be esteemed beyond the power of material things worthy to represent. Paul has the idea of God at its height before his mind, and having quickened his hearers' sense of God's exaltation by his elevated description of Him, he demands of them whether this Deity can be fitly represented by any art of man working in dead stuff. He uses the term *to theion*, rather than *ho theos*, not merely in courteous adoption of his hearers' own language, but because of its qualitative emphasis. On the whole, the best Eng. tr. of it would probably be "the Deity." "The Godhead" has ceased to be sufficiently qualitative: "the Godhood" is not sufficiently current; "the Divine" is not sufficiently personal; "the Divinity" is perhaps not sufficiently strong; "Deity" without the article loses too much of its personal reference to compensate for the gain in qualitiveness: "the Deity" alone seems fairly to reproduce the apostle's thought.

The Gr term in Rom 1 20 is *theiōtēs*, which again, as a term of quality, is not unfairly rendered

by "Godhead." What Paul says here is that "the everlasting power and Godhead" of God "are clearly perceived by means of His works." By "Godhead" he clearly means the whole of that by which God is constituted what we mean by "God." By coupling the word with "power," Paul no doubt intimates that his mind is resting esp. upon those qualities which enter most intimately into and constitute the exaltation of God; but we must beware of limiting the connotation of the term—all of God's attributes are glorious. The context shows that the thought of the apostle was moving on much the same lines as in Acts 17 29; here, too, the contrast which determines the emphasis is with "corruptible man," and along with him, with the lower creatures in general (ver 23). How could man think of the Godhead under such similitudes—the Godhead, so clearly manifested in its glory by its works! The substitution for "Godhead" here of its synonym "Divinity" by RV is doubtless due in part to a desire to give distinctive renderings to distinct terms, and in part to a wish to emphasize, more strongly than "Godhead" in its modern usage emphasizes, the qualitative implication which is so strong in *theiōtēs*. Perhaps, however, the substitution is not altogether felicitous. "Divinity," in its contrast with "Deity," may have a certain weakness of connotation clinging to it, which would unsuit it to represent *theiōtēs* here. It is quite true that the two terms, "Divinity" and "Deity," are the representatives in Lat Patristic writers respectively of the Gr *theiōtēs* and *theotēs*. Augustine (*The City of God*, VII, 1; cf X, 1) tells us that "Deity" was coined by Christian writers as a more accurate rendering of the Gr *theotēs* than the current "Divinity." But it does not follow that because "Deity" more accurately renders *theotēs*, therefore "Divinity" is always the best rendering of *theiōtēs*. The stress laid by the Gr Fathers on the employment of *theotēs* to express the "Deity" of the Persons of the Trinity was in sequence to attempts which were being made to ascribe to the Son and the Spirit a reduced "Divinity"; and it was the need the Lat Fathers felt in the same interests which led them to coin "Deity" as a more accurate rendering, as they say, of *theotēs*. Meanwhile *theiōtēs* and "Divinity" had done service in the two languages, the former as practically, and the latter as absolutely, the only term in use to express the idea of "Deity." *Theotēs* is very rare in classical Gr, "Deity" non-existent in classical Lat. To represent *theiōtēs* uniformly by "Divinity," if any reduced connotation at all clings to "Divinity," would therefore be to represent it often very inadequately. And that is the case in the present passage. What Paul says is clearly made known by God's works, is His everlasting power and all the other everlasting attributes which form His Godhead and constitute His glory.

It is *theotēs* which occurs in Col 2 9. Here Paul declares that "all the fulness of the Godhead" dwells in Christ "bodily." The phrase "fulness of the Godhead" is an esp. emphatic one. It means everything without exception which goes to make up the Godhead, the totality of all that enters into the conception of Godhood. All this, says Paul, dwells in Christ "bodily," that is after such a fashion as to be manifested in connection with a bodily organism. This is the distinction of Christ: in the Father and in the Spirit the whole plenitude of the Godhead dwells also, but not "bodily"; in them it is not manifested in connection with a bodily life. It is the incarnation which Paul has in mind; and he tells us that in the incarnate Son, the fulness of the Godhead dwells. The term chosen to express the Godhead here is the strongest and the most unambiguously decisive which the language affords.

Theiōtēs may mean all that *theotēs* can mean; on monotheistic lips it does mean just what *theotēs* means; but *theotēs* must mean the utmost that either term can mean. The distinction is, not that *theiōtēs* refers to the essence and *theiōtēs* to the attributes; we cannot separate the essence and the attributes. Where the essence is, there the attributes are; they are merely the determinants of the essence. And where the attributes are, there the essence is; it is merely the thing, of the kind of which they are the determinants. The distinction is that *theiōtēs* emphasizes that it is the highest stretch of Divinity which is in question, while *theiōtēs* might possibly be taken as referring to Deity at a lower level. It is not merely such divinity as is shared by all the gods many and lords many of the heathen world, to which "heroes" might aspire, and "demons" attain, all the plenitude of which dwells in Christ as incarnate; but that Deity which is peculiar to the high gods, or, since Paul is writing out of a monotheistic consciousness, that Deity which is the Supreme God alone. All the fullness of supreme Deity dwells in Christ bodily. There is nothing in the God who is over all which is not in Christ. Probably no better rendering of this idea is afforded by our modern Eng. than the term "Godhead," in which the qualitative notion still lurks, though somewhat obscured behind the individualizing implication, and which in any event emphasizes precisely what Paul wishes here to assert—that all that enters into the conception of God, and makes God what we mean by the term "God," dwells in Christ, and is manifested in Him in connection with a bodily organism.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD

GODLESS, god'les: This word is not found in the text of AV. It is found, however, in Apoc (2 Macc 7 34, "O goddess [RV "unholy"] man"). RV substitutes the word "godless" for the word "hypocrite" in the following passages: Job 8 13; 13 16; 15 34; 17 8; 20 5; 27 8; 34 30; 36 13; Prov 11 9; Isa 33 14. RV does not seem to be consistent in carrying out the idea of "godless" for "hypocrite," for in Isa 9 17; 10 6; Ps 35 16 this same Heb word *hānēph* is tr^d "profane." The principal idea lying at the root of the word is that of pollution and profanity; a condition of not merely being without God but assuming an attitude of open and blatant opposition toward God. The godless man is not merely the atheistic, unbelieving or even irreligious, but the openly impious, wicked and profane man. Indeed it can hardly be rightly claimed that the idea of hypocrisy is involved in the meaning of the word, for the "godless" man is not the one who professes one thing and lives another, but the one who openly avows not only his disbelief in, but his open opposition to, God. Doubtless the idea of pollution and defilement is also to be included in the definition of this word; see Jer 3 9; Nu 35 33; Dnl 11 31.

WILLIAM EVANS

GODLINESS, god'li-nes, **GODLY**, god'li (εὐσεβεία, *eusebeia*, εὐσεβής, -ός, *eusebēs*, -ός): In the OT the word rendered "godly" in Ps 4 3; 32 6 (רַשְׁיִת, *hāšūth*) is lit. "kind," then "pious" (RVm renders it in the former passage, "one that he favor-eth"). Sometimes in both the OT and the NT a periphrasis is employed, "of God," "according to God" (e.g. "godly sorrow," 2 Cor 7 10). Godliness, as denoting character and conduct determined by the principle of love or fear of God in the heart, is the summing up of genuine religion. There can be no true religion without it: only a dead "form" (2 Tim 3 5). The term is a favorite one in the Pastoral Epistles. The incarnation is "the mystery of godliness" (1 Tim 3 16).

JAMES ORR

GODS (אֱלֹהִים, 'ēlōhīm; θεοί, *theoi*):

- I. IN THE OT
 1. Superhuman Beings (God and Angels)
 2. Judges, Rulers
 3. Gods of the Nations
 4. Superiority of Jehovah to Other Gods
 5. Regulations Regarding the Gods of the Nations
 6. Israel's Tendency to Idolatry
- II. IN THE APOC
- III. IN THE NT

The Heb pl. 'ēlōhīm is generally known as the pl. of "majesty" and is the ordinary name for God. The meaning of the pl. seems to be "plenitude of powers." It denotes the fullness of those attributes of power which belonged to the Divine Being. Thus it is usually tr^d in the sing., "God," when referring to the God of Israel. When reference is made to the gods of the other nations the word is tr^d in the pl., "gods." The heathen nations usually had a plurality of gods. Among the Semites it was customary for one nation or tribe to have its own particular god. Often there were many tribes, or families, or communities, in one nation, each having a particular god. Thus even among Semites a nation may have many gods and be polytheistic. Among the other nations, Iranian, Hamitic, etc, there were always a number of deities, sometimes a multitude. There are many references to these in the OT. In a few cases where the pl. is used, the sing. would be better, e.g. Gen 3 5 AV; Ex 32 4.8.23; Ruth 1 15 AV; Jgs 17 5; 18 24; 1 S 17 43. This, however, might be disputed.

I. In the OT.—The following are the more important usages of the word in the OT: The tr of Ps 8 5

is disputed. LXX and AV translate it "angels," RV and ARV, "God," with "angels" in the margin. The Epistle to the He has the word "angels." This seems to be more in keeping with the OT ideas of the relation between God, men and angels. Gen 1 26 has the pl. "us," but it is not certain to whom it refers, most probably to the angels or mighty ones which surrounded the throne of God as servants or counsellors; cf Job 38 7, and see Sons of God. In Ps 97 7 the expression "worship him, all ye gods," may possibly refer to the gods of the nations, but more probably to the angels or mighty ones.

Judges, rulers, are regarded "either as Divine representatives at sacred places, or as reflecting Divine majesty and power" (see BDB,

s.v.). Ex 21 6 might better be tr^d as in the margin, "the judges." These were men appointed to represent God and adjudicate on important matters of law. LXX has "Criterion of God." In Ex 22 8 the word is used in the same sense, and ver 9 would also be better tr^d "the judges"; ver 28 likewise. See also 1 S 2 25; Ps 82 1.6, where the reference is to those who act as judges.

(1) The ancestors of Israel "beyond the River" had their gods (Josh 24 14 f). While there is no mention of idolatry before the Deluge,

3. Gods of the Nations were idolaters. Ur of the Chaldees was the center for the worship of Sin, the Moon-god. Many others were worshipped in the various cities of Babylon. See BABYLONIA.

(2) The gods of Laban and his family (Gen 31 30.32; 35 2.4) were household gods or (*trāphīm*, and were stolen by Rachel and carried off in her flight with Jacob. See TERAPHIM.

(3) Gods of Egypt: For many centuries before the time of Abraham there had been numerous objects of worship in Egypt. Many of these were animals, birds and natural objects. Horus, the