

## **1098. Nazarene, Church of the**

SOURCE: *CRB*, 1936, Vol. 2, part 1, pp. 458–461.

[p. 458] *History*. I. Near the close of the nineteenth century, a movement for the spread and conservation of Scriptural holiness in organized church form developed almost simultaneously in various parts of the United States. This movement was similar to that of the previous century historically known as the Wesleyan revival. There was manifested everywhere a spontaneous drawing in the unity of the Spirit toward closer affiliation of those of like precious faith which finally culminated in the organization of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene.

The great impulse of this movement has been the emphasis placed by the Scriptures upon the facts that, in the atonement, Jesus Christ has made provision not only to save men from their sins, but also to perfect them in love.

II. On May 12, 1886, a number of the brethren in Providence, R. I., interested in promoting the Wesleyan doctrine and experience of entire sanctification, organized and held weekly religious services... On July 21, 1887, the People's Evangelical Church was organized with 51 members... On November 25, 1888, the Mission Church, Lynn, Mass., was organized... On March 13 and 14, 1890, representatives from these churches and other evangelical holiness organizations in southern New England, assembled at Rock, Mass., and organized the Central Evangelical Holiness Association... Within the following year the Mission Church, Malden, Mass., the Emmanuel Mission Church, North Attleboro, Mass., and the Bethany Mission Church, Keene, N. H., were organized.

In January 1894 William Howard Hoople, a businessman in New York City, founded a mission in Brooklyn, which, in the following May, was organized as an independent church, with a membership of 32, and called Utica Avenue Pentecostal Tabernacle... The following February the Bedford Avenue Pentecostal Church was organized, in an abandoned church building, and a little later, the Emmanuel Pentecostal Tabernacle. In December 1895 delegates from these three churches formed the Association of Pentecostal Churches of America, adopting a constitution, a summary of doctrines, and bylaws...

On November 12, 1896, a joint committee from these two associations met in the city of Brooklyn, N. Y., to formulate some plan of union... This meeting resulted in the union of the two bodies. It was agreed that the work should be continued under the name of the Association of Pentecostal Churches of America.

III. In October 1895 a number of persons, under the leadership of Rev. Phineas F. Bresee, D. D., and Rev. J. p. Widney, LL. D., formed the First Church of the Nazarene, at Los Angeles, Calif... As a result of this organization, a number of churches sprang into existence, reaching as far east as Chicago.

IV. As these two bodies came to know more of each other, it was felt that they should unite; and, after consultation by delegates from one body to the other, the following basis of union was prepared and unanimously adopted by both bodies. The first union assembly was held in Chicago, in October 1907...

[p. 459] It was agreed that the name of the united body should be, "The Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene."

V. In 1894 the first organization of the New Testament Church of Christ was effected by Rev. R. L. Harris, at Milan, Tenn., with 14 members. This church was

deemed necessary to conserve the work of holiness, and soon spread throughout western Texas and Arkansas...

In 1898 the first holiness churches were organized in Texas by Rev. Thomas Rogers and Rev. Dennis Rogers, who came from California.

In 1900 the first Independent Holiness Church was organized by Rev. C. B. Jernigan, at Van Alstyne, Tex., and the denomination grew and prospered until in 1903, there were 20 church organizations.

The legal representatives of the Independent Holiness Church and the New Testament Church of Christ met at Rising Star, Tex., in November 1904, where a joint committee framed a manual and statement of doctrine and basis of union. The union was fully consummated at Pilot Point, Tex., in November 1905, and the united body adopted the name Holiness Church of Christ.

VI. At the general assembly of the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene, at Chicago, in 1907, in response to an invitation, several persons were present from the Holiness Church of Christ... Provisional arrangements were made for incorporating this church into the general body, upon proper action on their part. Upon the invitation of the Holiness Church of Christ, the second general assembly convened at Pilot Point, Tex... The motion [to unite] was adopted ... at 10:40 a. m., Tuesday, October 13, 1908.

VII. In the year 1898 Rev. J. O. McClurkan and a few of God's children called a meeting of the holiness people of Tennessee and adjacent States to be held in Nashville. At this convention an association was formed known as the Pentecostal Alliance, which name was afterward changed to the Pentecostal Mission...

The union of the Pentecostal Mission with the Pentecostal Church of the Nazarene ... on February 13, 1915, ... was effected at Nashville, Tenn...

VIII. In November 1901 the first stage in the present holiness church movement in the British Isles began, when Rev. George Sharpe, who had been for over 13 years a preacher in the Methodist Episcopal Church, accepted a call to [p. 460] the Congregational Church at Ardrossan, Scotland. In September 1905 he was accepted as the minister of Parkhead Congregational Church, Glasgow, Scotland, where, after a strenuous, successful, and glorious ministry of 13 months, he was evicted for preaching Bible holiness.

On September 30, 1906, the first services of the first distinctively holiness church were held in the Great Eastern Roads Hall, Glasgow. The charter members numbered 80. Other churches were organized and became the Pentecostal Church of Scotland. Visits of Dr. E. F. Walker and Dr. H. F. Reynolds to Scotland, and a visit of Rev. George Sharpe and Mrs. Sharpe to the fourth general assembly, at Kansas City, Mo., led the way to union with the Church of the Nazarene, which was consummated in November 1915.

IX. The general assembly of 1919, in response to memorials from 35 district assemblies, changed the name of the organization to "Church of the Nazarene."

X. For many years a holiness movement had been developing in Minnesota, the Dakotas, and Montana. It was originated by a group of Methodist laymen, and formally organized at Jamestown, N. Dak., in 1907, as The Laymen's Holiness Association... Evangelists and workers engaged in a widespread program of holiness evangelism and camp-meeting promotion. In 1922 more than 1,000 people who were identified with The Laymen's Holiness Association, under the leadership of these ministers, united with the Church of the Nazarene.

*Doctrine.* In doctrine the Church of the Nazarene is essentially in accord with historic Methodism. It stands for apostolic purity of doctrine, primitive simplicity of worship, and pentecostal power in experience, it being generally regarded that the primary dispensational truth is that Jesus Christ baptizes believers with the Holy Spirit, cleansing them from all sin and empowering them to witness the grace of God to men. This church stands particularly for this truth and experience, which the general assembly has expressed in the following terms:

We believe that entire sanctification is that act of God, subsequent to regeneration, by which believers are made free from original sin, or depravity, and brought into a state of entire devotement to God, and the holy obedience of love made perfect.

It is wrought by the baptism with the Holy Spirit, and comprehends in one experience the cleansing of the heart from sin and the abiding, indwelling presence of the Holy Spirit, empowering the believer for life and service.

Entire sanctification is provided by the blood of Jesus, is wrought instantaneously by faith, preceded by entire consecration; and to this work and state of grace the Holy Spirit bears witness.

This experience is also known by various terms representing its different phases, such as "Christian perfection," "perfect love," "heart purity," "the baptism with the Holy Spirit," "the fullness of the blessing," and "Christian holiness."

The Church of the Nazarene recognizes that the right and privilege of men to church membership rests upon their being regenerate, and would require only such statements of belief as are essential to Christian experience and the maintenance of that condition. Whatever is not essential to life in Jesus Christ may be left to individual liberty of Christian thought. That which is essential to Christian life lies at the very basis of their associated life and fellowship in the church, and there can be no failure to believe this without forfeiting Christian life itself, and thus the right of all church affiliation.

While emphasizing the baptism with the Holy Spirit as a definite experience of divine grace, the Church of the Nazarene never has taught, nor does it now teach, or countenance teaching, that speaking in tongues is a manifestation attendant upon, or an evidence of, the baptism with the Holy Spirit.

While standing especially for the great dispensational truth that Jesus Christ baptizes believers with the Holy Spirit, cleansing them from all sin, the Church of the Nazarene also emphasizes the great cardinal doctrines of Christianity. Briefly stated, the Church of the Nazarene believes:

[p. 461] (1) In one God—the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; (2) in the plenary inspiration of the Old and New Testament Scriptures, and that they contain all truth necessary to faith and Christian living; (3) that man is born with a fallen nature, and is, therefore, inclined to evil, and that continually; (4) that the finally impenitent are hopelessly and eternally lost; (5) that the atonement through Jesus Christ is for the whole human race; and that whosoever repents and believes on the Lord Jesus Christ is justified and regenerated and saved from the dominion of sin; (6) that believers are to be sanctified wholly, subsequent to regeneration, through faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; (7) that the Holy Spirit bears witness to the new birth, and also to the entire sanctification of believers; (8) in the return of our Lord, in the resurrection of the dead, and in the final judgment.

... The Church of the Nazarene believes in the Bible doctrine of divine healing, and urges its people to offer the prayer of faith for the healing of the sick. Providential means and agencies when necessary are not to be refused.

Its position upon temperance and prohibition is stated in the following terms:

The Holy Scriptures and human experience alike condemn the use of intoxicating drinks as a beverage. The manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for such purposes is a sin against God and the human race. Total abstinence from all intoxicants is the Christian rule for the individual...

*Organization.* The ecclesiastical organization is representative, thus avoiding the extremes of episcopacy on the one hand and the unlimited congregationalism on the other... The churches in a particular area are united to form an assembly District... The 45 districts elect both ministerial and lay delegates to the general assembly, which meets once in 4 years.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: Membership (1959), 300,771 (*YAC*, 1961, p. 253).]

### **1099. Nebuchadnezzar, Accession of, According to Berosus**

SOURCE: Josephus *Antiquities* x. 11. 1; translated by Ralph Marcus, Vol. 6 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958), pp. 279, 281. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 279] His [Nebuchadnezzar's] deeds are also mentioned by Berosus in the third book of his *History of Chaldaea*, where he writes as follows. "When his father Nabopalsaros [Nabopolassar] heard that the satrap appointed over and Egypt and the districts of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia had revolted from him, being no longer himself able to endure hardships, he placed a part of his force at the disposal of his son Nebuchadnezzar, who was in his prime, and sent him out against this [p. 281] satrap. Then Nebuchadnezzar engaged the rebel, defeated him in a pitched battle and brought the country which was under the other's rule into his own realm. As it happened, his father Nabopalsaros fell ill at about this time in the city of Babylon and departed this life after reigning twenty-one years. Being informed, not long after, of his father's death, Nebuchadnezzar settled the affairs of Egypt and the other countries and also gave orders to some of his friends to conduct to Babylon the captives taken among the Jews, Phoenicians, Syrians and peoples of Egypt with the bulk of his force and the rest of the booty, while he himself set out with a few men and reached Babylon through the desert. There he found the government administered by the Chaldaeans and the throne preserved for him by the ablest man among them; and, on becoming master of his father's entire realm, he gave orders to allot to the captives, when they came, settlements in the most suitable places in Babylonia."

### **1100. Nebuchadnezzar, Accession of—Ancient Babylonian Record**

SOURCE: The Babylonia Chronicle, tablet BM 21946, obverse, lines 1–16, 20, transl., in D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings*, (London: The Trustees of the British Museum, 1956), pp. 67, 69. Used by permission.

- [p. 37] 1. In the twenty-first year the king of Akkad stayed in his own land, Nebuchadnezzar his eldest son, the crown-prince,
2. mustered (the Babylonian army) and took command of his troops; he marched to Carchemish which is on the bank of the Euphrates,
  3. and crossed the river (to go) against the Egyptian army which lay in Carchemish,
  4. ... fought with each other and the Egyptian army withdrew before him.
  5. He accomplished their defeat and to non-existence [beat?] them. As for the rest of the Egyptian army
- [p. 69] 6. which had escaped from the defeat (so quickly that) no weapon had reached them, in the district of Hamath

7. the Babylonian troops overtook and defeated them so that not a single man [escaped] to his own country.
8. At that time Nebuchadnezzar conquered the whole area of the Hatti-country.
9. For twenty-one years Nabopolassar had been king of Babylon.
10. On the 8th of the month of Ab he died (lit. 'the fates'); in the month of Elul Nebuchadnezzar returned to Babylon
11. and on the first day of the month of Elul he sat on the royal throne in Babylon.
12. In the 'accession year' Nebuchadnezzar went back again to the Hatti-land and until the month of Sebat
13. marched unopposed through the Hatti-land; in the month of Sebat he took the heavy tribute of the Hatti-territory to Babylon.
14. In the month of Nisan he took the hands of Bel and the son of Bel and celebrated the *akitu* (New Year) festival.
15. In the first year of Nebuchadnezzar in the month of Sivan he mustered his army
16. and went to the Hatti-territory, he marched about unopposed in the Hatti-territory until the month of Kislev...
20. ... Then in the month of Sebat he marched back to Babylon.

[EDITORS' NOTE: See Berosus' version of this narrative (No. 1099). This Babylonian tablet gives us the exact date of Nebuchadnezzar's accession. The years of his reign were already known beyond doubt from an astronomical tablet of his 37th year (see No. 452). Nabopolassar died on Ab 8 (approximately Aug. 16), and Nebuchadnezzar was enthroned in Babylon on Elul 1 (approximately Sept. 7), in 605 B.C. Note that dating sequence (lines 1, 12, 15) demonstrates the Babylonian "accession-year" method of numbering regnal years. First, Nebuchadnezzar's campaign in Hatti-land (Syria-Palestine) takes place in the 21st year of Nabopolassar; then the last portion of that year, between Nebuchadnezzar's accession (Elul 1) and the next New Year's Day, is called the "accession year"; only then begins the "first year" of Nebuchadnezzar, on Nisan 1, several months after his accession. The ellipses and the brackets (except for page numbers) are in the translation.]

### **1101. Nebuchadnezzar—Dealings With Captives**

SOURCE: W. F. Albright, "King Joiachin in Exile," *BA*, 54 (December, 1942), 51, 52, 54, 55. Used by permission.

[p. 51] More than a third of a century ago the German excavators of Babylon cleared the ruins of a remarkable vaulted building near the famous Ishtar Gate. Just southwest of the building in question lay the ruins of the great palace of the Chaldean kings, called "The House at which Men Marvel." According to the excavators, the vaulted building represents the substructure of the Hanging Gardens, counted by the Greeks as one of the Seven Wonders of the World... However this may be, there can be no doubt that the vaulted rooms (fourteen in number) represent the substructure of an important public building, probably one of the main depots for the distribution of supplies from the royal storehouses. In favor of this more prosaic interpretation are the location of the building at the Ishtar Gate and the discovery of nearly 300 cuneiform tablets relating mostly to the distribution of sesame oil and barley to individual recipients. These tablets were found in the bottom of a stair-well, where they had fallen when the upper stories of the structure collapsed.

The contents of the tablets, in Dr. Weidner's resume, prove to be extraordinarily interesting, since they list payment of rations in oil and barley, etc., to captives and skilled workmen from many nations, all living in and around Babylon between the years 595 and 570 B.C. Among them are Yaukin [Jehoiachin], king of Judah, and five royal princes, as well as numerous other men of Judah; the sons of Aga, king of Ascalon in the

land of the Philistines, together with mariners and musicians from that seaport; mariners and craftsmen from Tyre, Byblus and Arvad in Phoenicia; Elamites, Medes and Persians; many Egyptians, who were mariners, ship-builders, horse-trainers and monkey-trainers (among their names are Necho, Psammetichus, Haryotes and perhaps Apries); Ionian carpenters and ship-builders, all with Carian or Lycian (localities in Asia Minor) names; and finally a number of Lydians. When all the tablets have been cleaned and published in detail, they will provide rich material for the study of the [p. 52] international relations of Babylonia in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar...

A number of other Biblical names occur among the persons receiving rations in these tablets. Shelemiah, Semachiah (both also found in the Lachish Letters), Kenaiah (known from the Elephantine Papyri and from an early Jewish seal), Gaddiel, Or-melech are specifically mentioned by name; Shelemiah is called "gardener." A century later Jews had already become so numerous and so important in the economic life of Babylonian that they figured largely in the business transactions for such houses as that of Murashu and Sons at Nippur.

As pointed out by Dr. Weidner, this distribution of rations undoubtedly means that Joiachin was free to move about Babylon and was not in prison. His imprisonment was then a later event, perhaps brought about by an attempt at escape in connection with intrigues or actual revolt in Judah. One such movement is mentioned in (*Jer.* 28:1–4); the prophet Hananiah son of Azariah ("Azur," also mentioned in the Lachish Letters) of Gibeon predicted that Joiachin would be restored to his throne within two years. Since his prophecy is dated 594 B.C. and one of the tablets mentioning Joiachin is dated in 592, it follows that Joiachin's status was not seriously affected by this particular incident. Some later event was therefore responsible for his incarceration...

[p. 54] The new documentation brings other confirmations of the authenticity of the Book of Ezekiel—small but none the less significant, especially when added to the accumulated mass of archaeological illustrations of Ezekiel. On pp. 31f. of his book Torrey insists that Ezekiel paints the [p. 55] material situation of the exiles in impossibly bright colors: the prophet lived in a house; he possessed an iron pan and a balance; he could eat wheat, barley, beans, lentils, millet and spelt. Quite aside from the fact that such circumstances are far from being luxurious, is the fact that at least one of the Jews listed in Weidner's tablets is expressly termed a "gardener," and that skilled craftsman [i.e. craftsmen] were in great demand, since rations for many hundreds of them from all parts of the Near East are recorded on these same tablets. Torrey's statement that the Jewish exiles under Joiachin were "not farmers" and that "artisans (craftsmen) could have found no means of support" are thus directly disproved by our new source of information (*cf. II Kings 24:14ff*).

### **1102. Nebuchadnezzar—Dealings With Jehoiachin, in Babylon, Archeological Confirmation of**

SOURCE: Merrill F. Unger, *Archeology and the Old Testament*, pp. 17, 18. Copyright 1954 by Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich. Used by permission.

[p. 17] Another instance of minute and extraordinary confirmation of the sacred record is found among some three hundred cuneiform tablets unearthed near the Ishtar Gate in the Babylon of Nebuchadnezzar II and dating between 595 and 570 B.C. In the lists of rations paid to craftsmen and captives who lived in or near the capital at that time occurs the name of "Yaukin, king of the land of Yahud"—none other than "Jehoiachin,

king of Judah” (11 Kings 25:27–30), who was taken captive to Babylon after Nebuchadnezzar’s first conquest [i.e. second in view of that of Dan. 1:2] of Jerusalem, taken out of confinement by Nebuchadnezzar’s successor, Evil-merodach, and [p. 18] given a daily allowance of food all the days of his life.<sup>6</sup> [Note 6 cites W. F. Albright in *BA*, 4, i.e., 5 (December, 1942), 49–55.] The five sons of Yaukin are mentioned three times in the tablets and are described as being in the hand of an attendant having the Jewish name Kenaiah. No doubt several or all of these sons lived to be included in the list of the seven sons of Jehoiachin given in I Chronicles 3:17, 18.

### **1103. Nebuchadnezzar, Religion of**

SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, *A History of Babylonia and Assyria*, (6th ed., rev.; New York: Abingdon, 1915), Vol. 2, p. 544.

To all his virtues and all his faults Nebuchadnezzar added deep piety. He was a polytheist, worshiping especially Marduk, god of the mighty temple of E-sagila in Babylon, and Nabu, god of the great temple E-zida in Borsippa. He was, however, careful to pay due homage to gods many and lords many in different cities of his empire, and to these ... he likewise dedicated temples.

### **1104. Neo-orthodoxy, Defined**

SOURCE: L. Harold DeWolf, *Present Trends in Christian Thought* (New York: Association Press, 1960), p. 77. Copyright 1960 by National Board of Young Men’s Christian Associations. Used by permission.

Like fundamentalism, neo-Reformation theology is a reaction against liberal accommodation to culture. However, neo-Reformation theology is more sophisticated, and it takes for granted some ideas stressed by the liberals but rejected by fundamentalists. Though fundamentalism seeks to return to a preliberal Christianity, neo-Reformation theology is intentionally postliberal.

### **1105. New Earth, Final Abode of the Saints**

SOURCE: G. F. Cox, *Letters on the Second Coming of Christ* (Boston: Joshua V. Himes, 1842), pp. 43–45.

[p. 43] One thing ... we think we have fixed without a reasonable doubt; namely, that the millennium spoken of in the Bible, cannot take place in the present organized state of the world, or of its inhabitants. Man must be new-made, and so must be the world...

[p. 44] There is another fact settled. The new heavens and new earth are to be the *final* abode of the saints... “*We look* for a new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.” And Peter wrote his second epistle, that the disciples should not forget *this very promise*. ... John also fully and gloriously points out the new heavens and earth as the final habitation of all the redeemed. And *where* this abode is to be, we gain additional light from the testimony of the four living creatures *who are before the throne*, and the four and twenty elders... [p. 45] They will reign on earth. They without doubt represent, with the four and twenty elders, the Jewish and Christian church, and the redeemed from all nations... No one would expect them to reign on earth as it now is; nor could they till ... the resurrection.

### **1106. Nicaea, Council of, and Nicene Creed**

SOURCE: Paul Hutchinson and Winfred E. Garrison, *20 Centuries of Christianity: A Concise History* (1st ed.), pp. 55–57. © 1959 by Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., New York. Used by permission.

[p. 55] So it happened that Constantine, the patron of Christianity, who was looking to this religion to tie his empire together, no sooner became master of all the Roman world than he found this major Christian dispute [the Arian controversy] on his hands, more threatening than any political challenge to the unity of his realm. He was, of course, incapable of understanding the subtleties of theological distinctions in the debate. But

there was one thing on which he was determined; he meant to have internal peace. So in 325, the second year of his undivided rule, he summoned the Christian bishops to a council at Nicaea, near Nicomedia. Not all Christian bishops were [p. 56] invited. Less than a dozen were from the West, and the most important of the Western bishops, the bishop of Rome, was not among them. Burckhardt, with his usual jaundiced view of Constantine's relations with the church, says that "of the perhaps thousand bishops of the East only those received invitations from the imperial secretariat whose opinions could be swayed or overborne." The council had one purpose—to end the theological controversy which was rending the church and disturbing the empire by reaching an agreement on the nature of the Christian God.

Eusebius of Caesarea, who participated in that historic meeting, has painted a vivid picture of the assembling of that first general church council. He tells how more than three hundred bishops (other sources say there were exactly 318) came rushing to Nicaea with their attendants in a frenzy of excitement, many of them scarred by what they had undergone in Diocletian's persecution, with eyeless sockets, disfigured faces, twisted and withered limbs, paralyzed hands. Constantine himself presided, a glittering figure in his imperial robes, which were no longer the austere purple garment worn by the emperors in Rome but were the jewel-encrusted, multicolored brocades thought proper to an Eastern monarch.

At the start, the bishops were divided nearly evenly between those who supported the Arian view and those who favored that of Athanasius. Eusebius, who had Arian leanings, proposed a formula in words quoted directly from the New Testament, but the Athanasian party would have none of that because it seemed that the Arians might accept it and still hold their own views. The New Testament writers had never said anything about the *ousia* [essence] of either the Father or the Son. It was probably Bishop Hosius who introduced the word *homoousion* [of the same essence]. Since he had great influence with Constantine, the imperial weight was thrown into that side of the scales. After more days of inconclusive debate the impatient emperor intervened to demand that this statement of the Athanasian view should be adopted. Only two bishops voted against it. Thus, it came to pass that, out of an assembly which partook more of the character of a political convention than a [p. 57] religious convocation, there emerged that Nicene Creed, which to this day is the standard of orthodoxy in the Roman, Eastern, Anglican, and some other churches.

### **1107. Nineveh, Fall of, Dated by a Babylonian Tablet as Having Taken Place in 612 B.C.**

SOURCE: H. H. Rowley, *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, pp. 43, 44. Copyright 1946 by The Westminster Press, Philadelphia. Used by permission of The Westminster Press and James Clarke & Co., Ltd., London.

[p. 43] A Babylonian tablet ... was deciphered in 1923, which showed that the fall of Nineveh did not take place in 606 B.C. as the [p. 44] older textbooks had surmised, but in 612 B.C. This has found its way into recent text-books of history, but as our commentaries have not yet been replaced by new ones, the necessary corrections have not been made there.

### **1108. Nineveh, Medieval Knowledge Concerning**

SOURCE: Robert William Rogers, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria* (New York: Eaton & Mains, 1908), pp. 5, 6.



[p. 5] It was in the Middle Ages that men began to travel over the great valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates, seeking some signs of its former magnificence and power. Perhaps the earliest of the intelligent travelers was the rabbi Benjamin, son of Jonah, of the city of Tudela in the kingdom of Navarre. He set out from home about 1160 A.D. and journeyed overland across Spain and France and Italy. Thence he passed on to Greece and to Constantinople. After visiting the sacred places in Palestine he went over the desert, by way of Tadmor, to Mosul on the Tigris. What a wonderful journey that was, in that distant day! At Mosul he wrote in his journal these words: “This city, situated on the confines of Persia, is of great extent and [p. 6] very ancient; it stands on the banks of the Tigris, and is joined by a bridge to Nineveh. Although the latter lies in ruins, there are numerous inhabited villages and small towns on its site. Nineveh is on the Tigris distant one parasang from the town of Arbil.” These words introduced the long-lost city of Nineveh to the modern world, while the modern world was still latent in the Middle Ages. Benjamin had seen the mounds beyond the river and knew that beneath them lay all that remained of ancient Nineveh. Babylon he probably did not see, for the mention which he makes of it scarcely seems to be in the words of an eye-witness.

From the time of Benjamin onward the sites of Babylon and of Nineveh were visited again and again by passing travelers, but the day of scientific exploration was long deferred, and only came with the nineteenth century.

### **1109. Nineveh—Site Forgotten in Time of Xenophon, Two Centuries After Its Destruction**

SOURCE: Xenophon *Anabasis* iii. 4. 10; translated by Carleton L. Brownson, Vol. 2 (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1944), pp. 467, 469. Reprinted by permission of the publishers and The Loeb Classical Library.

[p. 467] From this place they marched one stage, six [p. 469] parasangs, to a great stronghold, deserted and lying in ruins. The name of this city was Mespila,<sup>1</sup> and it was once inhabited by the Medes. The foundation of its wall was made of polished stone full of shells, and was fifty feet in breadth and fifty in height. Upon this foundation was built a wall of brick, fifty feet in breadth, and a hundred in height; and the circuit of the wall was six parasangs.

[Translator’s note 1; p. 468] The ruins which Xenophon saw here were those of Nineveh, the famous capital of the Assyrian Empire. It is curious to find him dismissing this great Assyrian city (as well as Calah above) with the casual and misleading statement that “it was once inhabited by the Medes.” In fact, the capture of Nineveh by the Medes (c. 600 B.C.) was the precise event which *closed* the important period of its history, and it remained under the control of the Medes only [p. 469] during the succeeding half-century, *i.e.* until the Median Empire was in its turn overthrown by the Persians (549 B.C.). Xenophon, then, goes but one unimportant step backward in his historical note—perhaps because he did not care to go farther, perhaps because he was unable to do so.

<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Neufeld, D. F., & Neuffer, J. (1962). *Seventh-day Adventist Bible Student's Source Book*. Commentary Reference Series. Washington, D.C.: Review and Herald Publishing Association.