# Rahab's Name

BASED UPON a long-standing tradition, a precedent presumably started by the Septuagint, the Hebrew word translated *Rahab* in Joshua Chapter 2, which identifies the famous harlot and heroine of the Judeo-Christian faith, is the same word found in five other verses of the Old Testament, in Job 9: 13, Job 26: 12, Isaiah 30: 7, Isaiah 51: 9, Psalms 87: 4, and Psalms 89: 10. But is this the case? Is the name of the harlot the same word found in the subsequent verses? The words in question are all constructed of three consonants, *rhb*, but is the meaning the same in each case? Many different Hebrew words can be constructed from the same consonants in the same order.

I intend to demonstrate that this precedent is in error. While the LLX, like other versions of scripture, is valuable for study purposes, this evidence should cast doubt on the Septuagint as a whole. Whereas arguments against the Masorah are proven to be suppositions, confabulations without any actual evidence.

In answering this question, it is instructive to take a cursorily look at these five verses in question because they have influenced the traditional interpretation of Rahab the harlot's name.

The King James Version of Job 9: 13 translates the word *rahab* as an adjective, "proud."

> If God will not withdraw his anger, the proud helpers do stoop under him.

Modern translators often support the precedent of translating the word as a proper noun, something like this:

> Even the cohorts (assistants, helpers) of Rahab do cringe (cower) before him (God).

In Job 26: 12, the King James translates *rahab* the same way, "proud," but some modern translation also translate the word as the proper noun *Rahab*.

> by his understanding he smiteth the proud.

Job 9: 13 is more readily understandable in the modern vernacular, but what establishes the precedent for translating the word as a proper noun, scriptually, that is? For one thing, *Rahab* in Psalms 87: 4 is clearly referring to nations.

> Rahab, Babylon, Philistia, Tyre and Cush

It would be illogical to translate the word "pride" or "strength" here.

In the Septuagint, the proper noun in Psalms 87: 4 is rendered "Egypt." Indeed, it seems to be alluding to nothing else, particularly, when other verses are taken into account.

Isaiah 30: 7 has been variously interpreted. The King James opts for identifying the word *rahab* here with one of its meanings, "strength," which alludes to overweening pride and boastfulness:

> For the Egyptians shall help in vain, and to no purpose: therefore have I cried concerning this, Their strength is to sit still.

But modern translations interpret it as a name, with obvious reference to Egypt:

> For the Egyptians shall help in vain, and to no purpose; therefore have I called this people, Rahab who sits still.

Presumably, the phrase "this people" is referring to Israel which had adopted the ways of Egypt. Verse 12 qualifies it, "Because you have despised this word and trusted in oppression and

perverseness, and stay thereon," oppression and perverseness characterizing Egypt, which is a boastful do-nothing. It is problematic that *Rahab* should be applied to Israel; but it denotes them facetiously, only insofar as they imitate Egypt.

Psalms 89: 9-10 adds dimension to the term found in the books subsequent to Joshua. Rahab is not only antagonistic to God but inhabits a stormy sea:

> Thou rulest the raging of the sea: when the waves thereof arise, thou stillest them. Thou hast broken Rahab in pieces, as one that is slain; thou has scattered thine enemies with thy strong arm.

Almost verbatim, similar imagery is mentioned in Job 26: 12-13, verse 12 having already been cited.

> He divideth the sea with his power, and by his understanding he smiteth the proud. By his spirit he hath garnished the heavens; his hand hath formed the crooked serpent.

It is understandable if some modern scholars have opted to use the proper noun here, given the similar language. But it is debatable whether these verses are alluding to the Exodus as Psalm 89 was?

This usage already intimates the usage of *Rahab* which is spelled more expressly in the following verse; the adjectives "proud, arrogant, and insolent" coupled with the nation of Egypt and the indigenous abode of a tempestuous sea, combine in the symbolic form of a storm dragon or sea serpent.

If the word *rahab* in Job 26: 12-13 is understood as a substantive, the language is uncannily similar to that used by Job in reference to Leviathan, and, indeed, there are other similarities to that famous sea monster.

Isaiah 51: 9b-10 mentions the parting of the Red Sea with reference to the dragon:

> Art thou not it that hath cut Rahab, and wounded the dragon? Art thou not it which hath dried the sea, the waters of the great

deep; that hath made the depths of the sea a way for the ransomed to pass over?

In keeping with the precedent established by Isaiah 51: 10, modern translations have the Job 9: 13 passage, which we mentioned initially, saying:

Even the cohorts (assistants, helpers) of Rahab, the sea-monster, do cringe (cower) before him (God).

Theologians have theorized that Rahab must have been one of the *tanninim*, the sea monsters, which God created in Genesis 1: 21. In the Isaiah 51 passage cited above, the word translated "dragon" in the King James is the Hebrew word *tannin*.

Secular scholars have speculated that Rahab could be synonymous with Tiamet, the legendary serpent of primordial chaos, which was killed by Marduk of the Babylonian religion. And Judeo-Christian ones that it may also be associated with the Biblical Leviathan, which is also symbolic of pride. King James translates the word *tannin* in Psalms 73: 13-14 "Leviathan." If they are not identical, both Rahab and Leviathan are at least *tanninim*, sea-monsters. Howbeit, the dragon Rahab seems to have been a personification of Egypt.

Some scholars see Rahab's demise as a past event, having been fulfilled during the Exodus. Leviathan's, according to Job 3: 8, is a future escatological event.

Presumably, it was a principality living in the Red Sea (Gulf of Aqaba), that is, a fallen angel. But, as with Leviathan, there is a larger picture. It is symbolic of Egypt as a type of the world, and as such, rising amidst tempestuous seas, of Gentile civilization as a whole, even the Beast itself, that is, the governmental system at least, the seven-headed monster of the Antichrist's empire during the Tribulation Period, Babylon the Great, the Revived Roman Empire.

Doubtless, Rahab and Leviathan are to be viewed similarly. One scholar has even speculated that they are indeed *tanninim*, both (metaphorically; spiritually, or actually) scheduled to arise in the Latter Days from the depths of the sea; Rahab being a fe-

male monster, Leviathan the male principle. But the attribution of the feminine gender to Rahab seems to be based solely on the conflation of the dragon with the harlot.

These attributions to the dragon may or may not be correct, but they complicate the issue when applied to the harlot.

Naturally, upon realizing these things, attempting to achieve some sort of synthesis in understanding the word *rahab*, the inclination is to view Rahab the harlot as a type of Mystery Babylon, the so-called Whore of Babylon, the religious system of the Latter Days.

Indeed, Egypt should not to be underestimated in connection with Babylon. Although, the evidence lies scattered in a jigsaw puzzle of ruins, eroded by time, and obfuscated by the misinformation of the Devil; it seems likely that the empire of Nimrod may have been, at least for a short time, a dual kingdom of Babylon and Egypt. Perhaps God himself has contributed to this darkness for the purpose of effacing the memory of evil-doers. At any rate, Egypt can be considered at least part of the source of that brand of false religion employed by the Illuminati and, as such, predicates, to some extent, the form of endtimes idolatry.

But is such strained logic and credulity based upon sound exegesis? While an identity of the harlot and the dragon can perhaps be established on a symbolic level, there are some legitimate questions.

"Why would the Biblical heroine's parents have named their daughter after a storm dragon, a symbol of primordial chaos or destructive pride?" And there are more fundamental issues than this.

Outside the Bible no one has been able to identify the existence of a god or goddess named *Rahab*. Much less a mythical beast.

Can we completely dismiss the fact that Phoenician, Akkadian, Egyptian, and Aramaic records concurrent with the Eisodus have failed to provide a semblance of the proper name? If there existed a god by this name during the period of the conquest of Canaan, it would seem to be, even for a culture as debased as that of the Canaanites, an execrable name for a child.

Were her parents so corrupt that they thought it honorable to name their daughter after an entity that, presumably, even Canaanite culture eschewed? Were people named after Resheph, Anath, Tiamet, or any other socially disparaged god or goddess? (Granted, *Anath* may be an exception, the place name *Anathoth* in Israel, for example.)

Jewish scholars shed no light on the mystery. They don't know where the precedent for Rahab the dragon came from, even if there was a precedent, much less why a woman should have been named after the Devil.

Talmudists muddied the waters with confabulation. Enlightening though they are with regard to their own language, most of them seem as stumped as the Goiim. But the vowel markup of the Masoretes may hold the answer, the points themselves being a commentary.

(Indeed, one wonders how modern man knows the pronunciation of even one Hebrew word apart from the Masorah, the most ancient document that records the pronunciation. The modernist controversy with regard to the Hebrew name of God seems to be nothing more than a smoke bomb of the atheists of Higher Criticism in the nineteenth century. Could not the pronunciation of a thousand other words be as easily argued?)

The fierce argument regarding the Sacred Name, ultimately boils down to nothing less than witchcraft, and although New Testament Greek is not our topic of discussion, those persons angry about the name *Jesus* should reprimand the God of the Apostles and not me. On Pentecost, Peter proclaimed to Hellenized Jews, speaking Koine Greek, "There is no other name under heaven by which men should be saved."

Introduction of the "J" is historically explainable. If one isn't comfortable using it, by all means pronounce it as the Greeks or Hebrews would, with the "I," "E," or "Y" sound respectively. God created the languages, after all. He understands them.

At the risk of alienating the reader, knowing how tempers flair over the issue, I would cursorily like to say a few words about the Masorah because my ideas with regard to the etymolgy of the harlot's name rests upon it. My purpose here is not to

argue the position of a vowellist but to acceed some ground to that position, which itself has several positions; with the thought that the Masorah may answer some questions which can be answered in no other way.

Before we look at a short history of the Masorah, I would like to make a couple of simple observations, which are often overlooked in the discussion.

When Jesus said "not one jot or tittle" would pass from the Law, some scholars think that he was referring to the diacritical markup of the Masoretic text; although this flies in the face of modern scholarship which says that the Masorah was not invented until AD 100 at the earliest. Modern scholarship also uses the Dead Sea Scrolls to bolster their argument, and indeed it is a powerful one. The Dead Sea Scrolls are not diacritically marked.

Another thing:

The Sacred Name as proposed by scholars of Higher Criticism should be pronounced *Yahweh*. How they arrived at this conclusion this I do not know. Well, I do too. They made it up. Josephus said that the name had been forgotten in his day, but rabbis were convinced that it was to be pronounced with four vowel sounds. The Masoretic *Jehovah* would satisfy this perfectly, the "J" pronounced with the conventional Jewish "Y" sound. (The thought that the Masoretes refused to speak the name of God for fear of soiling His majesty — in the manner that the modern Hasidic Jews use the title *Hashem*, The Name, to reference God— and consequently cobbled together vowel points from various other designations of God into the Tetragrammaton is sheer nineteenth-century German confabulation. It does not have one bit of corroborating evidence.) In any event, there is almost universally a correspondence between the espousers of the Primitive Text and adoption of the nineteenth-century "Yahweh." This in itself is revealing.

It is also noteworthy, given the Sacred Name controversy, that Jesus himself did not espouse the magical properties of God's name and even seemed to go out of his way to repudiate such thinking, in the same way that he repudiated, ahead

of time, Mariolotry, by calling his mother Mary exclusively the derrogatory "woman." (While some take great pains to rationalize his use of this term, to protect his reputation, they are fighting a futile battle and missing the point altogether.) Jesus used the Koine Greek term *Kurios* when referring to God the Father, which is the Greek translation of Hebrew *Adoni*, Lord, rather than using the Tetragrammaton or one of its many supposed pronunciations, Jehovah, Yahweh, etc . . .

So what we shall see among the "Primitive Text" crowd, is not only disingenuous scholarship but also superstition, even pagan sorcery. Among this dominant group of scholars, you will find adherents of the Enlightenment and its sordid underbelly, New Age spirituality. In other words, Jesuits and the Illuminati, neither of whom care one wit about the truth.

First off, lets deal with the Aramaic characters of the alphabet which are so lambasted by the anti-Masoretes.

According to Jewish tradition, the Biblical Scribe Ezra introduced the square Aramaic characters. Blame God's prophet, not me. Some of the Masoretes believed that vowel points were revealed to him as well. Or re-revealed to him as the case may be. But this seems to be incorrect.

The first Masoretic text was completed circa AD 100. By 550, Karaites added vowel points. This is called the Babylonian system.

Very mention of "Babylon" is enough to send many self-proclaimed linguists, self-righteous arbiters, into orbit. I have no problem conceding that conscientious rabbis could develop beside Kabbalists. Indeed, wheat and tares often grow side by side. Besides, are you not in Babylon yourself, O Self-Anointed One? Do you condemn yourself?

As Hebrew literacy declined, particularly after the Romans expelled the Jews from Israel, the rabbis realized the need for aids to pronunciation, so they developed a system of dots and dashes known as *nikkudim* (points). These dots and dashes are written above or below the letter, in ways that do not alter the spacing of the line. Text containing these markings is referred to as "pointed" text. The point or dot within a letter, as seen in the

three letters Bet, Kaf, and Peh, is known as a *dagesh*.

Aaron ben Moses ben Asher of Tiberias finalized the Masorah in AD 900 with the *Aleppo Codex*. The Bomberg edition of 1524–25, which was edited by Jacob ben Hayyim ibn Adonijah, was used for the King James Bible.

Due to the meticulous care of the Masoretes and the *Sopherim* (Scribes) before them, we have a Hebrew text which is essentially identical with the text that was authoritative in Jesus' time.

Elias Levita (Eliahu ha-Levi), chief Jewish scholar of the sixteenth century, denied the divine orgin and authority of the vowel points and overturned the thinking on the subject at that time, which had become conventional.

Among the proofs provided by Levi that the vowel points were not Sinaitic is the ingenious evidence that words in the Old Testament were often understood wrongly from Ezra onward. (In the seventeenth century, Cappellus reiterates this argument in his debate with vowellists.) He says that the preservation of the language was based solely upon memorization, which was threatened during the Captivity. This was the most devastating effect of God's judgment ("a famine of the word of God"). Nevertheless, Levi had nothing but praise of ben Asher, Masorete of Tiberias, as the consumate authority of the Hebrew language, whose work eventually led to the King James Bible.

Notwithstanding that the *Zohar*, the sacred code of the Kabbalists, says "the letters are the body and the vowel points the soul," doubtless a later addition to the text, the pointed text is nevertheless assumed to have been unknown to pre-Jesus Kabbalists. It would be created later.

Mistakes with the Masorah have been noted, but I know of no better place to start. And the alternatives are not good. Frankly, there are no alternatives.

At the risk of seeming impious, the problem really seems to be with the onerous "ambiguity" of Hebrew. Once again, don't blame me. With a cohesive culture before the Captivity, this was not a problem; given of course a preposed historical continuity, which, as we know in hindsight, was not to be because the Jews did not maintain the righteousness upon which it was based. But

could the Masoretes have been inspired? Christians have often rejected this thought because of the apostate condition of the Jews, particularly after the advent of Jesus.

The LLX is really no alternative.

Jerome lamented the errors made by the Seventy Translators of the LLX. He was aware of doing little better by following the precedents of Symmachus and Theodotion, rabbis against the Septuagint.

By in large the Reformers believed the vowel points were a late invention, but they held the Masoretes in high esteem and the invention a great tool to be used with discretion. But John Buxtorf of the seventeenth century was an apologist for the vowellists and revived enthusiasm for the idea of the originality of the points.

Lest we reason like the Jesuit Thomas Harding and the Oratorian John Morinus (who was a vowellist) by saying that the common people were intentionally kept from understanding the scriptures so that only the Sanhedrin overlords could interpret it for the common swine, let us, like our forebears, embrace with good conscience the work of the Masoretes, as trustworthy men and not deceivers. Besides, the Roman Catholic priesthood has always wanted to diminish reliance on *Sola scriptura* in favor of elevating the traditions of men. This is assuming, of course, that Thomas Harding' statement was not made from democratic fevor but in approbation of the Hierarchy.

I have not been rambling about the history of the Bible for nothing. With regard to our original subject, tracing the etymological roots of the word *rahab*, the pointed text irons out some problems.

Utilizing the Masorah as a resources, we find ourselves in luck.

Immediately, one notices, upon cursorily studying the issue, that the word translated *Rahab* by the King James Bible, as found in the Masoretic Hebrew, is not the same word used in Isaiah and the Psalms to speak of the dragon. The diacritcal marks are different.

Even the consonants are not the same. *Resh-Chet-Bet* is "Ra-

chabh," *Resh-Hey-Bet* is "Rahab." Modern Hebrew pronounces the final Bet as a *V* sound in any event, thus rendering *Rachav* and *Rahav* respectively.

To be perfectly honest, sometimes the harder *ch* sound is soften to the *h* sound and rather than *chet* the letter is called *het*. The pronunciation is also variable, as in the name of the Jewish Festival of Lights, *Chet-Nun-Kaf-Heh*, which is is phonetically spelled Chanukah or Hannukah. This explains some of the reasoning for seeing the words as referring to the same thing.

But was this always the case?

Let us pretend, as most Hebrew linguists contend, that the consonants are the same. The forty-seven translators of the Authorized Version conservatively opted to translate the words identically, based upon the precedent of the Septuagint. But it isn't a foregone conclusion that this would be the correct course. Jews themselves have admittedly grasped at straws when it came to problematic scriptures, the "Rahab" issue but one among them.

Is it not interesting that the Matthew Chapter 1 geneology of Jesus says in verse 5, "Salmon begat Booz of Rachab . . ."? Booz being the Hebrew *Boaz*. Here *Rachab* appears to be Rahab the Harlot. Only three women are mentioned in the geneology (none in Luke's account), and all of them with some sort of blight upon their name, as if to demonstrate God's forgiveness and love, Tamar who seduced her father-in-law Judah, Bathsheba, who was seduced by King David, and this woman named "Rachab." If there was no equivalent name in Greek, the Apostolic writers of the New Testament, Matthew here, transliterated the Hebrew name. They approximated with Greek letters the pronunciation of the word. Notice the hard or gutteral *ch* sound.

This does not at all suggest that the Hebrew or Aramaic of Jesus' day pronounced the word with a soft *Het* sound.

This would seem to corrborate the Masorah. Indeed, it suggests that the attributions of an Egyptian dragon and a harlot are two distinct things. They are not referencing the same thing at all.

Granted, the revelations of a mysterious God have proven a

daunting task to translators; one which the King James translators admitted with much humility. But, in attempting to reconcile the Egyptian dragon and the Biblical heroine, scholars have chased the varmit up the wrong tree. Perhaps the explanation lies in another direction. Not west but eastward.

Spending more time searching for etymological clues for the name of Rahab the harlot in Egypt is a mistake. Misplaced though it is—

Speculation based on the similarity of the word *rib* in the Egyptian nome of *Athribis* probably deserves a few words here. before we look eastward.

Ptolemaic Egypt had two cites named *Athribis*, one formerly called *Hut-Repyt* by the Egyptians in Upper Egypt, named after the lion-headed goddess Repyt. Greeks called this goddess *Thriphis*. Indigenous Copts, accomodating themselves to their overlords, called her *Athrébi*, and through agglutination *Athribis*. As far as the etymological study of the word *Rahab* goes, this is a deadend. But Athribis, the tenth nome of Lower Egypt has generated the most enthusiasm as the hypothetical source of the word, because, rather than being Greek, it is, conversely, a Greek pronunciation of an original Egyptian word.

There is another theory explaining the origin of the word *Athribis*, which is thought to be cognate to the name *Rahab*.

In ancient times, Lower Egypt was called *Raab* or *Reib*. According to Edward Wells and Josiah Conder, this word meant "pear-shaped." Egyptians knew that the Delta was triangular, fan-shaped, and thus was "pear-shaped." John Gardner Wilkinson thought that "Raab" simply meant *triangular*. The main city of the tenth nome was *Hut-Herib* or *Aireib*, which meant "The Land of Raab or Reib," he says. *Aethreib* meant "The heart of the triangular or pear-shaped country." *Athribis* (*rib* being a Greek mispronunciation of *Raab* or *Reib*) maintained the Egyptian etymon with which scholars have tried to patch the name of Rahab the harlot into an Egyptian context while distancing it from the pernicious association with the dragon and at the same time explaining how she was, presumably, named after the saurian principality, which is symbolic of sin, pride, and the world in

Isaiah and the Psalms.

Suffice it to say, this is a stretch. The inclination to find a positive source for her name outside Hebraism and even the Canaanite culture, in which no precedent has been found either, is, however, I believe, a correct thesis. Unfortunately, the theory of an Egyptian connection proceeds more from the bias of Higher Criticism against the Masorah than from internal evidence. Once again, one must apply a consistent hermeneutic. The same logic must be applied, for example, to words like *mlk*, from which the words *melech* and *moloch* are derived, and indeed a thousand other words, if one insists upon using the Primitive Text alone.

In using the Primitive Text, one must necessarily rely heavily upon tradition, that is, the tradition of the Septuagint and Jerome. But there is no tradition other than the Masorah, and Othodox Jews know this to be the case. Its detractors are disingenuous at best.

Let us depart from etymology for a moment and deal with the dragon first.

Only God was aware of the existence of Rahab the dragon. We will not find a social context within which the mythological dragon is mentioned, be it literature or religion. God revealed the angelic principality to his prophets Isaiah and the Psalmist. The word used in these instances is literally *Rahab*, "Rah-hab." It is used as an epithet for Egypt as well as for "boasting," from the primary root "raw-hab," "to urge severely, to be overcome, behave proudly, make sure, strengthen."

On the other hand, the name of the harlot is literally *Rachabh*. According to the Masorah, it is pronounced "Raw-khawb." The consonants are the same, but the diacritical mark-up is different. The phonetic symbols inform the pronunciation of the consonants. The gloss impinges upon the vowels as well. This changes the meaning of the word altogether.

They are different words altogether.

Are there etymological clues to the proper name of *Rachabh* the harlot outside an Egyptian context? There are, and they make perfect sense.

Canaanite language was similar to Hebrew. The Amorites,

according to the Bible, were also Canaanites, but they spoke Akkadian, a Semitic language which was closely related to Hebrew, having emigrated from western Mesopotamia where they had been informed by Babylon and Assyria. Both languages, Canaanite and Akkadian, were related to Hebrew.

It seems that the Semites had a peculiar genius for language, their contributions dominating civilization in this sphere.

But—and this is very important to remember—the Canaanite, as well as the Hebrew, lexicon was, even at this early date, colored with a smattering of Aramean, that is Aramaic. The Arameans were also Semitic.

During Israel's conquest of Canaan, the Arameans were still largely in Arabia, having not yet established dominance in Syria where they would immigrate later. From the eight century BC, Aramaic would become a sophisticated international language, dominating the Middle East.

Ishmaelites and Midianites, who originally spoke Hebrew, intermarried with their Semitic cousins from East-Central Arabia, the Arameans, and adopted their language. They doubtless had commerce with other Semitic tribes as well, Kedar and Sheba among them. This language developed into Arabic.

Several names in modern Arabic are related to the etymon *Rahab*. One is *Rehab*, which means "Garden of Paradise." This also jives with another meaning of the Hebrew word *Rachabh*, which is "broad," by inference also meaning "freedom."

These meanings would seem more consistent with the name of a daughter, even taking into account the debased culture of Canaan.

The following conjecture is a little further out on the hypothetical limb, as it were.

There is also the possibility that Rechab, a relative of Jethro Ruel Moses' father-in-law, a Midianite, the progenitor of the Rechabites, who attached himself to Israel and entered with them during the Eisodus, had essentially the same name as the harlot. This being the masculine version of the name which in its feminine form is pronounced *Rachabh*. (In the book of *Judges*, Moses' father-in-law is also called Hobab the Kenite, the Kenites being

a Midianite clan.)*

Conventional wisdom maintains that *Rechab* was a Hebrew word meaning "Charioteer," and indeed it may have been. But it may also have been a Midianite word that had a different meaning, the clan of the Kenites which assimilated with Israel early on accomodating themselves to both meanings. Granted, this is sheer speculation, but we know so little about Midian and their association with Arabs and Arameans that it is a possibility; having been decimated by the retaliations of Israel for their bellicose harrassment of them.

*Rachabh* was an Aramean name, having come from the east, beyond Jordan. This explains its strangeness and its lack of precedent in Hebrew; presumably among Egyptians, Canaanites,

* A tribe of Palestine, mentioned in the time of Abraham as possessing a part of the promised land (Gen. xv. 19). At the Exodus it inhabited the vicinity of Sinai and Horeb; and to it belonged Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses (Judges i. 16). In Ex. iii. 1 Jethro is said to have been "priest of Midian" and a Midianite (Num. iv. 29); hence the conclusion seems justified that the Midianites and Kenites are identical. The Kenites journeyed with the Israelites to Palestine (Judges i. 16); and their encampment, apart from the latter's, was noticed by Balaam (Num. xxiv. 21-22) . . . Jethro, priest of Midian, and father-in-law of Moses, is said (Judges i. 16) to have been a Kenite. This indicates that the Kenites originally formed part of the Midianite tribe or tribes. Some rabbis believed that Jethro initiated Moses and Aaron into the worship of YHWH. Several modern scholars believe that YHWH was a Kenite deity, and that from the Kenites through the agency of Moses his worship passed to the Israelites. This view, first proposed by Ghillany, afterward independently by Tiele, and more fully by Stade, has been more completely worked out by Budde; and is accepted by Guthe, Wildeboer, H. P. Smith, and Barton. *(www.JewishEncyclopedia.com.)*

and Akkadians, as well.

Concerning the qualm that the Aramaic of Jesus' time, which used the term *Raca* to mean "worthless, empty-headed, brainless," seems to have an opposite meaning to similarly pronounced Arabic words; we would do well to consider that Aramaic had fifteen hundred years to develop into its two branches, the Syriac and the Arabian. Furthermore, Hebrew culture and the Arabian culture, during this period, had very little commerce, being separated by mutual enmity.

Normally, scholars default to the Syriac Aramaic of the Greek and Roman Empires. But clearly Arabs were also developing their language. Who's to say that the Aramaic which was used by Hellenized Jews in Jesus' day had more etymological integrity than Arabic?

If this is a plausible scenario; rather than being a full-blooded Canaanite, Rahab could have been part Midianite. This Abrahamic tribe had a considerable presence on the eastern bank of the Jordan River, only a few miles away from Jericho.

Ishmaelites and Midianites had intermarried early on also. Strictly speaking, Rahab may not have been a full-blooded Hamite at all. She could have been part Semite, that is, Arabian.

This would explain why, for example, a Hebrew would have purportedly married her when there was an injunction of God against marrying the daughters of the land. Remember that Moses himself married a Midianite. Perhaps some latitudinal concession could have been granted under the circumstances because the purpose of the commandment had been to keep the Israelites from adopting the idolatrous religion of the Canaanites. (Notwithstanding the hypothesis that the genocidal injunction may have been for the purpose of exterminating the Canaanites because their genes had been corrupted by the Nephilim.) With a believer such as Rahab, idolatry would not have been a concern, she having risked her life to hide the spies, proving her fidelity.

Argument with regard to either the severity or the relative latitude in the application of the Law is by no means a simple issue in any event because there were other cases in which the violation of it was presumably sanctioned by God. After his mar-

riage to Zipporah, Moses, for example, married a Cushite. During the days of the Judges, Boaz married Ruth, the Moabitess. But presumably, in both cases the women in question were believers. Ruth was without doubt. And we can reasonably assume that the Cushite was as well. Who can imagine Moses marrying a heathen?

Although Midianites and Ishmaelites were easily as idolatrous as the nations of Canaan—not to diminish the magnitude of her faith and courage—Rahab may have had a cultural affinity with Israel.

Whether her forebearers were Aramean is a point of conjecture. The presence of an Aramaic name in her family does suggest, as the Talmudic commentators intimate, that her father, at the very least, must have been affluent, educated, and well-traveled.

Perhaps he was a government official or merchant. If so, it is problematic that Rahab is termed a common prostitute. She is nowhere called a *qedesha*, that is, a temple prostitute. Elsewhere in scripture, promiscuous women are called prostitutes, however. And while it is possible that she was simply a prostitute, it seems to me unlikely that such a profession would have been embraced by a person of affluence, but not so with a person of lower socio-economic status or by someone coerced into it.

In writing *World Without End: Rahab*, I have tried to represent some of the aforementioned ideas, even those ideas that associate the Biblical heroine and the dragon. On the most elemental level, these ideas have been developed in the complexity of Rahab's character, insofar as promiscuity verges upon false religion, that is to say, as hedonism becomes Epicurean religion, a panacea, in other words, for the God-created yearning of the heart. In so doing, it has provided a springboard for discussing topics of great interest to me, namely Biblical prophecy relating to the endtimes. There is much food for thought along these lines in the story of the Eisodus.

A cogent argument can be made for understanding it typologically, something I will not elaborate upon here, the conquest of Canaan as a type of the Second Coming of Jesus, complete

with a southern campaign and a northern campaign. Depending upon how one views the sequence of events, this typology includes at the Parousia an eastern entry, not the southern entry from Bosrah, Edom/Jordan.

Indeed, Jericho itself is a suitable symbol of world civilization during the Tribulation Period, which is represented scriptually as Babylonian. Among other things, it was a commercial center. (Typologically, like end-times civilization, I have represented Jericho as the "daughter of Babylon," that is, being the progeny of the Whore of Babylon. Like mother, like daughter.) One example of the typological similarity is the collapsing of the walls: they fall down upon the blowing of seven trumpets.

If any of these postulates holds true, there may be a prophetic lesson to draw from the theory that Rahab was at least partially Semitic, partially Arabic.

Rahab, the famous heroine, probably doesn't only represent Gentile Christianity, as Church Fathers have noted. More exactly, she represents those Gentiles who get saved during the Tribulation Period.

If the aforementioned scenario is correct, there may be reason to anticipate, based upon typology, that some Arabs will be saved during the Tribulation. They may be evangelized, if on a limited scale.

There may be another level of interpretation, as well. It has to do with the adoption of the Aramaic script by the Jews.

Rather than condemning this as a transgression and associating it with the introduction of Chaldean witchcraft into Judaism, both of which presumably took place during the Babylonian captivity, we would do better, I think, to keep from throwing the baby out with the bath water. Because the Masoretic text was written in Aramaic letters, Masoretes surmising the trends, that Aramaic was dominant in the Levant and correctly anticipating that it would continue to be so, may have had not only the objective of preserving for future generations the pronunciation of their language, which was already losing ground to Aramaic among the Jews by necessity, laudable as that goal was, but also to preserves traditional teachings and insights into the scrip-

tures. This could be yet another piece of evidence to suggest that Rahab, that is, Rachabh, symbolizes a future generation.

In other words, the conflation of the dragon with the heroine, on one level, which has been perpetuated by the Septuagint and modern translations, as well as the differentiation of the Masoretic text, both convey information useful for understanding. But can they both be correct? Perhaps. This is not to approve of faulty translation, though.

In conclusion, allow me to reiterate.

While I maintain the interpretation that *Rachabh* should not, in etymological terms, be associated with the dragon Rahab, I, nevertheless, have seen profound implication in the symbolism, much of which I believe is well-suited to understanding the story prophetically. I sincerely hope that this is not confusing. The central idea in viewing Rachabh the harlot with any reference to attributes of the dragon, as I have represented in the dream squence which spans the first three chapters of the novel, is simply this, that the Eisodus seems on one level to be a type of the Second Coming.

(Perhaps God has allowed the conflation to continue for this very reason.)

Canaanites were merchants. In fact, the Hebrew word became synonymous with "merchant." Jericho in particular was an economic center, representing the end-times world economic system. This system was idolatrous. Rachabh was a harlot. Presumably, she was a reluctant one, which means that she participated in the system at least until her repentance. Therefore, her identification with the Whore of Babylon is natural enough; only in this case, she repents. If there is any typological virtue in this understanding, it may be that the people Rachabh represents, whether they may be Raptured Christians or Tribulation Period saints, are not only associated with the whoredoms of the New World Order, but are, in some cases, ringleaders of it; that is, until realization of their folly. During the Tribulation Period the shoddy disguise of world Communism will be removed to reveal Satan worship beneath.

The experience of a people lured by sensuality into addic-

tion as a panacea for spiritual longing, idolatrous religion giving form to this impulse, is comparable to the condition of global society during the Latter Days. Most are ensnared, enslaved thereby, and irretrievably lost. But a few are delivered by the Word of God.

Whatever Rachabh's ethnic or racial origin, she was definitely part of Canaanite civilization. In considering her story and the fall of Jericho as a foreshadowing of the Second Coming, one must consider the disposition of the Canaanites. Who were they? How do they figure in the End Times, either actually or symbolically?