# J

## J Muhlius[[@Headword:J Muhlius]]

             SEE MUHL.

## Jaabez, Isaac[[@Headword:Jaabez, Isaac]]

             a Jewish rabbi of Constantinople, who died at the beginning of the 17th century, is the author of תורת חסד, a commentary on the Hagiographa, consisting of tell different parts:

1, קדש הלולים, on the Song of Songs;

2, צמח קדש, on Ruth:

3, צדקת תמי, on Lamentations;

4, שערי מדע, on Coheleth;

5, עטרת שלים, on Esther;

6, תהלות, on the Psalms;

7, למודי, on Proverbs;

8, יראת שדי, on Job;

9, ברכת ישרים, on Daniel,

10, חוסים מושיע, on Ezra and Nehemiah, reprinted in Moses Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible (Amsterdam, 1724-27).

See De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), page 133; Fulrst, Bibl. Jud. 2:2.

## Jaabez, Joseph ben-Abraham[[@Headword:Jaabez, Joseph ben-Abraham]]

             a Jewish rabbi of the 16th century, belonged to those exiles who left Spain in 1492. Jaabez settled at Adrianople, where he became rabbi preacher. He wrote מאמר האחדות, or system of Jewish dogmatics (Ferrara, 1554): — האמונה יסיַד, or Dogmatics of Judaism, printed with the "system:" — איר החיים, or faith triumphant over philosophy (ibid. eod.; Amsterdam, 1781; Praemvsl, 1873): פרוש על תהלי, a commentary on the Psalms (Salonika, 1571). See De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), 132 sq.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:1; Jellinek, Joseph Jaabez, eine kurze Biographie in Literatur-Blatt des Orients, 1846, col. 261 sq. (B.P.)

## Jaafarites[[@Headword:Jaafarites]]

             a Mohammedan sect who held in highest reverence the memory of Jaafar, the sixth of the twelve Imams. An unsuccessful attempt was made by Nadir Shah to assimilate the Persian Mohammedanism to that of the Turks,  acknowledging Jaafar as the head of the new national faith. SEE IMAMS, THE TWELVE.

## Jaaikan[[@Headword:Jaaikan]]

             (Heb. Yaakan', יִעֲקָן, wrester; Sept. has two names, Ι᾿ωακὰν καὶ Οὐκάμ, other copies simply Ακάν or Ι᾿ακίμ; Vulg. Jacan), the last named of the sons of Ezer, son of Seir the Horite (1Ch 1:42, where it is Anglicized “Jakan”); called in the parallel passage (Gen 36:27) by a simpler form of the same name, AKAN. B.C. ante 1964. His descendants appear to have settled in the northern part of the Arabah. He was the forefather of the Bene-Jaakan (q.v.), round whose wells the children of Israel twice encamped, once after they left Moseroth, and just before they went on to Hor-Hagidgad (Num 33:30-32), and again in a reverse direction after they left Kadesh-barnea, and before they reached Mount Hor or Mosera (Deu 10:6). SEE BEEROTH-BENE-JAAKAN.

## Jaaizer[[@Headword:Jaaizer]]

             (Hebrew Yaazeyr', יִעֲזֵיר, 1Ch 6:81; 1Ch 26:31; elsewhere the more abbreviated form יִעְזֵרYazer', helper; Sept. Ι᾿αζήρ [2Sa 24:5, Ε᾿λιεζηρ]; Auth. Vers. “Jaazer” in Num 21:32; Num 32:35; elsewhere “Jazer”), a city on the east of the Jordan, taken by the Israelites under Moses from the Amorites (Num 21:32), and assigned, with other neighboring places of Gilead, to the tribe of Gad (Num 33:1; Num 33:3; Num 33:35; Jos 13:25); also constituted a Levitical city (Jos 21:39; 1Ch 6:81). It must have been a place of importance, for it gave its name to a large section of country. The “land of Jazer” was fertile, and its rich pastures attracted the attention of the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh (Num 32:1). As it is mentioned between Dibon and Nimrah, it appears to have stood on the high plain north of Heshbon (Num 32:3). It was allotted to the Merarite Levites (Jos 21:39; 1Ch 6:81), but in the time of David it would appear to have been occupied by Hebronites, i.e. descendants of Kohath (1Ch 26:31). It seems to have given its name to a district of dependent or “daughter” towns (Num 21:32, A.T “villages;” 1Ma 5:8). It is mentioned in connection with the census under David (2Sa 24:5; 1Ch 26:31), and was among the Moabitish places that experienced the desolating march of the Chaldaean invaders (Isa 16:8; Jer 48:32, in which latter passage a ‘sea of Jazer” is spoken of). In the “burdens” proclaimed over Moab by the prophets, Jazer is mentioned so as to imply that there were vineyards there, and that the cultivation of the vine had extended thither from Sibmah (Isa 16:8-9; Jer 48:32). After the exile it remained in the hands of the Ammonites (1Ma 5:8). According to Eusebias (Ononast. s.v. Ι᾿αζήρ), it lay 10 R. miles west (southwest) of Philadelphia (Rabbath-Ammon), and 15 from Heshbon. Josephus calls the place Jazorus (Ι᾿αζωρός, Ant. 12, 8, 1), and Ptolemy Gazorus (Γάζωρος, 5, 16, 9). Seetzen (in Zach's Monatl. Corresp. 18, 429) thinks it is found in the present ruins called Syr or Sar (Burckhardt's Trav. in Syria, p. 355, 357), but this is too near Rabbah according to Zimmerman's map, which also gives the village of Seir at the head of a wady of the same name, at about the proper location to correspond with that of Eusebius. Raumer (Palast. p. 254) thinks it is rather the Ain Hazir (Burckhardt, Trav. p. 609); but this is in consequence of the statement of Eusebius in another place (Onomast. s.v. Α᾿ζώρ), that it lay eight miles from Philadelphia, confounding Jazer with Hazor (see Keil's  Comment. on Joshua 13, 25). As to the “sea of Jazer” mentioned by Jeremiah (48:32), which Gesenius (Comment. on Isa 16:8) thinks an error, while Relan confounds it with the Jabbok (Palaestina, p. 825), and others with other streams (Büsching, Erdbesch. 11, 389); it is probably (see Hitzig, Comm. zu Jes. p. 196) the Nahr Syr or the above-named wady (see Prof. Stuart, in the Bibl. Repos. 1836, p. 157).

With this identification Schwarz coincides (Palestine, p. 230). Porter (in Kitto's Cyclop. s.v.) suggests that “the land of Jazer” must have extended to the shore of the Dead Sea, and that ‘; the sea of Jazer” may therefore have been so called by the inhabitants of the district, just as the northern lake took the name of “Tiberias,” and ‘; Genesaret,” and “Chinnereth.” But this is unconfirmed by any other passage. In Num 21:24, where the present Hebrew text has עֵז(A.V. “strong”), the Sept. has put Ι᾿αζήρ. Burckhardt, in traveling from Es-Salt to Heshbon, passed the last-named-above ruined town, called Sir, situated on the side of a hill, and immediately below it was the source of a stream which ran down to the Jordan (Trav. in Syria, p. 364). The ruins appear to have been on the left (east) of the road, and below them' and the road is the source of the wady Szir (Burckhardt), or Mojeb es-Szir (Seetzen), answering, though certainly in position, yet imperfectly in character, to the ποταμὸς μέγιστος of Eusebius. Seetzen conjectures that the sea of Jazer may have been at the source of this brook, considerable marshes or pools sometimes existing at these spots. (Comp. his earlier suggestion of the source of the wady Serka, p. 393.) Szir, or Seir. is shown on the map of Van de Velde as 9 Roman miles W. of Amman, and about 12 from Heshbon. There can be little doubt that this is the Jazer of the Bible (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 323). The prophecies of Scripture are fulfilled. The city and country are alike desolate. The vineyards that once covered the hillsides are gone; and the wild Bedawin from the eastern desert make cultivation of any kind impossible (Porter, Handbook for Syria and Palestine, p. 298 sq.).

## Jaakobah[[@Headword:Jaakobah]]

             [some Jaako'bah] (Heb. Yaako'bah, יִעֲקֹבָה, a paragogic form of the name Jacob; Sept. Ι᾿ακαβά), one of the prosperous descendants (נְשַׂיאַים princes) of Simeon that emigrated to the valley of Gedor [Gerar] (1Ch 4:36). B.C. apparently cir. 710.

## Jaala[[@Headword:Jaala]]

             [many Jad'la] (Heb. Yaala', יִעֲלָא, ibex; Sept. Ιεαήλ v.r. Ι᾿ελήλ) one of the Nethinim (“servants of Solomon”) whose descendants (or perhaps a place whose former inhabitants) returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel (Neh 7:58); called in the parallel passage (Ezr 2:56) by the equivalent [the final א or ה by Chaldaeism] name JAALAH (יִעֲלָה, Septo Ι᾿ελά). C. ante 53G.

## Jaalah[[@Headword:Jaalah]]

             [many Jaaa'lah] (Ezr 2:56). SEE JAALA.

## Jaalam[[@Headword:Jaalam]]

             [many Jaii'lamn] (Heb. Yalam', יִעְלָםconcealer; Sept. Ι᾿εγλόμ), the second named of Esau's three sons by Aholibamah in Canaan (Gen 36:5; Gen 36:14; 1Ch 1:35). B.C. post 1964.

## Jaan[[@Headword:Jaan]]

             SEE DAN-JAAN.

## Jaanai[[@Headword:Jaanai]]

             [some Jaa'nai] (Hebrew יִעְנִי, mourner, otherwise, for יִעְנְיָה, answered by Jehovah; Sept. Ι᾿αναί v. r. Ι᾿ανίν, Vulg. Janai), one of the chief Gadites resident in Bashan (1Ch 5:12). B.C. between 1093 and 782.

## Jaaphar Ibn-Tophail[[@Headword:Jaaphar Ibn-Tophail]]

             a distinguished Arab of the 12th century, deserves our notice as the author of a philosophical treatise entitled the History of Hoi IbnYokdan (translated into Latin by Pococke [Oxf. 1671] and into English by Ockley [Oxf. 1708, 8vo]). It aims to teach that “the light of nature is sufficient to lead mankind to a knowledge of the Deity without the aid of revelation. Of Jaaphar's personal history we know scarcely anything. He is supposed to have died about 1198. See Gorton's Biographical Dictionary, s.v.

## Jaare-oregim[[@Headword:Jaare-oregim]]

             (Hebrew Yaarey' Oregim', אֹרְגַים יִעֲרֵי; Sept. Α᾿ριωργίμ, Vulg. Saltus polymitariuss), according to the present text of 2Sa 21:19, a Bethlehemite, and the father of Elhanan, who slew Goliath (the words “the brother of” are added in the A.Vers.). In the parallel passage (1Ch 20:5), besides other differences. JAIR is found instead of Jaäre, and Oregin is omitted. Oregin is not elsewhere found as a proper name, nor is it a common word; and occurring as it does without doubt at the end of the verse (Auth.Vers. “weavers”), in a sentence exactly parallel to that in 1Sa 17:7, it is not probable that it should also occur in the middle of the same. The conclusion of Kennicott (Dissertation, p. 80) appears to be a just one-that in the latter place it has been interpolated from the former, and that Jair or Jaär is the correct reading instead of  Jaare. SEE ELHANAN.

Still the agreement of the ancient versions with the present Hebrew text affords a certain corroboration to that text, and should not be overlooked. SEE JAIR.

The Peshito, followed by the Arabic, substitutes for Jaäre-Oregim the name “Malaph the weaver,” to the meaning of which we have no clew. The Targum, on the other hand, doubtless anxious to avoid any apparent contradiction of the narrative in 1 Samuel 17, substitutes David for Elhanan, Jesse for Jaäre, and is led by the word Oregin to relate or possibly to “invent a statement as to Jesse's calling” And David, son of Jesse, weaver of the veils of the house of the sanctuary. who was of Bethlehem, slew Goliath the Gittite.” By Jerome Jaäre is literally translated “damask-weavers' grove” (compare Quaestionis Hebraica on both passages). In Josephus's account (Ant. 7, 12, 2) the Israelit-ish champion is said to have been “Nephan, the kinsman of David” (Νεφάνος ὁ συγγενὴς αὐτοῦ); the word kinsman perhaps referring to the Jewish tradition of the identity of Jair and Jesse, or simply arising from the mention of Bethlehem. In the received Hebrew text Jaare is written with a small or suspended R, showing that in the opinion of the Masoretes that letter is uncertain. — Smith. The Jewish Midrashim generally identify David with Elhanan, and interpret Jaare-Oregim fancifully; e.g.

(1) as David's own name, “because he was great among the forest [of the] Oregim or Weavers [of the Law]; i.e. the Sanhedrim, who brought the Halachah (legal decisions) before him that he might weave it,” as it were (Jalkut on 2Sa 21:19 sq.); or

(2) it is David's name as the son of a mother who “— wove veils for the sanctuary;” or

(3) as an epithet of Jesse. SEE OREGIM.

## Jaasau[[@Headword:Jaasau]]

             [some Jac'sau] (Heb. Yaisav', יִעֲשִׂו; Sept. translates ἐποίησαν q. d. יִעֲשׂוּ, but the margin has Ya-ci. stay', יִעֲשִׂי, fabricator, otherwise for יִעֲשָׂיָה, made by Jehovah, and so Vulg. Jasi), an Israelite of the “sons” of Bani, who renounced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:37). B.C. 459.

## Jaasiel[[@Headword:Jaasiel]]

             (Heb. Yaasiel', יִעֲשַׂיאֵל, made by God; Sept. Ε᾿σσιήλ and Α᾿σιήλ; Vulg. Jasiel), a Mesobaite, and one of David's body-guard (1Ch 11:47, where the name is Anglicized “Jasiel”); probably the same with the son of Abner and viceroy over Benjamin (1Ch 27:21). B.C. 1046-1014.

## Jaazaniah[[@Headword:Jaazaniah]]

             (Heb. Yaazanyah', יִעֲזִנְיָה, heard by Jehovah; also in the prolonged form Yaazanya'hu, יִעֲזִנְיָהוּ[-2Ki 25:23; Eze 8:11]; sometimes in the contracted form Yezanyah', יְזִנְיָה, “Jezaniah” [Jer 42:1], or Yezanmyahu, יְזִנְיָהוּ, “Jezaniah” [Jer 40:8]; Septuag. Ι᾿εζονίας, but Α᾿ζαρίας in Jer 42:1; vulg. Jezanias), the name of four men about the time of the Captivity.

1. The son of Jeremiah, and one of the chief Rechabites (i.e. sheik) whom the prophet tested with the offer of wine (Jer 35:3). B.C. 606. SEE JEHONADAB.

2. The son of Shaphan, whom Ezekiel in his vision saw standing in the midst of the seventy elders offering idolatrous incense in the “chambers of imagery” at Jerusalem (Eze 8:11). B.C. 593.

3. The son of Azur, and one of the “princes” among the twenty-five men seen in vision by the same prophet at the east gate of the Temple, and represented as encouraging the city in its wicked pride (Eze 11:1). B.C. 593

4. The son of Hoshaiah, a Maachathite, who acted in conjunction with Johanan, the son of Kareah, after the downfall of Jerusalem, first in submitting to the Babylonian governor Gedaliah, and, after his assassination, in requesting Jeremiah's advice as to the proper course for the people to pursue (2Ki 25:23; Jer 40:8; Jer 42:1). He appears to have assisted in recovering Ishmael's prey from his clutches (comp. Jer 41:11). After that he probably went to Egypt with the rest (Jer 43:4-5). He is doubtless the same person called AZARIAH, the son of Hoshaiah, who rejected the divine counsel thus asked, and insisted on fleeing into Egypt (Jer 43:1). B.C. 587. SEE JEREMIAH.

## Jaazer[[@Headword:Jaazer]]

             Khurbet Sar, the probable representative of this locality, is laid down at seven miles west of Amman, with notes of a pool, tower, and sarcophagi adjoining, on the reduced Map of the Ordnance Survey in the fragment published east of the Jordan; but the Memoirs containing details have not appeared. It is situated on the road running along the south side of Wady Sir. Tristram says (Bible Places, page 337): "It consists only of grass- grown mounds and rows of foundations at the very head of the valley, above a marshy spring, the highest source of the Seir." Merrill says (East of the Jordan, page 405), "Sar we made to be 3400 feet above the sea-level;" the Map indicates 1390 feet.

## Jaaziah[[@Headword:Jaaziah]]

             (Heb. only in the paragogic form Yaaziya'hu, יִעֲזַיָּהוּ, comforted by Jehovah; Sept. Ο᾿ζία), apparently a third son, or a descendant of Merari the Levite, and the founder of an independent house in that family (1Ch 24:26-27) (B.C. ante 1014); but neither he nor his descendants are mentioned elsewhere (compare the lists in 23:21-23; Exo 6:19). The word Beno (בְּנוֹ), which follows Jaaziah, should probably be  translated “his son,” i.e. the son of Merari. But the text is in such a state that it is hard to know in what light to regard the person to whom it is assigned. Elsewhere the only sons of Merari mentioned are Mahli and Mushi (Exo 6:10; Num 3:33; 1Ch 6:4 [A.V. 19]; 23:21).

## Jabajahites[[@Headword:Jabajahites]]

             is the name of a modern Mohammedan sect which teaches “that the knowledge of God extends to all things, but is perfected by experience; and that he governs the world according to the chance of divers events, as not having had, from eternity, a perfect knowledge of all things future.” Of course the orthodox Mohammedans look upon this doctrine as heretical, and condemn the Jabajahites as an impious and blasphemous set. See Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. i, 498. SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.

## Jabal[[@Headword:Jabal]]

             (Heb. Yabal', יָבָל, a stream, as in Isa 30:25; Isa 44:4; Sept. Ι᾿ωβήλ, Josephus Ι᾿ώβηλος, Ant. 1, 2, 2), a descendant of Cain, son of Lamech and Adah, and brother of Jubal; described in Gen 4:20 as “the father of such as dwell in tents, and have cattle.” B.C. cir. 3500. This obviously means that Jabal was the first who adopted that nomadic life which is still followed by numerous Arabian and Tartar tribes in Asia (compare Buttman, Mythologus, 1, 164 sq.). Abel had long before been a keeper of sheep (Gen 4:2); but Jabal invented such portable habitations (formed, doubtless, of skins) as enabled a pastoral people to remove their dwellings with them from one place to another, when they led their flocks to new pastures. SEE TENT.

Bochart (Hieroz. i, 2. c. 44, near the end) points out the difference between his mode of life and Abel's, Jabal's was a migratory life, and his possessions probably included other animals besides sheep. The shepherds who were before him may have found the land on which they dwelt sufficiently productive for the constant sustenance of their flocks m the neighborhood of their fixed abodes. There is no need of  supposing (with Hartmann, Ueb. Pentat. p, 395) any historical anticipation in Géneralé 4:17.

## Jabalot, Francois Ferdinand[[@Headword:Jabalot, Francois Ferdinand]]

             an Italian preacher of the Dominican order, was born at Parma in 1780, and educated at the university in that place. He paid particular attention to the study of Hebrew, and gained notoriety as a preacher and student of the Oriental languages. He was a distinguished member of the “Congregation of the Index,” and one of the examiners of bishops. He died at Rome, March 9, 1834. His writings are, Degli Ebrei nel loro rapporto colle nazioni Cristiane (Rome, 1825, 12mo): Oazione funebre in morte del conte Antonio Cerati (Parma, 1816, 4to). See Hoefer. Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26, 141.

## Jabbok[[@Headword:Jabbok]]

             (Heb. Yabbok', יִבֹּק, according to Simonis, Onomast. p. 315, a pouring out, by Chaldaism from בָּקִק; otherwise, for יְאִבֹּק, a wrestling, from אָבִק, a coincidence that seems alluded to in Gen 32:24; Sept. Ι᾿αβώκ, but Ι᾿αβώχ in Gen 32:22; Josephus Ι᾿άβακχος, Ant. 4. 5, 2; Chald. יוּבְקָא, Targ.), one of the streams which traverse the Country east of the Jordan, and which, after a course nearly from east to west, between the districts of Merad and Belka (Seetzen, 18:427), falls into that river nearly midway between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea, or about forty-five miles below the Lake of Tiberias, another outlet for. the water in time of freshets being situated a few miles higher up (Lynch, Exped. p. 253, and Map). It seems to rise in the Hauran mountains, and its whole course may be computed at sixty-five miles. It is mentioned in Scripture as the boundary which separated the kingdom of Sihon, king of the Amorites, or the territory of the Ammonites, from that of Og, king of Bashan (Jos 12:1-5; Num 21:24; Deu 2:37; Jdg 11:13; Jdg 11:22); and it appears afterwards to have been the boundary between the tribe of Reuben and the half tribe of Manasseh (Num 21:6; Deu 3:16). The earliest notice of it occurs in Gen 32:22, in the account of Jacob's mysterious struggle with Jehovah in its vicinity (south bank).

According- to Eusebius  it was between Gerasa (Jerash) and Philadelphia (Amman). Origen:(Opera, 2, 43) says it was known in his day by the name Jmnbice (Ι᾿αμβίκη or Ι᾿αμβύκη).  “The stream is important in a geographical point of view, and a knowledge of its topography helps us to understand more easily some passages of Scripture. It was the boundary between the Amorites and the Ammonites. We are told that after the defeat of Sihon, king of the Amorites, at Jazer, ‘Israel possessed his land from Arnon unto Jabbok, even unto the children of Ammon; for the border of the children of Ammon was strong (Num 21:24). The Jabbok, flowing in a wild and deep ravine through the Gilead mountains, formed a strong natural frontier for the bordering principalities. It would seem that at the Exodus the Ammonites possessed the country eastward and northward of the upper sources and branches of the Jabbok, and that Sihon amid Og occupied the whole region between the Ammonites and the Jordan, extending as far north as the Sea of Galilee (Jos 12:2-8; Josephus, Ant. 4, 5, 2 and 3). The Israelites conquered Sihon and Og, and took their kingdoms; and the possessions of the three tribes, thus acquired, extended from the Dead Sea to Hermon; but they were not permitted to touch the territory of Ammon (Deu 2:37; Deu 3:16). About fifteen miles from the Jordan the Jabbok forks, one branch coming down from Jerash on the north, and the other from Rabbath-Amman on the south; these branches formed the western frontier of the Ammonites, dividing them from the Amorites, and subsequently from the Israelites (Reland, Pel. p. 103).

Previous to the Exodus the territory of the Ammonites was much more extensive, embracing the whole region between the Jabbok and the Amon; but the Amorites drove them out of that portion, and forced them into the mountains around the sources of the Jabbok, and into the plains eastward (Jdg 11:13; Jdg 11:22)” (Porter in Kitto, s.v.). It is now called the Zerka [or Wady Zurka] (from its “blue” color, Robinson's Researches, 3, Append. p. 326; but, according to Schwarz, Palest. p. 52, from a fortress of the same name on the caravan route from Damascus to Mecca). Its sources are chiefly on the eastern side of the mountains of Gilead, and it also drains a portion of the high plateau of Arabia beyond. In its passage westward across the plains it more than once passes under ground. The upper branches and tributaries are mere winter streams. At the point where the two main branches from Jerash and Ammon unite, the stream becomes perennial, and often, after heavy rain, is a foaming, impassable torrent. “The ravine through which it flows is narrow, deep, and in places wild. Throughout nearly its whole course it is fringed by thickets of cane and oleander, and the large clustering flowers of the latter give the banks a gay and gorgeous appearance during the spring and early summer” (Porter,  Handbook for S. and P. p. 310). Higher up, the sides of the ravine are clothed with forests of evergreen oak, pine, and arbutus; and the undulating forest glades are carpeted with green grass, and strewn with innumerable wild flowers. The scenery along the banks of the Jabbok is probably the most picturesque in Palestine; and the ruins of town, and village, and fortress which stud the surrounding mountain sides render the country as interesting as it is beautiful. The water is pleasant, and, the bed being rocky, the stream runs clear (Burckhardt's Syria, p. 347; Irby and Mangles, Travels, p. 319; Buckingham, Palestine, 1, 109; Lindsay, 2, 123).

## Jabbok (2)[[@Headword:Jabbok (2)]]

             Wady Zerka, the modern name of this stream (which must be carefully distinguished from the Zerka Main, farther south, near Callirrhoe), has been explored by Dr. Merrill, whose account closes thus (East of the Jordan, page 381): "Its winding course is remarkable, making it in this regard unlike any other river of Syria. The Jordan is more crooked, having almost innumerable short bends; but the Jabbok sweeps far out into the desert, then doubles back upon itself, and forces its way through a mountain The valley is seventy or more miles in length, and is exceedingly fertile. Along its head-waters lived a great and powerful race, which existed from the earliest advent of the Hebrews in this region clear down to a period subsequent to the time of Christ.... Its capacities are great, because every acre can be reached by irrigation canals. Even at present it is very extensively cultivated. and contains many line farms. On the hill-sides there are. at certain points, some unused canals, of which a few can be traced to a distance of five or eight miles"

## Jabesh[[@Headword:Jabesh]]

             (Heb. Yabesh', יָבֵשׁ, dry, as in Job 41:25; Eze 17:24, etc.; also written fully Yabeysh', יָבֵישׁ, 1Sa 11:1; 1Sa 11:3; 1Sa 11:5; 1Sa 11:10; 1Sa 31:11; 2Sa 2:4-5; 1Ch 10:12, first time), the name of a place and also of a man.

1. (Sept. in Samuel Ι᾿αβίς, in Chronicles Γαβείς) The shorter form (1Sa 11:3; 1Sa 11:9-10; 1Sa 20:12-13; 1Ch 10:12, only) of the name of the city elsewhere called JABESH-GILEAD SEE JABESH-GILEAD (q.v.).

2. (Sept. Ι᾿αβείς v. r. Α᾿βείς, Joseph. Ιάβησος, Ant. Ix, 11, 1.) The father of Shallum, which latter usurped the throne of Israel by the assassination of Zachariah (2Ki 15:10; 2Ki 15:13-14). B.C. ante 770.

## Jabesh-gilead[[@Headword:Jabesh-gilead]]

             (Heb. telbesh' Gilad', יָבֵשׁ גַּלְעָד[also יָבֵישׁ, SEE JABESH, by which simple form it is sometimes called]; Sept. Ι᾿αβείς or Ι᾿αβίς [in Chronicles Γαβείς] Γαλαάδ or τῆς Γαλααδίτιδος; Josephus Ι᾿άβισος [Ant. 5, 2, 11], Ι᾿αβίς [Ant. 6, 5, 1], and Ι᾿αβισσός Ed Ant. 6, 14, 8]), a town beyond the Jordan, in the land of Gilead, distant a night's journey from Bethshan (1Sa 31:11; 2Sa 2:4; 2Sa 21:12). In the sense denoted in this juxtaposition, Gilead included the half tribe of Manasseh (1Ch 27:21), as well as the tribes of Gad and Reuben (Num 32:1-42) east of the Jordan; and of the cities of Gilead, Jabesh was the chief, lying within the limits of the half tribe of Manasseh east. It is first mentioned in connection with the cruel vengeance taken upon its inhabitants for not coming up to Mizpeh on the occasion of the fierce war between the children of Israel and the tribe of Benjamin. Every male of the city was put  to the sword, and all the virgins-to the number of 400-seized to be given in marriage to the 600 men of Benjamin that remained Jdg 21:8-14). Nevertheless the city survived the loss of its males, and is next memorable for the siege it sustained from Nahash, king of the Ammonites, the raising of which formed the first exploit of the newly-elected king Saul and procured his confirmation in the sovereignty. The inhabitants had agreed to surrender, and to have their right eyes put out (to incapacitate them from military service), but were allowed seven days to ratify the treaty. In the mean time Saul collected a large army, and came to their relief (1 Samuel 11). This service was gratefully remembered by the Jabeshites, and about forty years after, when he and his three sons were slain by the Philistines in Mount Gilboa (1Sa 31:8), the men of Jabesh-gilead came by night and took down their corpses from the walls of.

Bethshan, where they had been exposed as trophies, then burned the bodies, and buried the bones under a tree near the city, observing a strict funeral fast for seven days (1Sa 31:13). “Jabesh-gilead was on the mountain, east of the Jordan, in full view of Bethshan, and these brave men could creep up to the tell along wady Jalud without being seen, while the deafening roar of the brook would render it impossible for them to be heard” (Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 174). David does not forget to bless them for this act of piety towards his old master, and his more than brother (2Sa 2:15), though he afterwards had the remains translated to the ancestral sepulcher in the tribe of Benjamin (2Sa 21:14). Jabesh still existed as a town in the time of Eusebius, who places it on a hill six miles from Pella, towards Gerasa (Onomast. s.v. Α᾿ρισώθ and Ι᾿αβεῖς). Mr. Buckingham thinks it may be found in a place called Jehaz or Jejaz, marked by ruins upon a hill in a spot not far from which, according to the above indications, Jabesh must have been situated (Travels, 2, 130, 134). It was more probably situated on the present wady Jabes, which Burckhardt (Trav. in Syria, p. 289) describes as entering the Jordan not far below Beisan. According to Schwarz (Palest. p. 234), there is a village of the same name still existing on this wady ten miles east of Jordan; but Dr. Robinson, during his last visit to this region, sought in vain for any village or ruins by that name (which, he says, is applied exclusively to the wady), but thinks the site of Jabesh-gilead may be marked by that of the ruins called by the Arabs ed- Deir (the convent), high up the wady, on the south side, on a hill, and containing columns as he was informed (new ed. of Researches, 3, 319). It is about six miles from the ruins of Pella, near the line of the ancient road  to Gerasa (Van de Velde, Travels, 2 349-52; Porter, Handbook Jibr Syria and Palest. p. 317; Stanley, Sinai and Pal. p. 290).

## Jabez[[@Headword:Jabez]]

             (Heb. Yabets', יִעְבֵּוֹ, according to 1Ch 4:9, affliction, sc. to his mother, apparently by transposition from the root עָצִב; Sept. Ι᾿γαβής and Γαβής or Γάβης), the name of a man and also of a place.

1. A descendant of Judah (B.C. post 1612), but of what particular family is not apparent, although we have this remarkable account of him inserted among a series of bare pedigrees: “And Jabez was more honorable than his brethren: and his mother called his name Jabez, saying, Because I bare him with sorrow (עֹצֶב). And Jabez called on the God of Israel, saying, Oh that thou wouldst bless me indeed, and enlarge my coast, and that thine hand might be with me, and that thou wouldst keep me from evil, that it may not grieve me (צָצְבַּי, otsbi')! And God granted him that which he requested” (1Ch 4:9-10). It is very doubtful whether any connection exists between this genealogy and that in 1Ch 2:50-55. Several names appear in both Hur, Ephratah, Bethlehem, Zareathites (in A.V. 4:2 inaccurately “Zorathites”), Joab, Caleb; — and there is much similarity between others, as Rechab and Rechah, Eshton and Eshtaulites; but any positive connection seems undemonstrable. The Targum identifies Jabez and Othniel. For the traditionary notices of this person and his character, see Clarke's Comnnent. ad loc.

2. A place described as being inhabited by several families of the scribes descended from the Kenites, and allied to the Rechabites (1Ch 2:55). It occurs in a notice of the progeny of Salma, who was of Judah, and closely connected with Bethlehem, possibly the father of Boaz-; and also-though how is not clear — with Joab. The Targum states some curious particulars, which, however, do not much elucidate the difficulty, and which are probably a mixture of trustworthy tradition and of mere invention based on philological grounds. Rechab is there identified with Rechabiah, the son of Eliezer, Moses's younger son (1Ch 26:25), and Jabez with Othniel the Kenezite, who bore the name of Jabez “because he founded by his counsel (עֵיצָה) a school (תִּרְבַּיצָא) of disciples called Tirathites, Shimeathites, and Sucathites.” See also the quotations from Talmud. Tem urah, in Buxtorfs Lex. col. 966, where a similar deviation is given. As the place appears to have been situated within  the territory of Judah, it may have been settled by the numerous posterity of the above person by the same name (comp. “the men of Rechah,” 1Ch 4:12). The associated names would seem to indicate a locality near, if not identical with Kirjath-jearim (comp. in the same region Kirjath- sepher, or book-town, implying the literary avocation of its inhabitants), where some of the same families appear to have dwelt (1 Chronicles 2, 53), e.g. the Ithrites =Kenites, the Shumathites = Simeathites.

## Jabez, Isaac ben-Salomo ben-Isaac ben-Joseph[[@Headword:Jabez, Isaac ben-Salomo ben-Isaac ben-Joseph]]

             a Jewish commentator of some note, flourished in the 15th century. Of his personal history we are uninformed, but his works, of great celebrity in the 15th century, still continue to be considered valuable contributions to exegetical literature; and Frankfurter, in his “Rabbinic Bible,” inserted the following, which are, however, rather compilations from different expositors than the original productions of Jabez:

(1) יְהוָֹה תהלוֹה, or Commentary on the Psalms: —

(2) למודי יהוה, or Commentary on Proverbs: —

(3) יראת שדי, or Commentary on Proverbs: —

(4) קדש קדשים, or Commentary on the Song of Songs: —

(5) צמח צדיק, or Commentary on Ruth: —

(6) צדקת תמים, or Commentary on Lamentations: —

(7) שערי מדע, or Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes: —

(8) עטרת שלום, or Commentary on the Book of Esther: —

(9) ברכת ישרים, or Commentary on Daniel: —

(10) מושיע חוסים, or Commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah. Besides these, Jabez wrote יפק רצון, or homiletical Commentary on the Haphtaroth, or Sabbatic Lessons from the prophets (Belvidere, near Constantinople, 1593, folio): המנהה סלת, or Commentary on the Pentateuch. See W. — Biblioth. Hebraea, 1, 694; 3:617 sq.; 4:886; Furst, Biblioth. Jued. 2, 2; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. in Biblioth. Bodl. col. 1125; C. D. Ginsburg, in Kitto, s.v.

## Jabin[[@Headword:Jabin]]

             (Heb. Yabin', יָבַין, discerner; Sept. Ι᾿αβίς [v.r. Ι᾿αβίν, but Ι᾿αβείν in Psa 83:9], Josephus Ι᾿αβῖνος, Ant. 5, 5, ), the name of two kings of  the Canaanitish city Hazor. SEE HAZOR. It was possibly a royal title, like Agag among the Amalekites and Abimelech among the Philistines.

1. A king of Hazor, and one of the most powerful of all the princes who reigned in Canaan when it was invaded by the Israelites (Jos 11:1-14). His dominion seems to have extended over all, the north part of the country; and after the ruin of the league formed against the Hebrews in the south by Adonizedek, king of Jerusalem, he assembled his tributaries near the waters of Merom (the Lake Huleh), and called all the people to arms. This coalition was destroyed, as the one in the south had been, and Jabin himself perished in the sack of Hazor, his capital, B.C. cir. 1615. This prince was the last powerful enemy with whom Joshua combated, and his overthrow seems to have been regarded as the crowning act in the conquest of the Promised Land, leaving only the Anakim in the mountains of Judah and Ephraim to be dispossessed in detail (Jos 11:21-23; comp. Jos 14:6-15).

2. Another king of Hazor. and probably descended from the preceding (Jdg 4:2-3), with whom some (Maurer, Comment. on Joshua 11; Hervey, Genealogies, p. 228) have confounded him (see Havernick, Einleit. II, i, 53; Keil, on Jos 11:10-15). It appears that during one of the servitudes of the Israelites, probably, when they lay under the yoke of Cushan or Eglon, the:kingdom of Hazor was reconstructed. The narrative gives to this second Jabin even the title of “king of Canaan;” and this, with the possession of 900 iron-armed warchariots, implies unusual power and extent of dominion. The iniquities of the Israelites having lost them the divine protection, Jabin gained the mastery over them; and, stimulated by the memory of ancient hostilities, oppressed them heavily for twenty years, B.C. 14291409. From this thraldom they were relieved by the great victory won by Barak in the plain of Esdraelon over the hosts of Jabin, commanded by Sisera, one of the most renowned generals of those times (Jdg 4:10-16). SEE SISERA.

The well-compacted power of the king of Hazor was not yet, however, entirely broken. The war was still prolonged for a time, but-ended in the entire ruin of Jabin, and the subjugation of his territories by the Israelites (Jdg 4:24). This is the Jabin whose name occurs in Psa 83:10. SEE HAZOR.

## Jabineau, Henri[[@Headword:Jabineau, Henri]]

             a French religious writer, born at Etampes near the opening of the last century, was, after completing his studies at Paris, appointed professor at the Vitry-le-Frangais College on his refusal to subscribe the formulary generally submitted before a candidate is permitted to enter the priesthood. But his attainments were of such superior order that the archbishop of Chàlons-sur-Marne waived this obligation; and Jabineau was consecrated a priest. He then became rector at the College of Vitry. But he soon exchanged the rostrum for the pulpit, where, on account of his liberal views, he was several times interdicted. In 1768 he entered the lawyer's profession, and during the Revolution wrote a number of vehement articles against the French clergy of the Roman Catholic Church. He died in July 1792, shortly before the publication of the decree of the National Assembly against priests (Aug. 26, 1792). The most important of his writings are, Competence de la puissance temporelle relativement à l'erection et a let suppression des sieges èpiscopaux (Par. 1760, 8vo; 1790, and often): — Exposition des principes de labfoi Catholique sur l'Eglise, recueillie des instructions familieres de l. Jab (published shortly after his death, Par. 1792, 8vo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26:142.

## Jablonski, Daniel Ernst[[@Headword:Jablonski, Daniel Ernst]]

             a distinguished German theologian, was born at a little village near Dantzic Nov. 26, 1660. The name of his father, a preacher, was originally Figulus, but he in after life exchanged it for Jablonski, deriving the name from that of his native place, Jablunka, a small village in Silesia. Young Jablonski was educated: at the gymnasium of Lyssa, in Prussian Poland, and at the University of Frankfort on the Oder (now constituting the Berlin University), where he applied himself to literature and philosophy, but more especially to theology and the Oriental languages. In 1680 he visited the universities and libraries of Holland and England, and spent considerable time at Oxford. On his return in 1683 he was appointed preacher at one of the reformed churches of Magdeburg, which place he left two years later in order to assume the rectorship of the gymnasium at Lyssa. In 1690 he was made court preacher at Knigsberg, and in 1693 his fame procured him the place of preacher to the king at Berlin. But still other honorable offices awaited him. Thus, in 1718, he was made a member of the Consistory, in 1729 a Church councilor, and in 1733 he was elected president of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Berlin. At the  request of the king, Frederick I, he labored earnestly, but unsuccessfully, to accomplish a union of the different Protestant churches. He died at Berlin May 25, 1741. The greater part of his life had been devoted to severe study, and he was eminently successful as a preacher. Dr. Hagenbach (Hurst's transl. of Ch. Hist. (Of 18th and 19th Cent, i, 410, 412) says that Jablonski was a bishop among the Moravians (1698), and even was “the eldest of the Moravian bishops,” and that he consecrated both David Nitschmann (q.v.) and count Zinzendorf for the episcopal office. At the instance of the queen, he was honored as early as 1706 with the degree of doctor of divinity. Jablonski translated into Latin the eight discourses of Richard Bentley against. Atheism, the treatise of Joseph Woodward on the religious societies of London, and that of Burnet on predestination and grace; but he is especially celebrated by an edition of the Hebrew Bible, with notes and an introduction, published under the title of Biblia Hebraica cum notis hebraicis (Berlin, 1699, 2 vols. 4to; — 2nd ed. 1712, 12mo). The ‘preface has since been printed in other editions of the Hebrew Bible. Both editions have a list, by Leusden, of 2294 select verses, in which all the words to be found in the Bible are contained. He also published an edition of the Talmud, and wrote a number of religious works, the most important of-which is Christliche Predigten (Berlin, 1716, etc., 10 parts, 4to). Many of Jablonski's writings bear on the state of the Church in Poland. One of the most able of them is the Historia Consensus Sendomniriensis inter evangelicos regni Polonic et Lithuanice (Berlin, 1731, 4to), etc. See Ersch Lu Gruber, Allg. Encyk. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 26, 145; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. s.v.

## Jablonski, Paul Ernst[[@Headword:Jablonski, Paul Ernst]]

             a distinguished German theologian and philologist, and son of the former Jablonski, was born at Berlin in 1693. He was educated at the University of Frankfort on the Oder, where he acquired such great proficiency in the Coptic as well as other Oriental languages that the government of Prussia sent the young man of twenty-one years, at the expense of the king (in 1714), to visit the principal libraries and high schools of Europe, to perfect himself in his knowledge of the Oriental tongues, and decipher Coptic and other MSS. For this purpose he visited the universities of Oxford, Leyden, and Paris. After his return home he entered the ministry, and was appointed pastor at Liebenberg in 1720. He, however, soon found that his place was in the rostrum rather than in the pulpit, and in 1721 accepted the professorship of philosophy in his alma mater. In 1722 he was honored  with the appointment of professor of theology, and shortly after was elected a member of the Royal Academy of Berlin. He died December 14, 1557. Jablonski was one of the most learned of the many who have endeavored to throw light on the language, literature, and antiquities of the Egyptians. His Egyptian Glossary-, which makes the first volume of the Opuscula quibes lingua et antiquitas AEgyptiorums, etc., published by J. S. te Water (Leyden, 1804-10,3 vols. 8vo), is pronounced by Quatremere the most complete work in that department. Another work of great value in this department, and certainly one of the best productions of Jabloniski, is the Pantheon AEgyptiorum sire de diis eoraum commentarius, cume prolegomenis de eligione et theologia Aegyptiorum. (Berlin, 1750-52, 3 vols. 8vo). The other works of especial value, and of interest to our readers, are, Disquisitio de Lingua Lycaonica (Berlin, 1714, 4to; 2nd edition, Utrecht, 1724), an attempt to prove that the language of Lycaonia, mentioned in Act 14:11, bore no relation to Greek: — Exercitatio historico-theolougica de Nestorianismo, etc. (Berlin, 1724, 8vo; German by Immermann, Magdeburg, 1752, 4to); this work, intended as a defence of Nestorianism, excited great controversy among the German theologians: — Remphan, AEgyptiorums Deus, ab Israelitis deserto cultus (Franefort ad Oder, 1735, 4to): — Disserf. exeg. histor. de Serapi parabolico, ad Mat 12:31 et 32 (Francfort ad Oder, 1736, 4to): — De ultimis Pauli apostoli laboribus a beato Luca pretermissis (Berl. 1746, 4to): — De Memnone Graecorun et AEgyptiorum, hujusque celeberrima in Thebaide statua, Syntagmata III (Frankfurt ad Oder, 1753, 4to): — Institutiones histories Christiance antiquioris (Franefort ad Oder, 1753, 8vo): — Institutiones hist. Christiane recentioris (Francf: 1756, 8vo); the two latter works were published together under the title Inst. Hist. Christiance (Frankfurt ad Oder, 1766,1767,2 vols. 8vo; revised and augmented by E. A. Schulze, id. 1783. 1784. 2 vols. 8vo; 3rd vol. by E. H. D. Stosch, containing the history of the 18th century, idem. 1767, 8vo; revised and completed by A. P. G. Schickedanz, id. 1786, 8vo). See Ersch u. Gruber, Allg. Encyklop.; Hoefer. Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26:146 sq.: Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit. s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, s.v.

## Jabme Acco[[@Headword:Jabme Acco]]

             was a goddess worshipped by the Laplanders, the mother of death. Her dwelling was, deep in the bed of the earth, and the departed remained with her, Until their destiny was decided by the judges of the infernal regions.

## Jabneel[[@Headword:Jabneel]]

             (Hebrew Yabneel', יִבְנְאֵל, built by God; Sept. Ι᾿αβνήλ, but Ι᾿αβιήλ in Jos 19:33), the name of two places.

1. A town on the northern boundary of Judah, between Mount Baalah and the Mediterranean (Jos 15:11); probably the same elsewhere (2Ch 26:6) called JABNEH SEE JABNEH (q.v.) or JAMNIANI (1Ma 4:15, etc.).

2. A city on the border of Naphtali, mentioned between Nekeb and Lakum (Jos 19:33). Schwarz (Palest. p. 181, 182) affirms that the later name of Jabneel was Ker Yameah, “the village, by the sea,” and on Talmudical grounds (comp. Reland's Palcest. p. 545, 716) locates it on the southern shore of Lake Merom, and thinks it identical with the Jaminia or Jainnuith mentioned by Josephus as lying in this section of Upper Galilee (Ι᾿άμνια, Life, 37; Ι᾿αμνίθ, War, 2, 20, 6). This is ‘not improbable, as the boundary-line here described appears to have extended from the northern limit of Palestine along the eastern bounds of Naphtali to the Jordan proper. It is perhaps the village Ja'tneh, visited by Dr. Robinson, on the declivity of the western mountain south of Lake Huleh, with a wady containing a small stream on the south of the village, and a few ruins of the Jewish type (Later Researches, p. 361,362).

## Jabneel Of Naphtali[[@Headword:Jabneel Of Naphtali]]

             is identified by Condei (Tent Work, 2:337), with Yemma, a modern village wit} a spring of the same name, four miles south-west of the Sea of Tiberias, but with no special signs of antiquith (Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Map, 1:365). Jabneh. The modern site Yebnah is located midway (four and a quarter miles) between Akir (Ekron and the shore, and is thus spoken of in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (2:441): "The modern village occupies a strong position on a rounded hill the houses being mostly of mud. The only remains of interest noted were the church in the village and the mosque west of it." which are described in detail.

## Jabneh[[@Headword:Jabneh]]

             (Heb. Yabneh', יִבְנֶה, a building; Hamaker Miscell. Phaen. p. 256, compares the Arabic Yubnlay; Sept. Ι᾿αβήρ v.r. Ι᾿αβνῆ and Ι᾿αβείς,Vulg. Jabnia), a Philistine town near the Mediterranean, between Joppa and Ashdod, whose wall king Uzziah demolished (2Ch 26:6). It is probably this place whose name many of the copies of the Sept. insert in Jos 15:56 (Ι᾿εμναϊv, Ι᾿αμναί, Ι᾿εμνάθ, Cod. Vat. Γεμνά). In later times (Josephus, War. 1, 7, 7; Strabo, 16:759; Pliny, 5, 14), under the name of Jamsnia (Ι᾿αμνία, 1Ma 4:15; Ι᾿άμνεια, 1Ma 5:58; 1Ma 10:69; 2Ma 12:8), it was inhabited by Jews as well as Gentiles (Philo, Opp. 2. 575). According to Josephus (Ant. 12, 8, 6), Gorgias was governor of it; but the text of the Maccabees (2Ma 12:32) has Idumaea. At this time there was a harbor on the coast (see Ptol. 5, 16. 2), to which, and the vessels lying there, Judas set fire, and the conflagration was seen at Jerusalem, a distance of about twenty-five miles (2Ma 12:9). The harbor is also mentioned by Pliny, who, in consequence, speaks of the town as double — duae Jannes (see Reland, p. 823). Like Ascalon and Gaza, the harbor bore the title of Majumas, perhaps a Coptic word, meaning the “place on the sea” (Kelrick, Phoenicia, p. 27, 29). Pompey took the place from the Jews and joined it to the province of Syria  (Josephus, War, 1, 7, 7). Its distance from Jerusalem was 240 stadia (2Ma 12:7), from Diospolis twelve Roman miles (Itin. Anton.), from Ascalon 200 stadia (Strabo, 16:759). At the time of the fall of Jerusalem, Jabneh was one of the most populous places of Judaea, and contained a Jewish school of great fame, whose learned doctors are often mentioned in the Talmud (Mishna, Rosh Hasshana, 4, 1; Sanhedr. 11. 4; comp. Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 285 sq.; Sperbach, Diss. de Academia Jabhnensi ejusque rectoribus, Viteb. 1740; Lightfoot, Academe. Jab. histor., in his Opp. 2, 87 sq.). The Jews called this school their Sanhedrim, though it only possessed a faint shadow of the authority of that great council (Milman, History of the Jews, 3:95, 2nd edit.; Lightfoot, 2, 141-143). In this holy city, according to an early Jewish tradition, was buried the great Gamaliel. His tomb was visited by Parchi in the 14th century (Zunz, in Asher's Benj. of Tudela, 2, 439, 440; also 98). In the time of Eusebius, however, it had dwindled to a small place (πολίχνη), merely requiring casual mention (Onomasticon, s.v. Ι᾿αμνεία). In the 6th century', under Justinian, it became the seat of a Christian bishop (Epiphanius, adv. Haer. lib. 2, 730). Under the Crusaders, who thought it to be the site of Gath, and who built a fortress in it, it bore the corrupted name of Ibelin, and gave a title to a line of counts, one of whom, Jean d'Ibelin, about 1250, restored to efficiency the famous code of the “Assises de Jerusalem” (Gibbon, chap. 58 ad fin.). For the history in full, see Reland, Palest. p. 822; Rosenmüller, Alterth. 2, 2, p. 366; Raumer, Palest. p. 200; comp. Thomson, L. and B. 2, 312 sq.

The name Yebna is still borne by a little village among the ruins of the ancient site, upon a small eminence on the western side of wady Rubin, about one hour from the sea (Irby and Mangles, p. 182; Corresp. d'Orienf, v, p. 373, 374). According to Scholz (Reisen, p. 146), there are here the ruins of a former church, afterwards a mosque; also, nearer the sea, the ruins of a Roman bridge over the wady, with high arches, built of very large stones. On the eastern side of the wady, on a small eminence, is the tomb of Rubin (Reuben), the son of Jacob from whom the wady takes its name; it is mentioned by Mejr ed-Din (1495) as having been formerly a noted place of pilgrimage for Moslems, as it still is in some degree (Fundgr. des Orients, 2, 138). It is about eleven miles south of Jaffa, seven from Ramleh, and four from Akir (Ekron). (See Robinson's Researches, 3, 22; Ritter, Erdk. 16, 125.) It probably occupies its ancient site, for some remains of old buildings are to be seen, possibly relics of the fortress which the Crusaders built there (Porter, Handbook, p. 274).  This position likewise corresponds with that of JABNEEL (Jos 15:11) on the western end of the northern boundary of Judah (so Schwarz, Palestine, p. 98; Keil, Comment. ad loc.), which is placed by Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Jamneel) between Ashdod and Diospolis. There is no sign of its ever having been occupied by Judah. Josephus (Ant. 5, 1, 22) correctly attributes it to the Danites. There was a constant struggle going on between that tribe and the Philistines for the possession of all the places in the lowland plain SEE DAN, and it is not surprising that the next time we meet with Jabneal it should be in the hands of the latter (2Ch 26:6).

## Jabruda[[@Headword:Jabruda]]

             (ἵαβρουδά), a city of Palestine mentioned by Ptolemy (5, 15), ‘and as an' episcopal city by St. Paulo (Geogr. Sacr. p. 294); now Yebord, a village, but still the seat of a bishop; rather more than an hour to the west of the great caravan road from Damascus to Homs, nearly midway between these two cities (Porter, Damnuscus, 1, 360). — Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 323; Robinson, Later Researches; p. 556.

## Jachan[[@Headword:Jachan]]

             (Heb. Yakan', יִצְכָּן, mourner; Sept. Ι᾿αχάν v. r. Ι᾿ωαχάν), one of seven chief Gadite “brothers” resident in Bashan (1Ch 5:13). B.C. between 1093 and 782. SEE AKAN.

## Jachin[[@Headword:Jachin]]

             (Heb. Yakin', יָכַין, firm; Sept. Ι᾿αχείν, Ι᾿αχίν), the name of three men and also of a pillar.

1. The fourth named of the sons of Simeon (Gen 46:10; Exo 6:15), called JARIB in 1Ch 4:24. His descendants are called JACHINITES (Heb. Yakini', יָכַינַי, Sept. Ι᾿αχινί, Num 26:12). B.C. 1856.

2. The head of the twenty-first “course” of priests as arranged by David (1Ch 24:17). B.C. 1014.

3. One of the priests that returned to Jerusalem after the Exile (1Ch 9:10; Neh 11:10). B.C. 536.

4. JACHIN (Sept. in Kings Ι᾿αχούμ, Alex. Ι᾿αχούν; but in Chronicles κατόρθωσις in both MSS.; Josephus Ι᾿αχίν; Vulg. Jachin, Jachimn) AND BOAZ were the names of two columns (the former on the right hand [south], the latter on the left) set up (according to Phoenician style: compare Menander in Josephus, Ant. 8, 5, 3; see Vatke's-Bibl. Theol. p. 324, 326; Movers, Phon. 1, 293) in the porch (לְאֻלָם) of Solomon's Temple (1Ki 7:15-22; 2Ch 3:17; comp. Jer 52:21), and doubtless of symbolical import (Simonis, Onomasticon, p. 430, 460). SEE ARCHITECTURE; SEE TEMPLE.

Each was eighteen cubits high and twelve in circumference, or four in diameter. They were formed of brass (copper or bronze, perhaps some more precious alloy) four fingers in thickness (Jer 52:21). The capitals (quadrangular, Jer 3:23), also of brass, were five cubits high (1Ki 7:16; Jer 52:22; 2Ch 3:15). The description of the ornaments (of the same metal, Jer 3:22) of the capitals (1Ki 7:17 sq.; compare 2Ki 25:17; 2Ch 2:15; 2Ch 4:12; Jer 52:22) is much confused and obscure (Hitzig, Jerem. p. 423), either on account of the brevity or in consequence of some corruption in the text, and it is therefore no wonder that antiquarians (see Lamy, De Tabern. fod. p. 1043 sq.; Meyer, Blätt. höh. Warh. 1, 13 sq.; 9:31 sq.; Grünersen, in the Stuttgart. Kunstb. 1831, No. 77 sq.; Keil, Tempel Solomo's, p. 95 sq.; Schnaase, Gesch. der bild. Kunste, 1, 245;.280) and architects (Schmidt, Biblic. Mathem. p. 253 sq.) should have varied greatly in their views and reconstructions on this point (compare Lamy, Tab. 18; Scheuchzer, Phys. sacr. 3, tab. 443 sq.; see Meyer, ut sup.). It is clear, however, that the capitals were swelling at the top, and lily shaped (1Ki 7:18; 1Ki 7:20; comp. Josephus, Ant. 8, 3, 4). (For discussions of various points connected with the subject, see Rosenmüller on Jer 52:22; Meyer's Bibeldeut. p. 257; Jahn, 3:261; Moyers, Chronicles p. 253; Hirt, Gesch. d. Baukunst, tab. 3, fig. 20; Böttcher, Prob. altest. Schriftausl. p. 335; Keil, Comment. on 1Ki 6:15. Monographs on the subject have been written by J. G. Michaelis, Frankf. 1733; Unger, Lugd. 1733; and Kilchberger, Berl. 1783; especially M. Plesken, De columnis cezeis, Viteb. 1719; also in Ugolini Thesaurus, x; compare the treatises of Lightfoot, Keil Hirt, and Bardwell on Solomon's Temple.) — Winer, 1, 520. SEE BOAZ; SEE PILLAR.

## Jachini, Abraham[[@Headword:Jachini, Abraham]]

             SEE LEVI (Sabbatai).

## Jachinite[[@Headword:Jachinite]]

             (Num 17:12). SEE JACHIN 1. Jacinth (ὑάκινθος, the hyacinth), properly a flower of a deep purple or reddish blue (so ὑακίνθινος, hyacinthine, i.e. hyacinth-colored, “of jacinth,” Rev 9:17); hence a precious stone of like color (Rev 21:20). Considerable doubt prevails as to the real mineral thus designated, if indeed any particular stone be intended, and not rather every purplish or azure gem. According to Dr. Moore (Anc. Mineralogy, p. 169), it is most nearly related to. the zircon of modern mineralogists. The hyacinth or jacinth stone was of various colors, from white or pale green to purple-red. Pliny speaks of it as shining with a golden color, and in much favor as an amulet or charm against the plague (Hist. Nat. 37:9). It occurs in the Sept. for תִּחִשׁ, Exo 25:5; also for תְּכֵלֶי, Exo 26:4; but is usually supposed to represent the Heb. לֶשֶׁם, “ligure” (q.v.) (Rosenmüller, Bibl. Alterthumsk. IV, 1, p. 38). SEE GEM.

## Jachja, David[[@Headword:Jachja, David]]

             SEE IBN-JACHJA, DAVID.

## Jachja, Gedalja[[@Headword:Jachja, Gedalja]]

             SEE IBN-JACHJA, GEDALJA.

## Jachja, Joseph[[@Headword:Jachja, Joseph]]

             SEE IBN-JACHJA, JOSEPH.

## Jachmann, Johann Gottlieb[[@Headword:Jachmann, Johann Gottlieb]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Breslau, January 8, 1727. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1752 conrector of the Mag dalene Gymnasium at Breslau, in 1767 provost of Si Mary's and St. George's churches, at Oels, Silesia, and died February 15, 1776. He wrote, De Sabbatho ainte Legei Mosaicams Existente (Leipsic, 1748): — Spicilegiium Observationum in Matthaei Caput 24 (1749): — Observati Exegetica in Ies. 26:19 (1749): — De Beringeri Editione N. Test. Germanica (Breslau, 1757): — De Josephi pro-rege Egyptiorum (1764): — De Justino, Martyr et Philosopho (1765). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:5. (B.P.)

## Jackal[[@Headword:Jackal]]

             the Persic shaal, Turkish jakal, canis aureus of Linnaeus, has been thought to be denoted by several Hebrew words variously rendered in the Autho Vers. SEE FOX; SEE DRAGON; SEE WHELP, etc. It is a wild animal of the canine family SEE WOLF; SEE DOG, which in Persia, Armenia, likewise Arabia (Niebuhr, Beschr. 166), and even in Syria (Russel, Aleppo, 2, 61) and Palestine (around Jaffa, Gaza, and in Galilee, Hasselquist, Trav. p. 271; among the hills of Judea, Robinson, 2, 432; 3:188), is frequently met with, attaining a large size (three and a half feet in length), and so closely resembling a fox in color and general appearance as to be at first readily mistaken for that animal. But the jackal has a somewhat peculiarly formed head, not greatly unlike that of a shepherd's dog, about seven inches long, with a very pointed muzzle, and yellowish-red hair which resembles that of the wolf. The color of the body is yellowish-gray above, whitish below; the back and sides sometimes of mixed gray and black; the shoulders, thighs, and legs uniformly tawny-yellow. The tail is round,  projecting, and reaching hardly to the heel. The eyes are large, with a round pupil. It is gregarious in its habits, hunting in packs (generally preying upon smaller animals and poultry, but frequently attacking the larger quadrupeds), the pest of the countries where it is found. It burrows in the earth, preferring forests and caverns, where it usually lies hid during the daytime; but at night it issues in companies (sometimes very large) on predatory incursions among the villages, and often the immediate vicinity of towns.

Its favorite food is fowls or carrion, and it' will break into graves to ‘make a meal upon the corpse, and even carry off and devour young children if found unprotected. In a wild state, this animal has an intolerably offensive odor. Colonel Hamilton Smith, in his Canidae, states that “jackals form a group of crepuscular and nocturnal canines, never voluntarily abroad before dark, and then hunting for prey during the whole night; entering the streets of towns to seek for offals, robbing the hen- roosts, entering out-houses, examining doors and windows, feasting upon all dressed vegetables and ill secured provisions, devouring all the carrion they find exposed, and digging their way into sepulchers that are not carefully protected against their activity and voraciousness; and in the fruit season, in common with foxes, seeking the vineyards, and fattening upon grapes. They congregate in great numbers, sometimes as many as two hundred being found together, and they howl so incessantly that the annoyance of their voices is the theme of numerous apologues and tales in the literature of Asia. This cry is a melancholy sound, beginning the instant the sun sets, and never ceasing till after it has arisen. The voice is uttered and responded to by all within hearing, in an accent of every possible tone, from a short, hungry yelp to a prolonged crescendo cry, rising octave above octave in the shrillness, and mingled with dismal whinings, as of a human being in distress.” Their nightly howl has a peculiar wailing tone (Russel, Aleppo, p. 62; Russegger, Reise, 3, 125), greatly resembling the cry of a child. “These sinister, guilty, woebegone brutes, when pressed with hunger, gather in gangs among the graves, and yell in rage, and fight like fiends over their midnight orgies; but on the battlefield is their great carnival” (Thomson, Land hand Book, 1, 134). (See, generally, Bochart, Hieroz. 2, 180 sq., who maintains that the jackal was designated among the Greeks and Romans by the name θώς, θωός, Kampfer, Amoen. 2, 406 sq.; Gmelin, Reise. 2, 81 sq. Güildenstädt, in Nov. coment. acad. Petropol. 20, 449 sq.; Oedmann, Samnnl. 2, 18 sq.)  This animal is very generally regarded as denoted by the name אַי (i, the howler, in the plural, אַיַּים, iyim', “wild beasts of the islands”), represented as inhabiting deserts (Isa 13:22; Isa 34:14; Jeremiah 40:39). It is more usually recognized as the שׁוּעָל, shual', of Scripture (ἀ λ ώ τ η ξ, “fox”), especially in the instance of Samson's exploit (Jdg 15:4; compare Rosenmüller, Alterthumsk. IV. 2, 156 sq., and Scholia ad Judices, p. 327). See Fox.

We have, however, no proof that shual' denotes exclusively the fox, and that iyim', and Solomon's little foxes, refer solely to jackals; particularly as these animals were, if really known, not abundant in Western Asia, even during the first century of the Roman empire; for they are but little noticed by the Greek writers and sportsmen who resided where now they are heard and seen every evening; these authorities offering no remark on the most prominent characteristic of the species, namely, the chorus of howlings lasting all night a habit so intolerable that it is the invariable theme of all the Shemitic writers since the Hegira whenever they mention the jackal. We may therefore infer that shual', if a general denomination, and that qinz', if the etymology be just, is derived from howling or barking, and may designate the jackal, though more probably it includes also those wild Caniaeu which have, a. similar habit. Indeed, as. Ehrenberg — (Icon. et descript. emammal. d(c. 2) has remarked, it is likely that travelers have usually confounded the jackal with the camis Syriacus, while a thorough treatise on the canis aureus is still a desideratum (see Wood, Bible Animals, p. 56).

There is also another term in the O.T., תִּן (tan, in plural by Chaldaism,

תִנַּין, tannin', regarded by others as the singular, whence a true plur.

תִּנַינַים, tasninim', “dragons”), described as a wild animal inhabiting deserts, and uttering a plaintive cry (Job 30:29; Mic 1:8); often joined (in poetic parallelism) with בִּת יִעֲנָה, “daughter of the ostrich.” and

אַיַּים, iyimm' (Isaiah 12:22; Isa 34:13; Isa 43:20). The Syriac understands the jackal, and the Arabic the wolf (comp. Pococke, Comm. in Mic. ad loc.; Schurrer, Diss. philol. p. 323 sq.). It is possibly no more than the canis Syriacus after all. Bochart (Hieroz. 3:222 sq.) interprets it of an endrmous kind of serpent. SEE DRAGON.

## Jackson, Abner, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Jackson, Abner, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, graduated from Trinity College, Hart ford, Conn., in 1837, and taught there for several years. In 1858 he was made president of Hobart College, Geneva, N.Y., and also held the starting  professorship of the evidences of Christianity. In 1867 he removed to Hartford, Connecticut, becoming president of Trinity College, where he was also Hobart professor of ethics and metaphysics, and continued in that position until his death, April 19, 1874, aged sixty-three years. In 1873 he was deputy from his diocese to the General Convention, and was one of the standing committee in 1871. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1875, page 144.

## Jackson, Arthur[[@Headword:Jackson, Arthur]]

             an English Nonconformist divine, was born in Suffolk in 1593. He studied at Trinity College, Cambridge, became lecturer, and afterwards minister of  St. Michael's, Wood Street, London. Subsequently he received the living of St. Faith's, but was ejected for nonconformity in 1662,' and died in 1666. His annotations are still esteemed. His writings are principally in the exegetical department, and are generally considered valuable even in our day. Of these the best are, A Help for the understanding of the Holy Scripture (Camb. 1643, 3 vols. 4to): — Annotations on the whole Book of Isaiah (London, 1682, 4to). — Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s.v.

## Jackson, Charles Davis, D.D[[@Headword:Jackson, Charles Davis, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Salem, Massachusetts, December 15, 1811. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1833; studied theology two years in Andover Theological Seminary; was engaged in teaching several years; ordained deacon in 1841, and presbyter in 1842; served as rector of St. Stephen's Church one or two years; of St. Luke's, Staten Island, from 1843 to 1847, and thereafter of St. Peter's, Westchester County, N.Y., for more than twenty years. He died June 28, 1871. He was the author of a work on Popular Education, and another on The Relation of Education to Crime, besides Sermons.

## Jackson, Cyril[[@Headword:Jackson, Cyril]]

             a celebrated English divine, was born in 1742. He was educated at Oxford University, and, after holding several benetices, was appointed dean of Christ Church, Oxford, which position he held until the time of his death, April 9, 1819.

## Jackson, Henry, D.D[[@Headword:Jackson, Henry, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Providence, R.I., June 16, 1798. He graduated from Brown University in 1817, and studied theology at Andover Theological Seminary for over a year (1821); was ordained in 1822; then took charge of a Baptist Church in Clarlestown, Massachusetts; next of the First Baptist Church of Hartford, Connecticut (1836); of New Bedford, Massachusetts (1839); of the Central Church, Newport, R.I. (1847), and continued there till his sudden death, March 2, 1863. See Trien. Cat. of Andover Theol. Sem. 1870, page 48.

## Jackson, James B[[@Headword:Jackson, James B]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South was born and reared in Clarke County, Ga. The date of his birth is not known to us, neither are we aware of the date of his conversion, though it appears, from the minutes of the Florida Conference, of which he was a member, that it must have been about the age of fourteen. He was honored by his associates in the ministry as a man of superior abilities, and held some of the best appointments in the Florida Conference. He was also professor in Andrew Female College for a number of years. At the time of his death, Feb. 18,1868, he was presiding elder of Jacksonville District. In all, he spent about thirty years in the ministry. See Minuetes (Ann. Conf. E. Ch. South, 3, 227.

## Jackson, John[[@Headword:Jackson, John]]

             an English Arian divine and great Hebraist of the last century, was born at Lensey, in Yorkshire, in 1686. He studied at Doncaster School and at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he took his bachelor's degree, but could not obtain that of master of arts on account of his Arian principles. In 1712 the corporation of Doncaster presented him with the rectory of Rossington, but the chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster having made him confrater of Wigston's Hospital, in Leicester a position which required no subscription of him, he removed to the hospital, and in 1729 succeeded to its mastership. He died in 1763. Jackson carried on a lively controversy with several of England's most distinguished orthodox writers of divinity, more  especially with bishop Warburton (Mq.5.). He also wrote a large number of works, the principal of which are, The Duty of a Christian set forth and explained in several practical Discourses, being said Expositior of the Lord's Prayer, etc. (Lond. 1728, 12mo): — The Existence and Unity of God proved from his Nature and Attributes, being a Vindication of Dr. Clarke's Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God, etc. (London, 1734, 8vo): — The Belief of a future State proved to be a fundamental Article of the Religion of the Hebrews, and held by the Philosophers, etc. (Lond, 1745, 8vo): — Chronological Antiquities, etc. for the Space of five thousand Years (Lond. 1752, 3 vols. 4to), and many other controversial pamphlets. See Dr. Sutton, Memoirs of the Life and Writings of J. J., etc. (Lond. 1764, 8vo); Chalmers, Genesis Biog. Dictionary, s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.'; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio,. Géneralé, 25, 149; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s.v.; Gorton. Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Jackson, John Frelinghuysen[[@Headword:Jackson, John Frelinghuysen]]

             SEE JACKSON, WILLIAM, 1.

## Jackson, John, D.D[[@Headword:Jackson, John, D.D]]

             an English prelate, was born in London, February 22, 1811. After studying at the Reading School, under Dr. Richard Valpy, he entered Pembroke College, Oxford, where he graduated in 1833, in the first class in classics. He was appointed to the head-mastership of Islington Grammar-school in 1836. In 1846 he was made rector of St. James's Church, Piccadilly, an appointment which soon made widely known his qualities as a preacher of singularly impressive earnestness and his powers as the administrator of a large and populous district. In 1847 Dr. Jackson was appointed chaplain to  the queen, and in 1845, 1850, 1862, and 1866 he was a select preacher at Oxford. In 1852 he was made canon of Bristol. In 1853 he delivered the Boyle lectures in London, and in the same year was made bishop of Lincoln. He was transferred to the see of London, January 4, 1869, and died January 6, 1884. Dr. Jackson published many sermons and charges, and a popular pamphlet on The Sinfulness of Little Sins.

## Jackson, Samuel[[@Headword:Jackson, Samuel]]

             a Wesleyan minister, who held the highest offices in the gift of the Wesleyans, and for many years was one of the greatest powers of English Wesleyanism, was born at Scranton, Yorkshire. Feb. 10, 1786. i.e. was particularly prominent in the Sabbath-school movement. “To him alone,” says a writer in the London Quart. Rev. 1863, p. 261, “must be attributed the awakening among them (the Wesleyans) of that religious jealousy for the younger members of their societies and congregations, which of late has so much elevated their system of Sunday-school instruction, and has thrown the hedge of a more direct ministerial oversight and training around multitudes of their youth, who might otherwise have passed unguarded through the perils that precede adult age. For some years before his death concern for the spiritual welfare of ‘the young became a passion with Mr. Jackson; he wrote and spoke of little besides.” As a preacher, he was plain in language, masculine in sentiment, ever abounding- in simple but forcible illustrations. He died suddenly, Aug. 4, 1861. His brother Thomas, another celebrated minister of the Wesleyans, edited the sermons of Samuel Jackson, and prefaced them with a memoir of the author (London, 1863, 8vo).

## Jackson, Samuel Cram, D.D[[@Headword:Jackson, Samuel Cram, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, son of Reverend Dr. William Jackson, was born at Dorset, Vermont, March 13, 1802. He graduated from Middlebury College in 1821, and studied for some time in the law school at New Haven, Conn.; graduated from Andover Theological Seminary in 1826; was ordained June 6 of the following year as pastor of West Church, in Andover, from which he was, dismissed in September 1850, and became assistant secretary of the State 'Board of Education, also acting librarian of the State Library, which office he held until 1877. He died July 26, 1878. Dr. Jackson published, Blessings of the Year, a sermon at West Andover, December 30, 1827: — Funeral Discourse of Reverend S.G. Pierce, Methuen, May 10, 1839: — Thanksgiving Sermon, November 28, 1839: — The License Law Vindicated: — Religious Principle a Source of Public Prosperity: — The Massachusetts Election Sermon (1843). See Cong, Year-book, 1879, page 45.

## Jackson, Thomas[[@Headword:Jackson, Thomas]]

             an eminent Wesleyan Methodist minister and writer, was born at Sancton, Yorkshire, December 10, 1783. He had no educational advantages in youth, but by extraordinary diligence in reading and study, continued with unabated vigor through a long life, he attained to a good degree of learning, though he was never a first-class scholar. He was converted in youth, entered the ministry in 1804, and was soon brought into notice by the wise, spirited, and faithful manner in which he discharged the various duties of a young Wesleyan minister. While at Wakefield he had a sharp contest with a Dissenting minister of Holmfirth, Reverend J. Cockin, about the "Five Points," and his Four Letters to that gentleman were the beginning of his long career as an author (Leeds, 1814-15, 8vo). The Calvinistic Controversy, The Times of Charles the First, The Commonwealth and the Restoration, the writings of Wesley, Fletcher, etc., and The Early History of Methodism were thoroughly studied, so that in  these fields Jackson became facile princeps, and his works in these lines have great and enduring value. During his first year at Wakefield (1814), he read through with care nearly sixty volumes, and he never subsequently diminished the amount of his reading.

From 1824 to 1843 he was editor of the Magazine and Book-room publications, and during these eighteen years he did an amount of ministerial and literary work that is marvellous. During the centenary year of Methodism (1838) he was made president of the conference, was requested to prepare a volume on the subject of the centenary, describing the rise, progress, and benefits of Wesleyan Methodism, and was appointed to preach the centenary sermon before the conference; yet Jackson went through all this extra work, and the great success of the movement was largely due to his pen, preaching and pleading, his godliness making itself felt through all Methodism. In 1849 he was for the second time elevated to the presidency. For nineteen years (1843-62) he was theological tutor at Richmond, being painstaking, perspicuous, comprehensive, and copious in his lectures, and "unutterably anxious to perpetuate sound doctrine." He became a supernumerary in 1861, taking up his residence in the suburbs of London, and preached and wrote as long as he was able. "His old age was beautiful. Always calm, cheerful, benign, often overflowing with kindness and love, he carried a happy influence wherever he went, and excited universal love and admiration." He died at Shepherd's Bush, near London, March 10, 1873. A list of Mr. Jackson's numerous works, which are largely contributions to Methodist biography and literature, may be found in Osborn, Methodist Bibliography, page 122. See Recollections of my Own Life and Times, by Thomas Jackson (Lond. 1873); Minutes of the British Conference, 1873, page 25; Smith, Hist. of Wesl. Methodism (index, volume 3); Stevenson, City-Road Chapel, page 284; Sunday at Home (Lond. March 28, 1874); Everett, Wesleyan Takings, 1:341.

## Jackson, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Jackson, Thomas, D.D]]

             an eminent English divine, was born at Willowing, Durham, in 1579. He studied at Queen's College, Oxford, and after 1596 at Corpus Christi, of which he became vice-president. He was afterwards appointed successively vicar of Newcastle, president of his college in 1630, prebendary of Winchester in 1633, and, finally, dean of Peterborough in 1638. He died in 1640. Dr. Thomas Jackson enjoyed a great reputation for piety and learning; he was profoundly read in the fathers, and possessed great depth of judgment. His works (commentaries, among these a valuable commentary on the Apostles' Creed, and sermons), which rank very high, form a magazine of theological knowledge, and are remarkable also for elegance and dignity of style. Southey places him among the very best of English divines, and George Herbert says, “I bless God for the confirmation Dr. Jackson has given me in the Christian religion against the Atheist, Jew, and Socinian, and in the Protestant against Rome.” A new edition of his works, with a copious index, was published in 1844 (Oxford, 12 vols. 8vo). See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.; Biograph. Britannica, s.v.; Fuller, Worthies; Wood, Athenae Oxonienses (see Index, vol. 1); Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.

## Jackson, William (1)[[@Headword:Jackson, William (1)]]

             born in 1732, was one of the earliest ministers of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in New Jersey. He began his studies for the ministry with the Rev. John Frelinghuysen, whose daughter he married in 1757. The church at Bergen, N. J., which was the first of any denomination in the state, had existed ninety years without a pastor, being unable to procure one from the mother country. In 1753 in union with the Church on Staten Island, a call was made upon MT. Jackson which bound him to go to Holland, complete his studies, and obtain ordination from the Classis of Amsterdam. These churches were to pay him £100 for his support while absent. Four years and three months elapsed before his return in 1757, when he assumed full pastoral charge, dividing his services equally between the two congregations. These facts show both the tenacity of Church life and the devotion of the people to the idea of a thoroughly educated ministry. The Coetus and Conference troubles, which had so long rent the churches, and which grew out of this very question of an educated ministry, were finally adjusted in 1771, through the great exertions of Dr. John H. Livingston (q.v.) and his associates, and both Mr. Jackson and these churches rejoiced  in the consummation. SEE REFORMED DUTCH CHURCH.

His ministry lasted thirty-two years (1757-1789), when he became insane. He died in 1813. Mr. Jackson's literary and theological attainments were attested by academic degrees conferred by Yale, Columbia, and Princeton colleges. He was celebrated as a pulpit orator, preaching in the Dutch language. His voice was commanding, and his popularity was such that “in Middlesex and Somerset counties he was estimated as a field-preacher second only to Whitefield. On one occasion, at the Raritan church, the assembly was so large that he had to leave the pulpit and take a station at the church door to deliver his sermon,” and the throng outside was greater than that which filled the building. His ministry was useful, acceptable, and crowned with great and permanent blessings. One of his five sons, the Rev. John Frelinghuysen Jackson, was for many years the pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church at Harlem, New York, where he died in 1836, at the age of sixty-eight years. He was a laborious, faithful, and devoted minister, and distinguished for his pecuniary liberality. — B. C. Taylor's Annals of Classis and Township of Bergen; Corwin's Manual of the Reformed Church, p. 120. (W. J. R. T.)

## Jackson, William (2)[[@Headword:Jackson, William (2)]]

             an English divine, brother of Cyril Jackson, born in 1750, was educated' at Westminster School and Christ Church, Oxford. He obtained the degree of D.D. in 1799, and became, after having been preacher at Lincoln's Inn, canon of Christ Church, regius professor of Greek in 1811, and bishop of Oxford. He died in November, 1815. He published some of his sermons (1784-1804). See Rich, Bibliotheca Americana Nova, 1, 317.

## Jackson, William, D.D. (3)[[@Headword:Jackson, William, D.D. (3)]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Cornwall, Conn., Dec. 14, 1768. At the age of sixteen, when about commencing his studies preparatory for college, his mind became deeply impressed with religious truth, and he at once decided to devote his life to the ministry. He entered Dartmouth College in 1786, and graduated in 1790. For a time he taught a school in Wethersfield, Conn., but, finding that his services were needed in the Church, he commenced finally the study of theology under Drs. Spring and Emmons. In 1793 he was licensed to preach, and he performed ministerial labors first near his home, and afterwards in New Jersey. A call which had been given him by the Congregational Society at Dorset, Vt., in 1793,  when feeble health obliged him to decline, was renewed three years after, and this time accepted. He was ordained Sept. 27, 1796. In 1837 he was obliged to ask his people for all assistant; and though his task had thus been made easier, his health continued to fail him, and he died Oct. 15, 1842. In 1837 Middlebury College, of which he had been a corporation member for several years, conferred on him the doctorate of divinity. Dr. Jackson possessed a mind of high order, sanctified by earnest devotion to the interests of the Church. “Dr. Porter, late of Andover, the companion of his youth, and particular friend in college, said of him, ‘He is the only minister of his- age who has kept up with the times.' His mental enterprise and panting for progress never left him.”-Dr. J. 1i-altby, in Sprague, Annals. of the American Pulpit, 2, 336.

## Jacob      [[@Headword:Jacob      ]]

             (Heb. Yaukob', יִעֲקֹבsupplanter, from עָקִב, to bite the heel [to which signification there is allusion in Gen 25:26; Gen 27:36; Hosea 12:31; Sept. and N.T. Ι᾿ακώβ; Josephus Ι᾿άκωβος, which latter is identical with the Greek name for “James”), the name of two men in the Bible.

I. The second-born of the twin sons of Isaac by Rebekah (B.C. 2004). His importance in Jewish history requires a copious treatment, which we accordingly give in full detail.

1. His conception is stated to have been supernatural (Gen 25:21 sq.). Led by peculiar feelings, Rebekah went to inquire of the Lord (as some think, through the intervention of Abraham) and was informed that she was about to become a mother, that her offspring should be the founders of two nations, and that the elder should serve the younger — circumstances which ought to be borne in mind when a judgment is pronounced on her conduct in aiding Jacob to secure the privileges of birthright to the exclusion of his elder brother Esau. He was born with Esau, when Isaac was 59 and Abraham 159 years old, probably at the well Lahai-roi.

As the boys grew, Jacob appeared to partake of the gentle, quiet, and retiring character of his father, and was accordingly led to prefer the tranquil safety and pleasing occupations of a shepherd's life to the bold and daring enterprises of the hunter, for which Esau had an irresistible predilection. The latter was his father's favorite, however, while Rebekah evinced a partiality for Jacob (Gen 25:27-28).  That selfishness, and a prudence which approached to cunning, had a seat in the heart of the youth Jacob, appears but too plainly in his dealing with Esau, when he exacted from a famishing brother so large a price for a mess of pottage as the surrender of his birthright (Gen 25:29-34). B.C. cir. 1985. (See Kitto, Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.)

The leaning which his mother had in favor of Jacob would naturally be augmented by the conduct of Esan in marrying, doubtless contrary to his parents' wishes, two Hittite women, who are recorded as having been a grief of mind to Isaac and Rebekah (Gen 26:34-35). B.C. 1964.

Circumstances thus prepared the way for procuring the transfer of the birthright, when Isaac, being now old, proceeded to take steps to pronounce the irrevocable blessing, which acted with all the force of a modern testamentary bequest. This blessing, then, it was essential that Jacob should receive in preference to Esau. Here Rebekah appears as the chief agent; Jacob is a mere instrument in her hands. Isaac directs Esau to procure him some venison. This Rebekah hears, and urges her reluctant favorite to personate his elder brother. Jacob suggests difficulties; they are met by Rebekah, who is ready to incur any personal danger so that her object be gained (see Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 355). Her voice is obeyed, the food is brought, Jacob is equipped for the deceit; he helps out his fraud by direct falsehood, and the old man, whose senses are now failing, is at last with difficulty deceived (Genesis 27). B.C. 1927. It cannot be denied that this is a most reprehensible transaction, and presents a truly painful picture, in which a mother conspires with one son in order to cheat her aged husband, with a view to deprive another son of his rightful inheritance. Justification is here impossible; but it should not be forgotten, in the estimate we form, that there was a promise in favor of Jacob, that Jacob's qualities had endeared him to his mother, and that the prospect to her was dark and threatening which arose when she saw the negligent Esau at the head of the house, and his hateful wives assuming command over herself.

For the sale of his birthright to Jacob, Esau is branded in the N. Test. as a “profane person” (Heb 12:16). The following sacred and important privileges have been mentioned as connected with primogeniture in patriarchal times, and as constituting the object of Jacob's desire:

(a) Superior rank in the family (see Gen 49:3-4).

(b) A double portion of the father's property (so Aben-Ezra) (see Deu 21:17, and Gen 47:22).

(c) The priestly office in the patriarchal church (see Num 8:17-19). In favor of this, see Jerome, ad Evang. Ep. 83, § 6; Jarchi, in Genesis 25; Estius, il Hebrews 12; Shuckford, Connexion, bk. 7; Blunt, Undes. Coinc. i, 1, § 2, 3; and against it, Vitringa, Observ. Sac; and J. D. Michaelis, Mosaisch. Recht, 2, § 64, cited by Rosenmüller in Genesis 25.

(d) A conditional promise or adumbration of the heavenly inheritance (see Cartwright in the Crit. Sacr. on Genesis 25).

(e) The promise of the Seed in which all nations should be blessed, though not included in the birthright, may have been so regarded by the patriarchs, as it was by their descendants (Rom 9:8, and Shuckford, 8). The whole subject has been treated in separate essays by Vitringa in his Observat. Sacr. 1. 11, § 2; also by J.H. Hottinger, and by J. J. Schröder. See Eycke, De venditione primogeniturae Esavi (Wittenb. 1729); Gmelin, De benedict. paterna Esavo a Jacobo praerepta (Tub. 1706); Heydegger, Hist. Patriarch. 2, 14. SEE BIRTHRIGHT.

With regard to Jacob's acquisition of his father's blessing (ch. 27), few persons will accept the excuse offered by St. Augustine (Serm. 4:§ 22, 23) for the deceit which he practiced: that it was merely a figurative action, and that his personation of Esau was justified by his previous purchase of Esau's birthright. It is not, however, necessary, with the view of cherishing a Christian hatred of sin, to heap opprobrious epithets upon a fallible man whom the choice of God has rendered venerable in the eyes of believers. Waterland (4, 208) speaks of the conduct of Jacob in language which is neither wanting in reverence nor likely to encourage the extenuation of guilt: “I do not know whether it be justifiable in every particular; I suspect that it is not. There were several very good and laudable circumstances in what Jacob and Rebekah did, but I do not take upon me to acquit them of all blame. Blunt (Undes. Coinc.) observes that none “of the patriarchs can be set up as a model of Christian morals. They lived under a code of laws that were not absolutely good, perhaps not so good as the Levitical; for, as this was but a preparation for the more perfect law of Christ, so possibly was the patriarchal but a preparation for the Law of Moses.” The circumstances which led to this unhappy transaction, and the retribution which fell upon all parties concerned in it, have been carefully discussed by Benson (Hulsean Lectures [1822] on Scripture Difficulties, 16, 17). See  also Woodgate (Historical Sermons, 9) and Maurice (Patriarchs and Lawgivers, 5). On the fulfillment of the prophecies concerning Esau and Jacob, and on Jacob's dying blessing, see bishop Newton, Dissertations on the Prophecies, § 3, 4.

Punishment soon ensued to all the parties to this iniquitous transaction (see Jarvis, Church of the Redeemed, p. 47). Fear seized the guilty Jacob, who is sent by his father, at the suggestion of Rebekah, to the original seat of the family, in order that he might find a wife among his cousins, the daughters of his mother's brother, Laban the Syrian (Genesis 28). Before he is dismissed, Jacob again receives his father's blessing, the object obviously being to keep alive in the young man's mind the great promise given to Abraham, and thus to transmit that influence which, under the aid of divine Providence, was to end in placing the family in possession of the land of Palestine, and, in so doing, to make it “a multitude of people.” The language, however, employed by the aged father suggests the idea that the religious light which had been kindled in the mind of Abraham had lost somewhat of its fullness, if not of its clearness also, since “the blessing of Abraham,” which had originally embraced all nations, is now restricted to the descendants of this one patriarchal family. And so it appears, from the language which Jacob employs (Gen 28:16) in relation to the dream that he had when he tarried all night upon a certain plain on his journey eastward, that his idea of the Deity was little more than that of a local god: “Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not.” Nor does the language which he immediately after employs show that his ideas of the relations between God and man were of an exalted and refined nature: “If God will be with me, and will keep me in the way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and raiment to put on, so that I come again to my father's house in peace, then shall the Lord be my God.” The vision, therefore, with which Jacob was favored was not without occasion, nor could the terms in which he was addressed by the Lord fail to enlarge and correct his conceptions, and make his religion at once more comprehensive and more influential. (Jacob's vision at Bethel is considered by Miegius in a treatise [De Scald Jacobi] in the Thesaur us novus Theologico-Philologicus, 1, 195. See also Augustine, Serm. 122; Kurz, History of the Old Covenant, 1, 309.)

2. Jacob, on coming into the land of the people of the East, accidentally met with Rachel, Laban's daughter, to whom, with true Eastern simplicity and politeness, he showed such courtesy as the duties of pastoral life suggest and admit (Genesis 29). Here his gentle and affectionate nature  displays itself under the influence of the bonds of kindred and the fair form of the youthful maiden. “Jacob kissed Rachel, and lifted up his voice and wept.” It must be borne in mind, however, that Jacob himself had now reached the mature age of seventy-seven years, as appears from a comparison of Joseph's age (Gen 30:25; Gen 41:46; Gen 45:6) with Jacob's (Gen 47:9; Gen 31:41). After he had been with his uncle the space of a month, Laban inquires of him what reward he expects for his services. He asks for the “beautiful and well-favored Rachel.”

His request is granted on condition of a seven years' service — a long period, truly, but to Jacob “they seemed but a few days for the love he had to her.” When the time was expired, the crafty-Laban availed himself of the customs of the country in order to substitute his elder and “tender-eyed” daughter, Leah. In the morning Jacob found how he had been beguiled; but Laban excused himself, saying, “It must not be done in our country, to give the younger before the first-born.” Another seven years' service gains for Jacob the beloved Rachel. Leah, however, has the compensatory privilege of being the mother of the first-born, Reuben; three other sons successively follow, namely, Simeon, Levi, and Judah, sons of Leah. This fruitfulness was a painful subject of reflection to the barren Rachel, who employed language on this occasion that called forth a reply from her husband which shows that, mild as was the character of Jacob, it was by no means wanting in force and energy (Gen 30:2). An arrangement, however, took place, by which Rachel had children by means of her maid, Bilhah, of whom Dan and Naphtali were born. Two other sons, Gad and Asher, were born to Jacob of Leah's maid, Zilpah. Leah herself bare two more sons, namely, Issachar and Zebulun; she also bare a daughter, Dinah. At length Rachel herself bare a son, and she called his name Joseph. As this part of the sacred history has been made the subject of cavil on the alleged ground of anachronism (see Hengstenberg, Auth. des Pentat. 2, 851), it may be well to present here a table showing the chronological possibility of the birth of these children within the years allotted in the narrative (Gen 29:32; Gen 30:24).

Jacob's polygamy is an instance of a patriarchal practice quite repugnant to Christian morality, but to be accounted for on the ground that the time had not then come for a full expression of the will of God on this subject. The mutual rights of husband and wife were recognized in the history of the Creation, but instances of' polygamy are frequent among persons mentioned in the sacred records, from Lamech (Gen 4:19) to Herod  (Josephus, At. 17, 1, 2). In times when frequent wars increased the number of captives and orphans, and reduced nearly all service to slavery, there may have been some reason for extending the recognition and protection of the law to concubines or half-wives, as Bilhah and Zilpah. In the case of Jacob, it is right to bear in mind that it was not his original intention to marry both the daughters of Laban. (See, on this subject, Augustine, Contra Faustum, 22, 47-54.)

Most faithfully and with great success had Jacob served his uncle for fourteen years, when he became desirous of returning to his parents. At the urgent request of Laban, however, he is induced to remain for an additional term of six years. The language employed upon this occasion (Gen 30:25 sq.) shows that Jacob's character had gained considerably during his service, both in strength and comprehensiveness; but the means which he employed in order to make his bargain with his uncle work so as to enrich himself, prove too clearly that his moral feelings had not undergone an equal improvement (see Baumgarten, Comment. I, 1, 276), and that the original taint of prudence, and the sad lessons of his mother in deceit, had produced some of their natural fruit in his bosom. (Those who may wish to inquire into the nature and efficacy of the means which Jacob employed, may, in addition to the original narrative, consult Michaelis and Rosenmüller on the subject, as well as the following: Jerome, Quaest. in Genesis; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 7, 10; Oppian, Cyneg. 1, 330 sq.; Michaelis Verm. Schrift. i, 61 sq.; Hastfeer, Ueber Schafzucht; Bochart, Hieroz. 1, 619; Nitschmann, De corylo Jacobi in Thesaur. novus Theologico- Philologicus, 1, 201. Winer [Handwörterb. s.v. Jacob] gives a parallel passage from Elian, Hist. Anitw. 8, 21.)

The prosperity of Jacob displeased and grieved Laban, so that a separation seemed desirable. His wives are ready to accompany him. Accordingly, he set out, with his family and his property, “to go to Isaac his father in the land of Canaan” (Genesis 31) (B.C. 1907). It was lot till the third day that Laban learned that Jacob had fled, when he immediately set out in pursuit of his nephew, and, after seven days' journey, overtook him in Mount Gilead. Laban, however, is divinely warned not to hinder Jacob's return. Reproach and recrimination ensued. Even a charge of theft is put forward by Laban: “Wherefore hast thou stolen my gods?” In truth, Rachel had carried off certain images which were the objects of worship. Ignorant of this misdeed, Jacob boldly called for a search, adding, “With whomsoever thou findest thy gods, let him not live.” A crafty woman's cleverness  eluded the keen eye of Laban.

Rachel, by an appeal which one of her sex alone could make, deceived her father. Thus one sin begets another; superstition prompts to theft, and theft necessitates deceit. Whatever opinion may be formed of the teraphim (q.v.) which Rachel stole, and which Laban was so anxious to discover, and whatever kind or degree of worship may in reality have been paid to them, their existence in the family suffices of itself to show how imperfectly instructed regarding the Creator were at this time those who were among the least ignorant in divine things. Laban's conduct on this occasion called forth a reply from Jacob, from which it appears that his service had been most severe, and which also proves that, however this severe service might have encouraged a certain servility, it had not prevented the development in Jacob's soul of a high and energetic spirit, which, when roused, could assert its rights, and give utterance to sentiments both just, striking, and forcible, and in the most poetical phraseology. Peace, however, being restored, Laban on the ensuing morning took a friendly, if not an affectionate farewell of his daughters and their sons, and returned home.

3. So far, things have gone prosperously with Jacob; the word of God to him at Bethel, promising protection and blessing, has been wonderfully verified, and, with a numerous family and large possessions, he has again reached in safety the borders of Canaan. But is there still no danger in front? Shortly after parting with Laban, he met, we are told, troops of angels, apparently a double band, and wearing somewhat of a warlike aspect, for he called the place in honor of them by the name of Mahanaim [two hosts] (Gen 32:1-2. Whether this sight was presented to him in vision, or took place as an occurrence in the sphere of ordinary life, may be questioned, though the latter supposition seems best to accord with the narrative; but it is not of material moment, for either way the appearance was a reality, and bore the character of a specific revelation to Jacob, adapted to the circumstances in which he was placed. It formed a fitting counterpart to what he formerly had seen at Bethel; angels were then employed to indicate the peaceful relation in which he stood to the heavenly world when obliged to retire from Canaan, and now, on his return, they are again employed with a like friendly intent-to give warning, indeed, of a hostile encounter, but at the same time to assure him of the powerful guardianship and support of heaven. The former part of the design was not long in finding confirmation; for, on sending messengers to his brother Esau with a friendly greeting, and apprising him of his safe  return after a long and prosperous sojourn in Mesopotamia, he learned that Esau was on his way to meet him with a host of 400 men.

There could be no reasonable doubt, especially after the preliminary intimation given through the angelic bands, as to the intention of Esau in advancing towards his brother with such a force. The news of Jacob's reappearance in Canaan, and that no longer as a dependant upon others, but as possessed of ample means and a considerable retinue, awoke into fresh activity the slumbering revenge of Esau, and led him, on the spur of the moment, to resolve on bringing the controversy between them to a decisive issue. This appears from the whole narrative to be so plainly the true state of matters, that it seems needless to refer to other views that have been taken of it. But Jacob was not the man at any time to repel force with force, and he had now learned, by a variety of experiences, where the real secret of his safety and strength lay. His first impressions, however, on getting the intelligence, were those of trembling anxiety and fear; but, on recovering himself a little, he called to his aid the two great weapons of the believer-pains and prayer. He first divided his people, with the flocks and herds, into two companies, so that if the one were attacked the other might escape. Then he threw himself in earnest prayer and supplication on the covenant-mercy and faithfulness of God, putting God in mind of his past loving-kindnesses, at once great and undeserved; reminding him also of the express charge he had given Jacob to return to Canaan, with the promise of his gracious presence, and imploring him now to establish the hopes he had inspired by granting deliverance from the hands of Esau. So ended the first night; but on the following day further measures were resorted to by Jacob, though still in the same direction. Aware of the melting power of kindness, and how “a gift in secret pacifieth anger,” he resolved on giving from his substance a munificent present to Esau, placing each kind by itself, one after the other, in a succession of droves, so that on hearing, as he passed drove after drove, the touching words, “A present sent to my lord Esau from thy servant Jacob,” it might be like the pouring of live coals on the head of his wrathful enemy. How could he let his fury explode against a brother who showed himself so anxious to be on terms of peace with him? It could scarcely be, unless there were still in Jacob's condition the grounds of a quarrel between him and his God not yet altogether settled, and imperiling the success even of the best efforts and the most skilful preparations.  That there really was something of the sort now supposed seems plain from what ensued.

Jacob had made all his arrangements, and had got his family as well as his substance transported over the Jabbok (a brook that traverses the land of Gilead, and runs into the Jordan about half way between the Lake of Galilee and the Dead Sea), himself remaining behind for the night. It is not said for what purpose he so remained, but there can be little doubt it was for close and solitary dealing with God. While thus engaged, one suddenly appeared in the form of a man, and in the guise of an enemy wrestling with him and contending for the mastery. Esau was still at some distance, but here was an adversary already present with whom Jacob had to maintain a severe and perilous conflict; and this plainly an adversary in appearance only human, but in reality the angel of the Lord's presence. It was as much as to say, “You have reason to be afraid of the enmity of one mightier than Esau, and, if you can only prevail in getting deliverance from this, there is no fear that matters, will go well with you otherwise; right with God, you may trust him to set you right with your brother.” The ground and reason of the matter lay in Jacob's deceitful and wicked conduct before leaving the land of Canaan, which had fearfully compromised the character of God, and brought disturbance into Jacob's relation to the covenant. Leaving the land of Canaan covered with guilt, and liable to wrath, he must now re-enter it amid sharp contending, such as might lead to great searchings of heart, deep spiritual abasement, and the renunciation of all sinful and crooked devices as utterly at variance with the childlike simplicity and confidence in God which it became him to exercise. In the earnest conflict, he maintained his ground, till the heavenly combatant touched the hollow of his thigh and put it out of joint, in token of the supernatural might which this mysterious antagonist had at his command, and showing how easy it had been for him (if he had so pleased) to gain the mastery.

But even then Jacob would not quit his hold; nay, all the more he would retain it, since now he could do nothing more, and since, also, it was plain he had to do with one who had the power of life and death in his hand; he would, therefore, not let him go till he obtained a blessing. Faith thus wrought mightily out of human weakness-strong by reason of its clinging affection, and its beseeching importunity for the favor of heaven, as expressed in Hos 12:4 : “By his strength he had power with God; yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed; he wept and made supplication unto him.” In attestation of the fact, and for a suitable commemoration of it, he had his name changed from Jacob to Israel (combatant or wrestler with God); “for as a prince,” it was added, by way  of explanation, “hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed.” Jacob, in turn, asked after the name of the person who had wrestled with him-not as if any longer ignorant who it might be, but wishing to have the character or manifestation of Godhead, as this had now appeared to him, embodied in a significant and appropriate name. His request, however, was denied; the divine wrestler withdrew, after having blessed him. But Jacob himself gave a name to the place, near the Jabbok, where the memorable transaction had occurred: he called it Peniel (the face of God), “for,” said he, “I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved” (Gen 32:25-31). The contest indicated that he had reason to fear the reverse: but his preservation was the sign of reconciliation and blessing.

This mysterious wrestling has been a fruitful source of difficulty and misinterpretation (see Hofmann, Varia Sacra, 185 sq.; Heumann, Sylloq. diss. 1, 147 sq.). The narrator did not, we think, intend it for the account of a dream or illusion (see Ziegler in Henke's Nat. Mag. 2, 29 sq.; Hengstenberg, Bileam, p. 51; Herder, Geist der Heb. Poesie, 1, 266; Tuch's Genesis p. 468). A literal interpretation may seem difficult, for it makes the Omnipotent vanquish one of his own creatures, not without a long struggle, and at last only by a sort of art or stratagem (compare similar accounts in heathen mythology, Bauer, Heb. Mythol. 1, 251 sq.; Movers, Phonic. 1, 433; Bohlen, Isdien, i, 225). At the same time it must be said that the only way to expound the narrative is to divest ourselves of our own modern associations, and endeavor to contemplate it from the position in which its author stood (see Bush's Note, ad loc.). Still, the question recurs, What was the fact which he has set forth in these terms? (see De Wette, Krit. d. Is. Gesch. p. 132; Ewald, Israeliten, 1, 405; Rosenmüller, Scholia, ad loc.) The design (says Wellbeloved, ad loc.), “was to encourage Jacob, returning to his native land, and fearful of his brother's resentment, and to confirm his faith in the existence and providence of God. And who will venture to say that in that early period any other equally efficacious means could have been employed?” (Comp. the language already quoted [Gen 32:28].)' A very obvious end pursued throughout the history of Jacob was the development of his religious convictions; and the event in question, no less than the altars he erected and the dreams he had, may have materially conduced to so important a result. That it had a lasting spiritual effect upon Jacob is evident from the devout tenor of his after life. (For a beautiful exposition of this event, see  Charles Wesley's poem entitled ”'Wrestling Jacob.” Compare Krummacher, Jacob Wrestling [Lond. 1838].)

After this night of anxious but triumphant wrestling, Jacob rose from Peniel with the sun shining- upon him (an emblem of the bright and radiant hope which now illuminated his inner man), and went on his way halting- weakened corporeally by the conflict in which he had engaged, that he might have no confidence in the flesh, but strong in the divine favor and blessing. Accordingly, when Esau approached with his formidable host, all hostile feelings gave way; the victory had been already won in the higher sphere of things, and he who turneth the hearts of kings like the rivers of water, made the heart of Esau melt like wax before the liberal gifts, the humble demeanor, and earnest entreaties of his brother. They embraced each other as brethren, and for the present at least, and for anything that appears during the remainder of their personal lives, they maintained the most friendly relations.

4. After residing for a little on the farther side of Jordan, at a place called Succoth, from Jacob's having erected there booths (Hebrew sukkoth) for his cattle, he crossed the Jordan, and pitched his tent near Shechene ultimately the center of the Samaritans. [In the received text, it is said (Gen 33:18), “He came to Shalem, a city of Shechem” — but some prefer the reading Shalom: “He came in peace to city of Shechem.”] There he bought a piece of ground from the family of Shechem, and obtained a footing among the people as a man of substance, whose friendship it was desirable to cultivate. But ere long, having, by the misconduct of Hamor the Hivite SEE DINAH and the hardy valor of his sons, been involved in danger from the natives of Shechem in Canaan, Jacob is divinely directed, and, under the divine protection, proceeds to Bethel, where he is to “make an altar unto God, that appeared unto thee when thou fleddest from the lace of Esau thy brother” (Genesis 34, 35) (B.C. cir. 1900). Obedient to the divine command, he first purifies his family from “strange gods,” which he hid under “the oak which is by Shechem,” after which God appeared to him again, with the important declaration, “I am God Almighty,” and renewed the Abrahamic covenant. While journeying from Beth-el to Ephrath, his beloved Rachel lost her life in giving birth to her second son. Benjamin (Gen 35:16-20) (B.C. cir. 1899). At length Jacob came to his father Isaac at Mamre, the family residence, in time to pay the last attentions to the aged patriarch (Gen 35:27) (B.C. 1898). The complete reconciliation between Jacob and Esau at this time is shown by  their uniting in the burial rites of their father. Not long after this bereavement, Jacob was robbed of his beloved son, Joseph, through the jealousy and bad faith of his brothers (Genesis 37) (B.C. 1896).' This loss is the occasion of showing us how strong were Jacob's paternal feelings; for, on seeing; what appeared to be proofs that “some evil beast had devoured Joseph,” the old man “rent his clothes, and put sackcloth- upon his loins, and mourned for his son many days, and refused to be comforted” (Gen 37:33).

A widely extended famine induced Jacob to send his: sons down into Egypt, where he had heard there was corn, without knowing by whose instrumentality (Genesis 42 sq.) (B.C. 1875). The patriarch, however, retained his youngest son Benjamin, “lest mischief should befall him,” as it had befallen Joseph. The young men returned with the needed supplies of corn. They related, however, that they had been taken for spies, and that there was but one way in which they could disprove the charge, namely, by carrying down Benjamin to “the lord of the land.” This Jacob vehemently refused (Gen 42:36). The pressure of the famine, however, at length forced Jacob to allow Benjamin to accompany his brothers on a second visit to Egypt; whence, in due time, they brought back to their father the pleasing intelligence, “Joseph is yet alive, and he is governor over all the land of Egypt.” How naturally is the effect of this on Jacob told — “and Jacob's heart fainted, for he believed them not.” When, however, they had gone into particulars, he added, “Enough, Joseph my son is yet alive; I will go and see him before I die.” Touches of nature like this suffice to show the reality of the history before us, and, since they are not infrequent in the book of Genesis, they will of themselves avail to sustain its credibility against all that the enemy can do. The passage, too, with others recently cited, strongly proves how much the character of the patriarch had improved. In the whole of the latter part of Jacob's life he seems to have gradually parted with many less desirable qualities, and to have become at once more truthful, more energetic, more earnest, affectionate, and, in the largest sense of the word, religious. Encouraged “in the visions of the night,” Jacob goes down to Egypt (B.C. 1874), and was affectionately met by Joseph (Gen 46:29).

Joseph proceeded to conduct his father into the presence of the Egyptian monarch, when the man of God, with that self-consciousness and dignity which religion gives, instead of offering slavish adulation, “blessed Pharaoh.” Struck with the patriarch's venerable air, the king asked, “How old art thou?” What composure and elevation is  there in the reply, “The days of the years of my pilgrimage are a hundred and thirty years; few and evil have the days of the years of my life been, and have not attained unto the days of the years of the life of my fathers in the days of their pilgrimage” (Gen 47:8-10). Jacob, with his sons, now entered into possession of some of the best land of Egypt, where they carried on their pastoral occupations, and enjoyed a very large share of earthly prosperity. The aged patriarch, after being strangely tossed about on a very rough ocean, found at last a tranquil harbor, where all the best affections of his nature were gently exercised and largely unfolded (Genesis 48, sq.). After a lapse of time, Joseph, being informed that his father was sick, went to him, when “Israel strengthened himself, and sat up in his bed.” He acquainted Joseph with the divine promise of the land of Canaan which yet remained to be fulfilled, and took Joseph's sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, distinguishing them by an adoption equal to that of Reuben and Simeon, the oldest of his own sons (Gen 48:5). How impressive is his benediction in Joseph's family (Gen 48:15-16): “God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth.” “And Israel said unto Joseph, Behold, I die; but God will be with you, and bring you again unto the land of your fathers” (Gen 48:21). Then, having convened his sons, the venerable patriarch pronounced on them also a blessing, which is full of the loftiest thought, expressed in the most poetical diction, and adorned by the most vividly descriptive and engaging imagery (see Sthhelin, Aninadversiones in Jacobi vaticiium, Heidelb. 1827), showing how deeply religious his character had become, how freshly it retained its fervor to the last, and how greatly it had increased in strength, elevation, and dignity: “And when Jacob had made an end of commanding his sons, he gathered up his feet into the bed [i.e. knelt towards the bed's head (see Delitzsch on Heb 11:21) rather than bowed over the top of his staff, as Stuart, ad loc. SEE STAFF ], and yielded up the ghost, and was gathered unto his people” (Gen 49:33), at the ripe age of 147 years (Gen 47:28). B.C. 1857. His body was embalmed, carried with great care and pomp into the land of Canaan, and deposited with his fathers, and his wife Leah, in the cave of Machpelah. The route pursued by this funeral procession is ingeniously supposed by Dr. Kitto (Pict. Hist. of Jews, 1, 136) to have been the more circuitous one afterwards taken by the Israelites by the way of Mount Seir and across the Jordan, the object being  apparently in both cases the fear of the Philistines, who lay in the direct route. Dr. Thomson objects to this as an unnecessary deviation (Land and Book, 2, 385), urging that the Bethagla, which Jerome identifies with the Area-Atad or Abel-mizraim (q.v.), as the scene of the mourning ceremonies, lay near Gaza; but in this case it is certainly difficult to explain the constant statement that the spot in question was situated “beyond the Jordan,” as it clearly implies a crossing of the river by the cavalcade.

In the list of Jacob's lineal descendants given in Gen 46:8-27, as being those that accompanied him on his removal to Egypt, there is evidence that the list was rather made up to the time of his decease, or, perhaps even somewhat later (see Hengstenberg's Pentateuch, 2, 290 sq.); for we find mentioned not only numerous sons (some of whom will appear to be even grandsons) of Benjamin, at the date of that emigration a youth (see 44:20, 30-34), but also the children of Pharez, at that time a mere child (comp. 38:1). SEE BENJAMIN.

There has, moreover, been experienced considerable difficulty in making out the total of seventy persons there stated, as well as the sum of sixty-six included it, and likewise the aggregates of the posterity of the several wives as there computed. This difficulty is further enhanced by the number seventy-five assigned by Stephen (Act 7:14) to Jacob's family at the same date. This last statement, however, cannot be disposed of in the manner frequently adopted by including the wives of Jacob and his sons (for it does not appear that they are at all referred to, and it is probable that they would have swelled the number more largely if added), but is rather to be regarded as a quotation made (without indorsing or caring to discuss its accuracy) from the Sept., which gives that total in the passage in Genesis; but inconsistently attributes nine sons to Joseph in place of two. Of all the explanations of the other discrepancies, that of Dr. Hales is perhaps the most plausible (Analysis of Chronology, 2, 159), but it has the insuperable objections of including Jacob himself among the number of his own posterity, and of not conforming to the method of enumeration in the text. A comparison of Num 26:8, shows that the name of Eliab, the son of Pallu and grandson of Reuben, has been accidentally dropped from the list in question; this restored, the whole, with its parallel accounts, may be adjusted with entire harmony, as in the table on the following pages.

The example of Jacob is quoted by the first and the last of the minor prophets. Hosea, in the latter days of the kingdom, seeks (Hos 12:3-4; Hos 12:12) to convert the descendants of Jacob from their state of alienation  from God by recalling to their memory the repeated acts of God's favor shown to their ancestor. Mal 1:2 strengthens the desponding hearts of the returned exiles by assuring them that the love which God bestowed upon Jacob was not withheld from them. Besides the frequent mention of his name in conjunction with those of the other two patriarchs, there are distinct references to events in the life of Jacob in four books of the N.T. In Rom 9:11-13, Paul adduces the history of Jacob's birth to prove that the favor of God is independent of the order of natural descent. In Heb 12:16, and Heb 11:21, the transfer of the birthright and Jacob's dying benediction are referred to. His vision at Bethel, and his possession of land at Shechem, are cited in Joh 1:51, and Joh 4:5; Joh 4:12. Stephen, in his speech (Act 7:12; Act 7:16), mentions the famine, which was the means of restoring Jacob to his lost son in Egypt, and the burial of the patriarch in Shechem.

In Jacob may be traced a combination of the quiet patience of his father with the acquisitiveness which seems to have marked his mother's family; and in Esau, as in Ishmael, the migratory and independent character of Abraham was developed into the enterprising habits of a warlike hunter- chief. Jacob, whose history occupies a larger space, leaves on the reader's mind a less favorable impression than either of the other patriarchs with whom he is joined in equal honor in the N.T. (Mat 8:11). But, in considering his character, we must bear in mind that we know not what limits were set in those days to the knowledge of God and the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit. A timid, thoughtful boy would acquire no self- reliance in a secluded home. There was little scope for the exercise of intelligence, wide sympathy, generosity, frankness. Growing up a stranger to the great joys and great sorrows of natural life-deaths, and wedlock, and births; inured to caution and restraint in the presence of a more vigorous brother; secretly stimulated by a belief that God designed for him some superior blessing, Jacob was perhaps in a fair way to become a narrow, selfish, deceitful, disappointed man. But, after dwelling for more than half a lifetime in solitude, he is driven from home by the provoked hostility of his more powerful brother. Then, in deep and bitter sorrow, the outcast begins life afresh long after youth has passed, and finds himself brought first of all unexpectedly into that close personal communion with God which elevates the son, and then into that enlarged intercourse with men which is capable of drawing out all the better feelings of human nature.

An unseen world was opened. God revived and renewed to him that slumbering promise,  over which he had brooded for threescore years since he had learned it in childhood from his mother. Angels conversed with him. Gradually he felt more and more the watchful care of an ever-present spiritual Father. Face to face he wrestled with the representative of the Almighty. And so, even though the moral consequences of his early transgressions hung about him, and saddened him with a deep knowledge of all the evil of treachery and domestic-envy, and partial judgment, and filial disobedience, yet the increasing revelations of God enlightened the age of the patriarch; and at last the timid “supplanter,” the man of subtle devices, waiting for the salvation of Jehovah, dies the “soldier of God,” uttering the messages of God to his remote posterity. (See Niemeyer, Charakt. 2, 260 sq.; Stanley, Jewish Church, 1, 58 sq.) For reflections on various incidents in Jacob's life, see Bp. Hall's Contemplations, bk. 3; Blunt, Hist. of Jacob (Lond. 1832,1860).

Many Rabbinical legends concerning Jacob may be found in Eisenmenger's Ent. Judenth., and in the Jerusalem Targum. (See also Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 286; Hamburger, Talmud. Torfterb. s.v.). In the Koran he is often mentioned in conjuncti6n with the other two patriarchs (chap. 2, and elsewhere). SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.

JACOB also occurs in certain poetical and conventional phrases, borrowed from the relations of the patriarch to the theocracy and state. “God of Jacob,” אֵֹלהֵי יִעֲקֹב (Exo 3:6; Exo 4:5; 2Sa 23:1; Psa 20:2; Isa 2:3); or simply “Jacob” (Psa 24:6, where the term אֵֹלהֵי appears to have fallen out of the text); also “mighty One of Jacob,” אֲבַיַר יִעֲקֹב (Psa 132:2), are titles of Jehovah as the national deity. “Jacob” frequently stands for his posterity or the Israelitish people; but poetically chiefly, “house of' Jacob,” בֵּית יִעֲקֹב (Exo 19:3; Isa 2:5-6; Isa 8:17; Amo 3:13; Amo 9:8; Mic 2:7; Oba 1:17-18), “seed of Jacob,” זֵרֲע יִעֲקֹב (Isa 45:19; Jer 33:26), “sons of Jacob,” בְּנֵי יִעֲקֹב (1Ki 18:37; Mal 3:6), “congregation of Jacob,” קְהַלִּת יִעֲקֹב (Deu 33:4), and simply “Jacob,” יִעֲקֹב (Num 23:7; Num 23:10; Num 23:21; Num 23:23; Num 24:5; Num 24:17; Num 24:19; Deu 32:9; Deu 33:10; Psa 14:7; Psa 44:5; Isa 25:6; Isa 25:9; Jer 10:25; Jer 31:11; Amo 5:8; Amo 7:2; Amo 8:7), all put for the house or family of Jacob; whence the expression “in Jacob,” בְּיִעֲקֹב (Gen 49:7; Lam 2:3), i.e. among the Jewish people. Very generally  the name is used for the people as an individual, and with the epithets appropriate to their patriarchal progenitor, i.e. “Jacob, my servant” (Isa 44:1; Isa 45:4; Isa 48:20; Jer 30:10; Jer 43:27, 28), “Jacob, thy (Edom's) brother” (Oba 1:10). In like manner with the term Israel, “Jacob” is even spoken of the kingdom off Ephratim, which had arrogated to itself the title proper only to the entire nation (Isa 9:7; Isa 17:4; Mic 1:5; Hos 10:11; Hos 12:3); and, after the destruction of the northern kingdom, the same expression is employed of the remaining kingdom of Judah (Nah 2:3; Oba 1:18).

See Isham, Discriminative uses of “Jacob” and “Israel” (Lond. 1854). SEE ISRAEL.

## Jacob Baradaeus[[@Headword:Jacob Baradaeus]]

             SEE JACOBITES.

## Jacob Ben-Isaac[[@Headword:Jacob Ben-Isaac]]

             of Prague, who died about 1628, is the author of צאינה וראינה, or a Judeo-German midrash on the Pentateuch, the five Megilloth and Haftaras (Amsterdam, 1648, and often; partly translated into Latin by Saubert, Helmstadt, 1660; Engl. transl. by Hershon, Lond. 1865); a modern imitation is the La Semaine Israelite, by B. Crehange (Paris, 1847), See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:19 sq. (B.P.)

J

acob Natta.

SEE NATTA.

## Jacob Berab[[@Headword:Jacob Berab]]

             a Jewish Rabbi, born A.D. 1474 at Maqueda, near Toledo, Spain, was obliged by persecution to leave his native land when only eighteen years old. After many years of travel through Egypt to Jerusalem, and thence to Damascus, he at last found a resting-place in Safet (about 1534). Possessing a large fortune and great thirst for honor, he sought distinction among his Palestinian brethren. Favored by the Rabbins of his own immediate vicinity, he succeeded in re-establishing (1538) the Sanhedrim in the Holy Land, which no doubt, he intended to serve as the starting-point for the re-establishment of the Jewish' kingdom. Unfortunately, however, for the Jewish cause, there was higher authority at Jerusalem than at Safet; and when Berab sought a reconciliation with the chief Rabbi, Levi ben- Chabib, by appointing him next in authority, the consummation of the project failed, to the great detriment of Judaism all over the world. A controversy between the two parties ensued, which ended with the death of Berab (January, 1541); it completely destroyed the hope of are establishment of ordination and of a Jewish state. See Grätz, Gesch. d.  Juden, 9, ch. 9 and 10; Jost, Geschichte d. Judenthums, 3, 128 sq. SEE JEWS. (J. H.W.)

## Jacob Emden Ashkenasi[[@Headword:Jacob Emden Ashkenasi]]

             (shortened Jabez), a Jewish Rabbi of great distinction among the Hebrews of the last century was born at Amsterdam in 1696. He was the son of Chacham Zewi, another Rabbi of the celebrated Zewi family. Being banished from their homes, his father's family sought a refuge first in Poland, later in Moravia. Possessed of a considerable fortune, Jacob devoted most of his time to the study of the Jewish traditions. to the exclusion of all secular studies, which he considered likely to be derogatory to his firm belief in the authenticity of Rabbinical writings. Even the position of Rabbi, which was frequently offered him, he hesitated to accept, lest it should in the least interfere with his studies. But, once persuaded to assume the sacred duties at Emden, he was thereafter always called Jacob Emden, although in the official papers of the Danish government he is called Herschel.

He soon returned to private life, and became a resident at Altona (about 1730), near Hamburg. But, if Jacob did not retain an official position in the synagogue, he certainly continued to work actively for the good of Israel; and as, by his zeal for the cause of the Jewish religion, he often censured, both by pen and tongue, those who departed from the old and wonted way, he thus made it possible for his adversaries, of whom, like his father, he had not a few, to stigmatize him as the Jewish “grand inquisitor,” etc. If Jacob Emden ever deserved to be criticized for improper conduct, it is for his relation towards Rabbi Eibeschutz, who was his competitor for the rabbiship of the Altona, Hamburg, and Wandsbeck congregations, which Jacob did not care to fill, but which he would gladly have had the honor to decline., (Compare Grätz, 5, 397 sq.) Emden was especially severe against all the Cabalists, and many were the books that he issued to contradict their teachings. He even denied the authorship of some of the cabalistic writings; thus he pronounced the book Zohar to be a spurious production of his own century, etc. He placed himself in a very ridiculous light by a judgment which he gave on Jewish traditional law, upon which the advice of Moses Mendelssohn had also been obtained, and in which, differing from this great man; he addressed him more like a teacher than a pupil. Jacob Emden died in 1776.

One of his pupils was the celebrated Samuel Dubno. His writings, according to his own statement, cover no less than 34 different works. The most important of them are his contributions to the history of  the fanatics of the last century, known as the followers of Sabbatai Zewi (q.v.). They are, צְבַי קצּוּר צַיצִת נוֹבֵל, taken from the celebrated polemical work by Jacob Sasportas, on the sad fate of Sabbatai Zewi (Amst. 1737, 4to): — סֵ8 הִשַּׁמּוֹשׁ, the most ably conducted polemic against Zoharites and Sabbatians, consisting of different brochures (Alton. 1758, 4to): — תּוֹרִת הִקַנָאוֹת, another collection against S. Zewi and his followers (Altona, 1752, 4to): — — תָּשׁוּבָה אִל אוֹדוֹת הִמַּינַין, on the Sabbatians who espoused the Christian faith (Altona 1757, 8vo). Of his other works, the most able are, perhaps, סֵדֶר עֲבוֹדָה, on the Temple service, the sacrifice, etc. (Altona, 1745-69, 8vo; extract by S. Deutsch, Presb. 1835, 8vo): — עִמּגדֵי שָׁמִיַם, first part of a great work on the Jewish ritual (Altona, 1745, 8vo, and often): עֵוֹ אָבוֹתthe Mishnic tract Aboth, with commentaries by celebrated Jewish savans, etc. (Amst. 1751, 4to); etc. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, x (Index); Jost, Gesch. d. Judenthums, 3:194, 252, 308; First, Biblioth. Jud. 1, 241 sq. (contains a list of all his writings); Samuel Dubno, יָחַיד אֵבֶל(Berl. 1776,8vo); Furst, Jacob Ernden in the Lib. d. Or., 1846, c. 442. SEE LUZATO; SEE JEWS (MODERN). (J.H.W.)

## Jacob Erlandsen[[@Headword:Jacob Erlandsen]]

             a Danish prelate, was originally dean of the chapter of Lund, in which capacity he attended the Council of Lyons in 1245. He afterwards became bishop of Roeskilde, and archbishop of Lund in 1253. He died May 10, 1274. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Jacob Of Viterbo[[@Headword:Jacob Of Viterbo]]

             archbishop of Naples, who died in 1308, was at first an Augustinian monk, and had the reputation of great learning. Gandolfo, in his dissertation, De Ducentis Augustinianis, attributes to him a large number of works, which are still unpublished. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Jacob Sasportas[[@Headword:Jacob Sasportas]]

             SEE SASPORTAS.

## Jacob ben-Abba-Mari ben-Simon[[@Headword:Jacob ben-Abba-Mari ben-Simon]]

             (Simson), generally known as Jacob Anatoli (ANATOLIO), a Jewish philosopher, was born in Provence in the latter half of the 12th century. He was the son-in-law of the celebrated writer Samuel Ibn-Tibbon, and, like him, became an ardent follower of Maimonides. In early life he acquired a thorough knowledge of the Arabic language, and this enabled him to translate many of the philosophical works for the benefit of his Jewish brethren. But, unlike his great master, he was inclined to rationalism to such a degree that he set about attempting to explain the miracles of the O.T. Scriptures in a natural way. His fame soon spread abroad, and when the emperor Frederick II, the last of the Hohenstaufen, looked about for a translator of Aristotle, his eves fell on Anatoli, and he was invited to Naples, and paid an annuity from the emperor's private purse to perform the arduous task, or, according to some, to assist in the undertaking. He prepared, in conjunction with Michael Scotus, a translation of the Greek philosopher, together with the commentary by the Arabian philosopher Averroes (Ibn-Rosill), into the Latin (comp. Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7, 105, note 1; Roger Bacon, Opera, 2, 140; Renan, Averroes et l'Arerroisme, p. 163 sq.). Jacob Anatoli died about 1250. SEE SCHOLASTICISM; SEE SCOTUS (MICHAEL). (J. H.W..)

## Jacob ben-Asheri ben-Jechiel ben-Uri ben-Eliakim ben- Juhdah[[@Headword:Jacob ben-Asheri ben-Jechiel ben-Uri ben-Eliakim ben- Juhdah]]

             also called Baal Ha-Turim, after his celebrated ritual work, was born in Germany about A.D. 1280. At the age of eighteen he was an eye-witness of the fearful massacres of his Jewish brethren, which began in Bavaria April 20, 1298, under the leadership of Rindfleisch and soon spread over France and Austria, and by which more than 100,000 persons were slaughtered in less than six months. The insecurity of the lives of Jews led him to emigrate in 1303. For more than two years he and his family moved from town to town, until they found a resting-place at Toledo, in Spain. Though in very straitened pecuniary circumstances, he began at once literary labors, and as the result we have

(1) A Commentary on the Pentateuch (עִל הִתּוֹרָה פֵירוּשׁ), the basis of which is Nachmanides's exposition. “He excluded from it Nachmanides's philosophico-cabalistic portions, inserted in their stead remarks of Rashi, Joseph Cara, Samuel ben-Meier, Abraham ben-Chija, R. Tam, Aben-Ezra, Joseph Kimchi, Jehudah the Pious, Simon ben-Abraham. Meier of Rothenburg, R. Asher, the father, and R. Jehudah, the brother of the author, as well as glosses of his own at the beginning of every Sabbatic section SEE HAPHITARAH, which chiefly consist of explanations of words and whole sentences according to the hermeneutical rule called גימטריא (i.e. reducing every letter of a word to its numerical value, and explaining it by another word of the same quantity SEE MIDRASH, and which he calls פרפיאית, dainty supplements), and recondite reasons for the critical remarks of the Masorites upon the text (טעמי המסורות). This work is of great importance to the understanding of the original design of the Masorah. Such was the extraordinary: popularity of the Genatrical portions of this commentary that they were detached from the exegetical part and printed in a separate form in Constantinople in 1514, in Venice in 1544, and have since appeared not only in the Rabbinic Bibles of Bomberg (Venice, 1546-48 and 1568), of Buxtorf (Basle, 1617-19), and Frankfurter (Amsterdam, 1.724-27), under the title of קצת פרפראות חידושי בעל הטורים, but also in five editions of the Bible between 1595 and 1653, and in no less than twenty different editions of the Pentateuch between the years 1566 and 1804--hereas the exegetical part was not published till 1805 at Zolkiew, and again in 1838 at Hanover: —

(2) אִרְבָּעָה טוּרַים, a celebrated religious code, so named because it consists of four parts or rows, respectively denominated אויח חיים, the way of life; דעה יורה, the teacher of knowledge; אבן העזר, the stone of help; and חשן המשפט, the breastplate of justice.” It treats of the ritual, moral, matrimonial, civil, and social observances of the Jews, and is, upon the whole, a very remarkable work; for a time it even supplanted the Jod Ha-Chezaka of the renowned Maimonides, and became the text-book of Jewish Rabbins throughout the entire known world. It is indispensable to the student of Jewish antiquities, and we refer here only to the best editions that have been published of this work (Augsburg, 1540; Hanover, 1610). He died in 1340. See Geiger, Wissenschaftl. Zeitung IV (Stuttg. 1839), p. 395 sq.; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7:346 sq.; First, Biblioth. Jud 1:2; Jud 1:16 sq.; Steinschneider, Catal. Libr. Hebsr. in Biblioth. Bodleiana, col. 1181 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. 2, 452 sq.

## Jacob ben-Chajim ben-Isaac Ibn-Adonia[[@Headword:Jacob ben-Chajim ben-Isaac Ibn-Adonia]]

             a celebrated Jewish writer, was born at Tunis about 1470. During the persecutions of the Jews in the first half of the 16th century he was obliged to flee his native country-, and he went to Italy. After residing at Rome and Florence he removed to Venice, and engaged as corrector of the press proofs of the celebrated Bomberg edition of the Rabbinic Bible. This work he performed with great ability, and he afterwards published a second edition of this Bible in four volumes folio, called Bomberg's Second Rabbinic Bible (Venice, 1524-25). The first was prepared under the supervision of Felix Pratensis (q.v.). It contains the Hebrew text, with the Masorah, the Targums, the commentaries of several of the most noted early Jewish scholars, and copious introductions, etc., by the editor himself. Jacob benChajim deserves especial credit for the able manner in which he labored on the Masorah (q.v.), displaying no small amount of erudition, sagacity, and patience. With the greatest of care he sifted the indigestible material which had gathered in the 1James , 2 nd centuries, and, having brought order out of chaos, he inserted it upon the margin of his edition of the Rabbinic Bible. In after life he embraced Christianity. He died about the middle of the 16th century. See Kitto, Journ. Sac. Lit. 1863, p. 521; Bibl. Cyclop. 2, 453; Rossi, Dizion. storico degli Autori Ebrei, s.v.; Fürst, Biblioth. Jud 1:2; Jud 1:17; Eichhorn, Einleit. in d. A. T. § 394. SEE RABBINICAL BIBLES. (J. H. W.)

## Jacob ben-Eleazar[[@Headword:Jacob ben-Eleazar]]

             a Jewish grammarian, flourished at Toledo in the first half of the 12th century. He distinguished himself by a work entitled הִשָּׁלֹם סֵפֶי(the book of completion), which investigates the nature of the vowel-points of Hebrew, and also the etymology of proper Hebrew names; it was freely used by Kimchi, as is proved by frequent citations. “Jacob ben-Eleazar was a sound grammarian, laid down some excellent rule respecting the Hebrew syntax, and materially aided the development of philology in Spain at a time when Biblical exegesis was much neglected and the study of the Talmud was paramount” (Dr. Ginsburg, in Kitto, s.v.). He was also active in the correction of the Hebrew text of the O.T., and for this purpose relied on the celebrated Codex Hillali or Helali, one of the most ancient and celebrated Hebrew codices. It was written, according to some, at Hilla, a town built near the ruins of the ancient Babel, and hence the name by which the MS. ‘is designated; others, however, hold that it was the production of Rabbi Moses ben-Hillel. It bears date from the beginning of the 7th century, according to Sakkuto, who in his day (circa 1500) saw a portion of the Codex, and pronounced it to be 900 years old, and cites Kimchi (Juchassin, ed. Filipowski, Lond. 1857, p. 220) as saying in his grammar on Num 15:4, that the Pentateuch of this Codex was in his day extant at Toledo. The probability is that a greater portion of it, if not the whole, was destroyed at Leon, in Spain, where it was last deposited, during the persecutions of the Jews and the destruction of all Jewish writings in 1197. Jacob ben-Eleazar's correction of the text of the O. — T. Scriptures by the aid of this celebrated Codex makes it, therefore, doubly valuable for all critical students of the Hebrew text. See Biesenthal and Lebrecht's Radicumn Liber (Berlin, 1817), p. 15, 26; Geiger, in Ozar Nechmad II (Vienna, 1857), p. 159 sq.; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 6, 132; Kitto, s.v. SEE MANUSCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.

## Jacob ben-Machir Tibbon[[@Headword:Jacob ben-Machir Tibbon]]

             SEE PROFIAT.

## Jacob ben-Meier[[@Headword:Jacob ben-Meier]]

             SEE TAM.

## Jacob ben-Sheshet Gerundi[[@Headword:Jacob ben-Sheshet Gerundi]]

             a celebrated Cabalist who flourished about the middle of the 13th century, deserves our notice because of his efforts to counteract the influence which some of the better educated and more liberal-minded Jewish Rabbins of the 13th and 14th centuries exerted in behalf of the introduction, of a philosophical mode of interpretation inaugurated by the renowned Maimonides. Like many others of his conservative brethren, he confronted the liberals with harsh terms and low and vulgar epithets and thereby only strengthened the cause of his adversaries. Thus he called the Maimonidists “heretics and transgressors of the law,” and asserted that “they seek only the furtherance of the temporal good, of the earthly life, the defense of life and property, but deny all future rewards and punishments,” etc. These gross misrepresentations are contained in a work which he published in defense of the cabalistic mode of interpretation. See Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, 7, 85; note 3, p. 442 459. SEE CABALA; SEE MAIMONNIDES. (J.H.W.)

## Jacob de Voragine[[@Headword:Jacob de Voragine]]

             archbishop of Genoa, and author of the Legenda aurea, was born at Viraggio, near Genoa, in 1230. He joined the preaching friars at Genoa in 1244, and became provincial of the order for Lombardy in 1267. For services rendered to the Church and to his order in different circumstances, he was finally made archbishop of Genoa in 1292, and died in 1298. His reputation rests exclusively on a compilation of legends which he wrote under the title of Legenda Sanctorume, or Legendela aurea (also known as the Historia Longobardica, on account of a short Lombard chronicle it contains, attached to the life of pope Pelagius).

The work consists of a series of fanciful biographies, some compiled from older works, others merely made up of the traditions current among the people and in convents. Many of the elements of these biographies are taken from apocryphal Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, and martyrologies, and are to be  found in other anterior and contemporary works, such as the Passional, the legends of Mary, etc. Some of them are inventions of the Middle Ages, and show how quickly fables become mixed up with history: such are the clives of Dominic and of Francis of Assisi. These legends are, moreover, entirely devoid of poetic beauty, that redeeming feature of many works of this kind. Jacob was a mere compiler and chronicler, without taste and without talent; a specimen of his coarseness is to be found in what he relates of Vespasian in his life of the apostle James.

The only original part of the work is the preface or introduction to the life of each saint, in which Jacob attempts to give an explanation of the meaning of their names; and these explanations consist in wonderful etymologies and wild speculations, such as could be expected from an ignorant monk unacquainted with either Greek or Hebrew. The work was soon esteemed at its just value. The superior of the order, Berengarius de Landora, subsequently archbishop of Compostella († 1330), commissioned Bernardus Guidonis, afterwards bishop of Lodève († 1331), to write a life of the saints from authentic sources. Bernardus, who was a zealous historian, set to work and produced a Speculum sanctorbum in four volumes. This, however, did not meet with much success. The Legenda of Jacob became the Legenda aurea, and gained in popularity not only because it was shorter than the voluminous compilation of Bernardus, but especially on account of its extravagant descriptions and relations of miraculous occurrences, which suited the spirit of the Middle Ages mulch better than a plain, truthful narration of facts.

Many translations of it were made into German, French, Italian, Spanish, and English, and after the discovery of printing many editions of it were published. (See Brunet,' Manuel de l'amateur de. lieres, 4, 687 sq. The latest edition is by Dr. Grässe, librarian of the king of Saxony, Lpz. 1845, 8vo). To us the book is very important as an index to the superstitious spirit of the Middle Ages. Among the other works of Jacob de Voragine we may mention Sermones de tempore et quadrayesimales (Paris, 1500; Venice, 1589, 2 vols.): — Sermones de dominicis per annum (Venice, 1544, 4to, and 1566, fol.): — Quadragesimale et de sanctis (Venice, 1602,2 vols. 4to): — Sermones de Sanctis (Lyon, 1494; Papiae, 1600; Venice, 1580): — Mariale sive sermones de L. Maria Virgine (Venice, 1497, 4to; Paris, 1503; Mayence, 1616, 4to). The latest editions of his collected sermons appeared at Augsburg (1760,4 vols. fol.). All these sermons are mere sketches: those on the saints are full of fables, and can be considered as a sort of supplement to the Legenda aurea; the 160 sermons on Mary treat, in  alphabetical order, of the virtues, perfection, and miracles of the Virgin. Lentz, in his Gesch. d. Homiletik (Brunswick, 1839, 1, 257), gives a German translation of one of them as a specimen. Jacob also wrote in defense of the Dominicans. and doubtless against the attacks of St. Amour, a Defensorium contra inmpugnantes Fratres Praedicatores, quod Znon vivant secundum vitam apostolicam (Venice, 1504). An abridgment which he prepared of the Summa viritutum et vitiorum of Wm. Peraldus, and his De operibus et opusculis S. Augustini have never been printed (Quetif and Echard, 1, 458). His chronicle of Genoa, down to 1297, has been published by Muratori, Scriptores rerum Italic. 9:1 sq. The assertion. made by Sixtus Senensis (Biblioth. Sacra, lib. 4), that Jacob wrote an Italian translation of the Bible, appears to be erroneous: no such work has ever been found, nor is it mentioned by contemporary writers; it is, moreover, highly improbable that the compiler of the Legenda aurea should have considered it desirable or profitable to give the fiction-loving people the Scriptures in the vernacular. See Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 6, 399.

## Jacob of Edessa[[@Headword:Jacob of Edessa]]

             (so called after the name of his residence), one of the most celebrated Syrian writers and theologians, flourished in the second half of the 7th century. He was born in the village of Indsba (in Antioch), and in early life entered the monastic order. About the year 651 he was appointed bishop of Edessa; but his zeal for the cause of the Church often led him astray, and he made many enemies among the clergy, and finally resigned the episcopal dignity, retiring to a life of seclusion in a monastery at Toledo. He now began an extended study of the Syriac Version of the Old Testament, and made many valuable corrections and annotations, of which parts still remain to us (compare Sylvestre de Sacy, in Eichhorn's Biblioth. d. bibl. Litter. 8, 571 sq.; Notices et extraits des MSS. 4, 648 sq.; Eichhorn, Bibl. d. bibl. Lit. 2, 270; the same, Einl. in d. A. T. 2, §260 sq.). After the decease of his successor at Edessa he was invited to reassume the duties of the bishopric, but he died while on his journey, June 5, 708 Jacob of Edessa was a zealous advocate of Monophysitism, and he is greatly revered by the Jacobites (q.v.), while he is highly esteemed also by the Maronites. He was distinguished for his thorough knowledge of the Syriac, Hebrew, and Greek, and translated a number of Greek works into Syriac, a task which he so ably discharged that he was honored with the surname of “‘interpreter of the books” (in the Syriac, קְפִשְׁקָנָא דִכְתָבֵא). He wrote commentaries and scholia on the O.T. and N.T., of which extracts are contained in the works of Ephraem (comp. Assemani, Biblioth. Orient. 1, 476 sq.). See Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 6, 379 sq.; Halle Encyklopadie, 2nd sect. 13:165-167. (J. H.W.)

## Jacob of Hungary[[@Headword:Jacob of Hungary]]

             surnamed the Master, a fanatic and adventurer, and the chief of the Pastoureaux or Shepherds, is supposed to have been a native of Hungary, though nothing definite is known as to his origin. In his youth he joined the Cistercian' order, but is said to have afterwards embraced Islamism: this, however, is a matter of doubt, some even reversing the order of his conversion from one faith to the other. He was also represented as having  learned the occult arts from the Moors of Spain, and also as having been a traitor to France. At any rate, we find him at Easter, A.D. 1251, heading a popular movement in favor of king St. Louis, then a prisoner at Caesarea. The king, apparently forsaken by the nobility and clergy, was the idol of the people. Jacob traveled through the provinces, preaching a crusade in which none but the poor and lowly should take part, God having forsaken the opulent and the great on account of their pride, and the clergy on account of their licentiousness. He claimed to have visions, to have received a direct message from the Virgin, etc. “He was an aged man,” says Milman, “with a long beard, and pale, emaciated face; he spoke Latin, French, and German with the same fluent persuasiveness; he preached without authority of pope or prelate.”

The eloquence of the Master of Hungary stirred the lowest depths of society. The shepherds, the peasants, left their flocks, their stalls, their fields, their ploughs; in vain friends, parents, wives remonstrated; they tool no thought of sustenance. So, drawing men after him “as the loadstone draws the iron,” he soon had a large number of followers, who received the name of Pastourels or Pastoureaux, from the fact that the first and the most of his followers were shepherds or peasants. Both the magistrates and queen Blanche, thinking they might become instrumental in securing the liberation of the king, encouraged them for a time. Soon, however, their ranks were swelled by a number of vagrants, thieves, highwaymen, and all the scum of the population, attracted by the prospect of spoils.

They had started from Flanders in the direction of Paris, and when they reached Amiens they numbered 30,000. These recruits wore daggers, swords, battle-axes, and all the implements of warfare. Received and entertained by the citizens of Amiens, they gained new adherents, and their number swelled to 50,000, and on their arrival at the gates of Paris they were a formidable band of 100,000 armed men. Sismondi says: “Their hatred of the priests was as great as their hatred of the infidels. They had preachers who never had been ordained; their teachings were far from orthodox, and they assumed the right of setting aside ecclesiastical discipline; they granted divorces, and permitted marriages which the priests denounced as contrary to the canons.” They were especially bitter against the monastic orders, and a number of monks were murdered by them. The authorities began to regret having encouraged them; yet they were allowed to enter Paris, and Jacob went so far as to officiate publicly in the church of St. Eustache. Several murders marked their stay in the capital.

Finding his forces considerably increased, Jacob divided them into several bands, under pretense of  embarking them at different points for the Holy Land. One of these bands went to Orleans, where they massacred all the priests and monks they could find; and thence to Bourges, where, the priests carefully keeping out of the way, they attacked the Jews, demolishing their synagogues and plundering their houses. Effective measures were at last taken to put a stop to these excesses. They were excommunicated by the Church, and the authorities invited the people to arm against and war on them. Jacob was still in the capital. One day, by order of the queen, an executioner mingled with the crowd who surrounded him, and, while he was preaching, cut off his head with a single blow of the axe. At the same time, a number of knights charged on his followers, who were dispersed. The other bands met with the same fate, and an end was put at the same time to the depredations and to the sect. See Matthew Paris, Hist. Anglae; Guillaume de Nangis, Chronicles in Spicil.; Matthew of Westminster, Historia; Chronicles de St. Denys; Sismondi, Hist. des Franais, 7, 475 sq.; Dufey, Dict. de la. Conversation. article Pastoureaux; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26, 167 sq.; Milman, Latin Christianity, 6, 57 sq.; Semler, Versuch e. Kirchengesch. 1, 545 sq.

## Jacob of Jutterbock[[@Headword:Jacob of Jutterbock]]

             (or Jacobus Cisterciensis, etc.) was born at Jütterbock about 1383. When yet quite young he entered the Cistercian monastery De Paradiso, situated in Poland, and afterwards went to Cracow to procure the doctorate. Distinguished for scholarship and piety, he soon became the acknowledged leader among his fellow monks, and was finally elected abbot of his convent. Some time after he removed to Prague, but, growing dissatisfied with the many failings of men who professed to have quitted the world to seek an alliance with God, but who, in truth, had only entered the monastic order because it was the road to distinction, he advocated a reform of the Church, and at one time even fostered the thought of forsaking the monastic life altogether. He changed to the Carthusian order, removed to one of their monasteries at Erfurt, was here also greatly beloved for his superior abilities, and became prior of the monastery. He died in 1645. Jacob of Jütterbock may be justly regarded an associate of the mystics of the 14th century, and virtually a forerunner of the Reformation--one of the Johns preparing the way for Luther. Characteristic of his efforts for a reformatory movement are his Sermones notabiles etformales de tempore et de sanctis: — Libelli tres de arte curandi vitia (in Joh. Wesseli Opp., Amst. 1617): — Liber de veritate dicenda: — Tract. de causis multarum  passionum (in Pezelii Biblioth. ascet. 7): — De indulgentiis: — De negligentia Praelatorum (in Walch, Monum. med. cev. 2, Fasc. 1): De septems ecclesiae statibus opusculum (Walch, Fasc. 2). Especially in the last work he declares that a reform of the Church could only be effected by subjecting the whole clergy, from the pope downward, to a thorough change. He vehemently opposed the absolute power of the papal chair, the right of the pope to control the councils, and naturally enough denied the infallibility of the so-called “vicar of Christ.” See Ullmann, Reformers before the Reformation, 1, 208, 250; Trithemii Catal. illustr. virorum, 1; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 380, 381; Bibliotheca Sacra, 1, 434 sq.

## Jacob of London[[@Headword:Jacob of London]]

             a Jewish Rabbi who flourished in England at the opening of the 13th century, was appointed by king John, at the commencement of his reign, when yet friendly to the Jews, and uninfluenced by the diabolical exertions of the Roman prelate Stephen Langton, as chief Rabbi of England (‘presbyteratus omnium Judmeorum totius Angliee”). Jacob was a man of great learning, especially conversant with Jewish tradition, and held in high esteem by Jews and Gentiles. Even the king hesitated not to call him his dear friend (“dilectus et familiaris noster”). Unfortunately, we have no knowledge of any of his literary productions, which, by a man of his abilities, must have been valuable, especially as an index to the history of the Jews in England under king John. See Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7, 16. (J. H. W.)

## Jacob of Mies[[@Headword:Jacob of Mies]]

             (Jacobus de Misa, also called, on account of his small stature, Jacobellus, i.e. Jacob the Short), one of the most prominent figures in the polemical controversy ‘inaugurated by Huss, was born about the second half of the 14th century, at Misa, in Bohemia. He was educated at the University of Prague, and then became priest at Trina, and ultimately at Prague. At the instigation of Petrus Dresdensis, the Waldensian, he was led to inquire into the antiquity of the Roman Catholic mode of administering the sacrament, and, after a careful study of the writings of the early Church, became convinced that the Roman Church had no right or authority to deprive the laity of the cup, and by his tongue and by his pen he preached against the malpractice, himself also deviating from the usage, and administering the cup to the  laity. Excommunicated by the archbishop of Prague, he challenged the university authorities to refute his arguments; and further defended his course by his pen: Vindiciae seu Replicatt. contra Andreas Brodam. The approbation which his course received from the people seemed rather serious to the Council of Constance, just then in session, and every effort was made to refute Jacob of Mies.

But soon Huss also came forward, and declared that the early fathers had been taught by the disciples that Christ desired both the wine and the bread to be given to the laity, and when arraigned as a heretic before the bar of the council, he still continued to reiterate his former statements (compare Iist. et Monum. J. Hus atque Hieron. Pragensis, Norimb. 1715, i, 52 sq.; V. d. Hardt, Magnum ecumenicum Constantiense Concilium, etc., 4:291). Jacob of Mies, thus encouraged by the attitude of Huss, a classmate of his at the university, more vigorously than ever defended his position, and sought further to prove the accuracy of his statements in Demonstratio per testimonia Scripturce patrum atgue doctorum communicationem calicis in plebe Christiana esse necessaritm, (in V. d. Hardt, 3:804 sq.). Of course his opponents could not long continue in silence, and they naturally, though awkwardly enough, endeavored to refute him by proofs from the Bible and the Church fathers. Perhaps the most able, i.e. the most ridiculous of all, and the most vehement of the opposition documents, was an anonymous Epistola Elenchtica (in V. d. Hardt). There were even some who attempted to prove that the deprivation of the cup had its sanction in the Old-Test. Scriptures! Thereupon the council convened at Constance (the 13th session, June 15,1415) again condemned the course of Jacob of Mies, although it- virtually admitted all that he claimed for the laity (see Gieseler, Kirchen Gesch. II, 2, 227 sq., in the 4th edit.).

Jacob again defended his course by an Apologia pro communione plebis, which was replied to by the celebrated Gerson in his Cone. publ. causan J. de Misa et Bohemorum quod commusionis laicalis sub utraque specie necessitatem uberius discutiendi. Notwithstanding the frequent denunciations of his course, he continued to hold his parish, and even took up his pen in behalf of many other peculiar doctrines of the Romanists. Thus he opposed the Waldensians on the doctrine of purgatory and the mass, in De purgatorio anime post mortem (in Walch, Monume. needii evi, 1, fasc. 3, p. 1 sq.). He also wrote De juramento, de antichristo, and prepared a translation of the works of Wycliffe. He died at Prague, Aug. 9,1429. The result of the controversy on the cup resulted, as is well known, in a  triumph for Jacob of Mies and for Huss. See Martini, Diss. de J. de Misa. etc., primo Eucharist. Calicis per eccles. Boh. vindice (Altdorf, 1753, 4to); Spittler, Gesch. d. Kelchs i. heil. Abendmahl, p. 49 sq.; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 33, 332 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 6, 394 sq.; Gillett, Life of Huss (1871, 2 vols. 8vo). (J. H.W.)

## Jacob of Nisibus[[@Headword:Jacob of Nisibus]]

             (often surnamed Jacob the Great), the instructor of Ephraem the Syrian, and a relative of Gregory the illuminator, flourished as bishop of Nisibis (Zoba) in the first half of the 4th century. The little that is known of him makes him out to have been a man “distinguished for ascetic holiness and for miraculous works,” clothed, of course, like many of the early characters, in such a mythical dress that the character is often placed in a most ridiculous light (comp. Stanley, Eastern Church, p. 193). In his early life he “spent many years as a hermit in forests and caves, and lived like a wild beast on roots and leaves,” clothed in a rough goat's-hair cloak; and this dress and mode of life he is said to have continued even after he became bishop of Nisibis. That he enjoyed the confidence and esteem of his contemporaries is evinced by the fact that he was a member of the Council of Nicaea (Assemani, Bibl. Or. 1, 169; 3, 587), and by the distinction which he received at the hand of the emperor, who called him one of the three pillars of the world (comp. Schaff, Ch. History, 3. 269). He died about 338. As a writer, Jacob of Nisibis hardly gained distinction; his authorship is even questioned by many. A number of works are attributed to him, but under his name are preserved only an Armenian translation of a letter to the bishops of Seleucia and eighteen sermons, of which a copy was prepared by direction of Assemani for the Vatican (Bibl. Or. 1, 557 sq., 632). An edition, with a Latin translation and notes, was prepared and published by cardinal Antonelli (1756, folio; Venice, 1765: Const. 1824). See, besides Schaff and Stanley, Neumann, Gesch. l. Armen. Lit. p. 18 sq.; Biographie Universelle, art. Jacques de Nisibe; Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 6, 396. (J. H.W.)

## Jacob of Sarug[[@Headword:Jacob of Sarug]]

             a celebrated writer and teacher of the Syrian Church, was born at Curtanim, on the Euphrates, in 452. He was made a presbyter in 503, and attained the distinction of bishop in 519. He was honored by the surname of “doctor” (Syr. Malpãna), and by that of “the universal” (Syr. Tibelita).  He was the author of an innumerable number of works. Thus no less than 763 homilies in verse are attributed to him (of which Barhebraeus had 182), besides expositions, an anaphora, a form of baptism, hymns, and letters. But evidently many works are falsely attributed to him, as Assemani (Bibl. Orient. 2, 332) has proved. Many of his writings are preserved in the Vatican. He died at Sarig Nov. 29, 521. The Jacobites and Maronites both commemorate him, and the former hold him with many other orthodox teachers, in great reverence, although it cannot be proved that he in the least deviated from the orthodox course. He certainly reproached Nestorius. His expositions are still used in the Syrian churches at public worship, and have also been translated into Arabic. Several of his hymns are contained in the Brev. ferile Syr. and in the Offic. Domin. (Rome, 1787). A poetic eulogy which he pronounced on Simeon the Stylite has been translated into German by Zingerle (in his Leben und Wirken des heil. Simeon Stylites, Innsbr. 1855, 8vo, p. 279-298). See Etheridge, Syr. Churches (Lond. 1846, 12mo), p. 241 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 6:3970

## Jacob of Vitry[[@Headword:Jacob of Vitry]]

             (Jacobus de Vitriaco, or Jacobus Vitriacus), so named after his native place, was born in the second half of the 12th century. He was a presbyter at the village of Argenteuil, near Paris, when, attracted by the celebrated sanctity of Maria of Ognies, he removed to her place of residence, the diocese of Liege. She received him kindly, and influenced him to take a position in the diocese. At the request of the pope, he began preaching against the Albigenses, and finally devoted himself to the interests of the sacred tomb at Jerusalem, traveling through France to levy contributions. While thus engaged he was elected bishop of Acre, and at the request of pope Honorius III went to the Holy Land. He there performed a noble work: among other things he provided for the children of the Saracens whom the Christians had taken, baptized them, and entrusted them to the care of pious Christian women.

After the retirement of the Christians from Damietta, he resigned in 1225 the episcopal office, and returned to Ognies. In 1229 pope Gregory IX appointed him cardinal and papal legate of France, Brabant, and the Holy Land. He died at Rome May 1,1240. The writings of Jacob de Vitry are valuable. He profited greatly by his stay in the Holy Land, gathering much of the material necessary for the preparation of his principal work, the Historia Orientalis, generally entitled History of Jerusalem., published entire as “Cura Andres Hoji Brugensis”  (1597); also by Martine and Durand, Thesaur. nov. Anecdotorum, t. 3 (Par. 1717). This work of Jacob de Vitry is divided into three parts. The first contains the history (this as well as the others are mainly ecclesiastical) of Jerusalem in brief; the second, a short review of the history of the West, paving particular attention to the history of the different Church orders, and the extent and value of pilgrimages; in the third he returns to the East, and, beginning with ‘the General Lateran Council, closes with the surrender of Damietta.

This last part of the work does not seem to be the production of Jacob, but, in all probability, was written by some other hand, to add to the completeness of the work. Ceillier, however, attributes the whole work to Jacob, and defends his view by stating, in commendation of part third, “L'auteur avait vu de ses yeux ce qu'il raconte” (in accordance with the statement in the preface of the work, p. 1048). This work has been translated into French, and inserted in the Collection des memoires relutifs ai l'histoire de France, Hom. 22. His letters are also of great importance to the historian: Jacobi de Vitriaco epistole messa in Lotharingiam de capitione Damiatae (published by Bongarsius in the first part of the Gesta Dei per francos), and l'Ejusdem episiohel quatuor ad Honorium III Papam (in Martene and Durand's above-named work, and same volume); a life of the celebrated St. Mary of Ognies; and sermons on the Gospels and Epistles, of which a portion was published at Antwerp in 1575. See Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs Sacres, 13, 537 sq.; Bibliotheca Belgica, 1, 542; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 6, 398. (J. H. W.)

## Jacob, Carl[[@Headword:Jacob, Carl]]

             a Benedictine, who died at Salzburg in 1661, is the author of, De Gratia Divina (1630): — Theoremata ex Uninersa Doctoris Angelici Summa (1642): — Verbum Dei Incarnatum (eod.): — De Deo Uno et Trino (1644): — Convivium Eucharisticum (eod.). See Hist. Univers. Salisburg. page 314; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Jacob, Henry[[@Headword:Jacob, Henry]]

             an English Nonconformist, was born in the county of Kent in the second half of the 16th century. He was educated at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. He had secured the living of Cheriton, a place in his native county, but appearing before the public in print as an advocate of a reform of the English Church (“Reasons proving the Necessity of Reforming our Churches in England,” Lond. 1604), he was deprived of his parish, and even obliged to flee the country. After residing some time in Holland he returned to England, and founded the first Independent (Congregational) church in that country. SEE INDEPENDENTS. In 1624 he emigrated to Virginia, and here he died soon after his arrival. Henry Jacob was an extensive writer, but his writings are almost without exception of a polemical nature, and at present very scarce. The most important are a reply to bishop Bison's Sermons on Redemption (preached in 1597, publ. 1598, 8vo), entitled Treatise on the sufferings and Victory of Christ (Lond. 1598, 8vo), and Defense of the same (1600, 4to). — See Strype, Life of Whitgift; Allibone, Dict. of Auth. 1, 948; Hook, Eccles. Biog. 6, 273.

## Jacob, Louis[[@Headword:Jacob, Louis]]

             a French Carmelite, was born at Chalons-sur-Saone in 1608, and died in 1670. Upon joining his order, he took the name of Louis de St. Charles. He  wrote, Bibliotheca Pontificia (Lyons, 1643): — Elogium Venerabilis Sororis Isaunae de Cambri, Tornacensis Monialis S. Augustini (Paris, 1644): — Bibliotheca Parisina (1645): — Bibliographia Gallica Universalis (1646): — De Claris Scriptoribus Cabilonensibus Libri Tres (1652): — Catalogus Abbatunm et Abbatissarum Benedictionis Dei, Ordinis Cisterciensis, etc. See Cosme de St. Etienne, Memoire sur le P. Louis de St. Charles; Nicedron, Memoires, 40, page 87 sq.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Jacob, Rabbi[[@Headword:Jacob, Rabbi]]

             is the name of a Jewish teacher who lived in the latter part of the 2d century of our mera. We have a recorded maxim of his in the treatise Pirke Aboth: "This world is like a vestibule before the world to come; prepare thyself at the. vestibule, that thou mayest be admitted into the hall. Better is one hour of repentance and good works in this world than all the life of the world to come; better is one hour of refreshment of spirit in the world to come than all the life of this world" (chapter 4:23, 24). (B.P.)

## Jacob, Stephen[[@Headword:Jacob, Stephen]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Argyle, N. Y., Feb. 23, 1789; was converted in Feb. 1810; entered the itinerancy in June, 1812; was superannuated in 1818; and died April 24, 1819. He was a zealous; acceptable, and useful preacher, and devotedly pious. — Minutes of Conferences, 1, 327.

## Jacobazzi[[@Headword:Jacobazzi]]

             (Lat..Jacobatius), DOMINICO, bishop of Lucera, was employed in various important affairs by Sixtus IV, and was created cardinal in 1517 by Leo X. He died July 2, 1527. He left a Treatise on the Councils., See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Jacobi, Adam Friedrich Ernst[[@Headword:Jacobi, Adam Friedrich Ernst]]

             a German divine, who died April 3, 1807, superintendent and member of consistory at Cranichfeld, in the duchy of Gotha, is the author of, Neuester Reliqiontszustand in Holland (Gotha, 1777): — Katechisationen uber 12 auserlesene Stucke der heiligen Schrift (Weimar, 1773): — Religion aus der Bibel in Unterredungen aus den Hauptstellen derselben (ibid. 1794). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:824; 2:270, 354. (B.P.)

## Jacobi, Fredrich Heinrich[[@Headword:Jacobi, Fredrich Heinrich]]

             one of Germany's most eminent philosophers, was born at Düsseldorf January 25,1743. His father was a wealthy merchant, and, anxious to be assisted by his son. he designed him for the mercantile profession. When only sixteen years old, Jacobi was sent to Frankfort on the Main to learn the business. But he daily evinced fondness for a literary profession, and a short time after, having removed to Geneva, he was further incited to study by association with learned men, among whom was the great mathematician Le Sage. The death of his father obliged him to return to Düsseldorf, to look after the business interests of the family. He, however, at the same time, continued his studies, which were now becoming multifarious, not to say contradictory, and, according to one of his biographers, “presented the strange appearance of a philosophical composite, including in his single personality the quadruple variety of an enlightened 18th century man, a mystic, an atheist, and a theist.”

Appointed a member of the Exchequer, he had much more leisure afforded him than while at the head of his father's business, and he now not only gave himself up to study, but also to authorship, to which he had been encouraged by his literary associates, among whom figured some of Germany's most noted names. His first productions were a collection of letters by an imaginary person named Allwill, and a romance called “Woldemar” (1777, and often), which, like some of the productions of his friend and present associate Gothe, incorporated the philosophical opinions of the writer. Brought more prominently to the notice of the government, he was honored with a financial position in the state's service, and lie removed to Munich. But his unhesitating exposures of the imprudence and injurious tendency of the Bavarian system of finance made him many enemies and he retired to his estate at Pempelfort, near Düsseldorf, where his hospitable nature soon gathered about him “celebrated guests from all quarters of the cultivated world,” and it was only natural that he should now continue his literary productions. Among other literary enterprises  which he ventured upon was a controversy with Mendelssohn (in Briefe'iber d. Lehre d. Spinoza [Bresl. 1785, and often]) on the doctrines that had been advocated by the pantheist Spinoza, whose philosophy had at this time been almost forgotten. This he further and most ably prosecuted in Wider Mendelssohus Beschuldigungen (Lpz. 1786); (comp. Kahnis, Hist. of German- Protestantism, p. 156 sq.). It was this controversy with Mendelssohn, which had originated with the discovery by Jacobi that the friend of the former, Lessing, the author of Nathan, was a Spinozi, which Mendelssohn was determined to refute, but which actually laid even the latter open to the charge of advocating pantheistical doctrines, that first brought clearly to light the philosophical opinions of Jacobi, and stamped him as the “philosopher of faith.”

The points of Jacobi's position are thus stated by Schwegler (History of Philosophy, transl. by Seelye, p. 272): “(1.) Spinozism is fatalism and atheism; (2.) Every path of philosophic demonstration leads to fatalism and atheism; (3.) In order that we may not fall into these, we must set a limit to demonstrating, and recognize faith as the element of all metaphysical knowledge.” Principles like these, advocated at a time when atheism was enthroned all over Germany and France, naturally-enough aroused universal opposition in the philosophical world. “It was charged upon him that he was an enemy of reason, a preacher of blind faith, a despiser of science and of philosophy, a fanatic and a papist.” To controvert these opinions, he determined to develop his principle of faith or immediate knowledge; he published David Hume uber d. Glauben, oder Idealismus u. Realismus (Bresl. 1787, 8vo).

This brought down upon him the followers of Kant, and shortly after he also estranged the admirers of Fichte by his Sendschreiben an Fichte (1799). His controversial opponents, however, never failed to acknowledge the great abilities of Jacobi, and the sincerity of his character and opinions. When the troubles arising out of the French Revolution extended to Germany, Jacobi retired to Holstein, whence he removed successively to Wandsbeck and Hamburg; from the latter he was called, in 1804, to Munich, to assist in the formation of the new Academy of Sciences, of which he was in 1807, appointed president. In 1811 he further involved himself in a controversy with another philosophical school, that of Schelling, by the publication of a work Von d. gottlichen Dingen u. ihrer Ogenbarung (Lpz. 1811). This time the dispute was waged rather bitterly; but, notwithstanding the unfavorable estimate which Schelling drew, in his reply, of the literary and philosophical merits of Jacobi, the latter continued to maintain a-high rank among sincere and honest inquirers after truth; and even if it must be  confessed that Jacobi was exclusively occupied with detached speculations, and that he rather prepared than established a system of philosophy, yet it remains undisputed that the profoundness and originality of his views have furnished-materials of which more systematic minds have not scrupled to avail themselves for the construction of their own theories. Jacobi died at Munich March 10,1819. Besides the philosophical productions already mentioned, he wrote Ueber d. Unternehmenu d. Kriticismus d. Vernumft z. Verstande zu bringen (Bresl. 1802, 8vo).

All his works were published collectively at Leipzig in 1812. “Jacobi stood to the philosophy of his day, as it had flowed down from Kant to Schelling, in a very peculiar relation. He was incited by each of these systems; he learned from each, and on each of them he exercised his strength. But he was not satisfied by either of them; yet he was most strongly repelled by pantheism whether the earlier pantheism of Spinoza, whom he highly esteemed as a mark or its later form in Schelling's natural philosophy ... Jacobi did not despise reason; he rather pleaded for it; but reason was not to him a faculty for the creation, discovery, or production of truth from itself. By reason he meant, according to the derivation of the word, that which perceives, the inmost and original sense. He did not regard reason and faith as being in conflict with each other, but as one. Faith inwardly supplies what knowledge cannot gain. Here Jacobi united with Kant in acknowledging the insufficiency of our knowledge to produce a demonstration of God and divine things.

But the vacant place which Kant had therefore left in his system for divine things Jacobi filled up by the doctrine of faith (Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent. 2, 238 sq.). The whole philosophy of Jacobi is perhaps best stated thus: “All demonstrative systems must necessarily lead to fatalism, which, however, is irreconcilable with man's consciousness of the freedom of his rational nature. The general system of nature, indeed, and man himself, so far as he is a part of that system, is pure mechanism; but in man there is unquestionably an energy which transcends and is superior to sense, or that faculty which is bound up with and regulated by the laws of nature. This higher energy is liberty or reason, and consequently sense and reason reveal to man two distinct spheres of his activity — the sensible or visible world, and the invisible or intelligible. The existence of these worlds no more admits of demonstrative proof than that of sense and reason themselves. Now sense and reason are the supreme and ultimate principles of all intellectual operations, and as such legitimize  them, while they themselves do not receive their legitimization from aught else; and the existence of sense and reason necessarily implies the existence of sensible and intelligible objects about which they are conversant. But this existing system of things cannot have originally proceeded either from nature or from man's intellect or reason, for both nature and the human mind are finite and conditionate, and there must be something infinite and unconditionate, superior to and independent both of nature and man, to be the source and principle of all things.

This being is God. Now as man's liberty consists in his personality or absolute individuality, for this constitutes his proper essence, while the mechanism of nature is hereby distinguished from man, that none of its members are individual of character, therefore that which is superior both to nature and to man must be perfectly and supremely individual; God consequently is one only, and strictly personal. Moreover, as the ground of all subsistence, he cannot be without subsistence; and as the principle of reason, he cannot be irrational. Of the existence of this divine intelligence, however, all direct proof is as impossible as a demonstration of existence simply. Generally, indeed, nothing can be known except upon testimony, and whatever rests on testimony is not certainty, but faith, and such a faith or belief, when its object is the existence of a good and supreme being, is religion.” It is apparent, then, that Jacobi may appropriately be looked upon as an advocate of religion, but by no means can he be admitted to have been a Christian philosopher; for, although he believed in a revelation of God, he was “far from taking sides with the believers of revelation, in the ecclesiastical sense of the word.” If it is proper to class the influence of Jacobi's philosophy with that of Fichte and Schelling, as Farrar (Critical History of Free Thought, p. 238) does, it is well at least to concede that these philosophical systems all together certainly “formed one class of influences, which were operating about the beginning of the 18th century, and were tending to redeem alike German literature and theology.” “Their first effect was to produce examination of the primary principles of belief, and to excite inquiry; and, though at first only re-enforcing the idea of morality, they ultimately drew men out of themselves into aspirations after the infinite spirit, and developed the sense of dependence, of humility, of unselfishness, of spirituality.

They produced, indeed, evil effects in pantheism and ideology, but the results were partial, the good was general. The problem, What is truth? was through their means remitted to men for reconsideration; the answers to it elicited from the one school, It is that which I can know; from the other, It is that which I can intuitively feel,  threw men upon those unalterable and infallible instincts which God has set in the human breast as the everlasting landmarks of truth, the study of which lifts men ultimately out of error.” One of the most celebrated advocates of these views of Jacobi we find in ‘Schleiermacher (compare Hagenbach, 2, 332 sq.; 339), though, of course, the former only prepared the way for the latter; and indeed, this “faith philosophy,” “with some slight modifications in each case, consequent upon their philosophical system,” is the theory not only of Jacobi and of Schleiermacher, but also of Nitzsch, Mansel (author of “Limits of Religious Thought;”), and probably, also, of the Scotch philosopher Hamilton (compare Cocker, Christianity and Greek Philosophy, p. 70 sq.). See Herbst, Biographie in the Bibliothek christlicher Denker (Leipz. 1830), 1; Max Jacobi, Briefwechsel zwischen. Gothe u. Fr. II. Jacobi (Leipz. 1846); Gervinus, Geschichte d. poet. Nat. Lit. d. Deutschen (3rd edit.), 4:556 sq.; Chalybaeus, Hist. Specul. Phil. p. 60 sq.; Ersch u. Gruber, Allyem. Encyklop.; English. Cyclop. s.v.

## Jacobi, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Jacobi, Johann Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 16, 1712. For some time preacher at Osterode and Brunswick, he was called in 1758 as general siuperinteudent of Liuneburg to Celle, and died March 21, 1791. He wrote a number of ascetical works. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:23, 385, 418, 438, 488; 2:40. (B.P.)

## Jacobins[[@Headword:Jacobins]]

             a name applied in France to the Dominicans (q.v.), because their principal convent was situated near the gate of St. James (Jacobus), in Paris. At the commencement of the first French revolution the meetings of its most zealous promoters were. held in the hall of this convent, and from this circumstance Jacobin came to be another name for revolutionist.

## Jacobites[[@Headword:Jacobites]]

             is the name by which the different communities in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia, who hold to the Monophysite doctrine, have been known since their union, about the. middle of the 6th century. SEE EUTYCHIANIS; SEE MONOPHYTES. The most prominent party in accomplishing the union of these Monophysites, who, near the middle of the 6th century, were very weak, and threatened with extermination, was Jacob (or James) Albardai, or Baradseus (or Zanzalus), a zealous disciple of Severus, a monk and presbyter of the convent of Phasilta, near Nisibis, and it is after this Jacob that the united Monophysites were named after their union, and not, as some have supposed, after James, the brother of Christ, or Jacob the patriarch, or after Dioscorus, who was called Jacob before his ordination. It is true, however, that these communities are sometimes designated as the Severians, Dioscorians, Eutychians, and even as the Theodosians (for the Egyptian Monophysites, SEE COPTS; for the Armenian, SEE ARMENIAN CHURCH: and for the Abyssinian, SEE ABYSSIAN CHURCH ).

The surnames of Jacob who united the Monophysites, however, have no bearing on his relation to the sects, but are strictly personal. Thus the coarseness of the dress in which he traveled through the East for the benefit of his party (says D'Herbelot, Bibliothéque Orientale, p. 435) gained him the name of Baradai (i.e. a coarse horse- blanket; compare Assemani, 2, 66, 414; Makrizi, Geschichte der Kopten, edited by Wtistenfeld; Eutychius, Annales, ed. Pococke, 2, 144, 147).  Jacob was made bishop of Edessa in 541, and then, says Dr. Schaff (Ch. History, 3:775), “this remarkable man devoted himself for seven and thirty years with unwearied zeal to the interests of the persecuted Monophysites. ‘Light footed as Asahel' (2Sa 2:18), and in the garb of a beggar, he journeyed hither and thither amid the greatest dangers and privations; revived the patriarchate of Antioch; ordained bishops, priests, and deacons; organized churches; healed divisions; and thus saved the Monophysite body from impending extinction.” He died in 578.

“The Jacobites have always protested against being considered followers of Eutyches; but, while they profess to anathematize that-heresiarch, they merely reject some minor opinions of his, and hold fast his great distinguishing error of the absorption of the humanity of our Savior in his divine nature. They think that in the incarnation, from two natures there resulted one. In other words, they believe that the Redeemer does not possess two natures, but one composed of two, illustrating their dogma in this way: ‘Glass is made of sand; but the whole is only glass, no longer sand: thus the divine nature of Christ has absorbed the human, so that the two have become one.'”A middle way between Eutychianism and orthodoxy was chosen by Xenayas (q.v.) and his school, who on the incarnation maintain “the existence in Christ of one nature, composed of the divinity and humanity, but without conversion, confusion, or commixture. He teaches that the Son, one of the Trinity, united himself with a human body and a rational soul in the womb of the Virgin. His body had no being before this union. In this he was born, in it he was nourished, in it he suffered and died. Yet the divine nature of the Son did not suffer or die. Nor was his human nature, or his agency, or death, merely visionary, as the Phantasmists taught, but actual and real. Moreover, the divine nature was not changed or transmuted into the human, or commixed or confused therewith; neither was the human nature converted into the divine, nor commixed or confused with it; but an adunation of the two natures took place, of a mode equivalent to that which, by the union of body and soul, makes a human being; for as the soul and body are united in one human nature, so, from the union of the Godhead and manhood of our Lord Jesus Christ, there has arisen a nature peculiar to itself, not simple, but complex; ‘one double nature.”' Here is evidently maintained a distinction from the Eutychians that the flesh of Christ taken from the Virgin was actual and real, and united with the divine in Christ, “without confusion, change, or division;” and from the orthodox, in holding that, after the union, the two  natures united in one, losing their distinctiveness. This view of Xenayas, says Etheridge (Syrian Churches, p. 143), seems to be at present the doctrine of the Jacobites; but, as the laity is very moderately educated, this remark applies only to the clergy. As an indication that they have only an imperfect idea on this point, Etheridge cites their usage of “making the sign of the cross with only the middle finger of their hand, holding the others so as to render them invisible,” evincing thereby that the whole subject is to them an unsolved mystery.

Like the Greek Church, the Jacobites, as a rule, deny the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, holding, however, to the orthodox doctrine of the personality and deity.

Sacraments. — It is generally believed that the Jacobites, with the Roman Catholics, hold to the septenary number on the sacraments, but Etheridge says (p. 144) that “this must be taken in a qualified sense, as they have no distinct service of confirmation, nor do they use extreme unction, unless it be sometimes imparted to members of the priesthood. Auricular confession, too, is scarcely known among them. And in the Eucharist, while they profess to recognize the real presence, it must not be understood in the Papite sense of transubstantiation, but the presence of the Savior which accompanies, in an undescribed manner, the elements of the bread and wine: a species of consubstantiation, illustrated by Bar Salib (in Matthew 28, Codd. Syr. Clement. Vatic. 16, fol. 29) under the idea of iron in union with fire, and receiving from it the properties of light and heat, while its own nature remains unaltered” (comp. Bar-Hebraeus, Menorath Kudshi, or the “Lamp of the Saints,” fundam. 6, sect. 2). At the celebration of the Eucharist they administer newly-made unleavened bread (Rödiger, however, in Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 6, 400, asserts that they use leavened bread), corn mixed with salt and oil, and of both kinds, but generally ‘dipping, like the Nestorians, the cake into the wine. The sacrament of baptism they are said, but very improbably, to have performed by imprinting on the subject (of course infants), with a burning iron, the figure of the cross, on some part of the body, generally the arm, sometimes even the face.

The doctrine of purgatory they wholly ignore, though it is true they follow the Syrian custom in praying for their dead.

Descent. — Their origin they attempt to trace lineally from the first Hebrew Christians. Dr. Wolff (Journal, 1839) says, “They call themselves  the Bnay Israel (the children of Israel), whose ancestors were converted by the apostle James;” and continues, that “there cannot be the least doubt that their claim to being the descendants of the Jewish Christians of old is just. Their physiognomy, mode of worship, their attachment to the Mosaic law, their liturgy, their tradition, so similar to the Jewish, the technical terms in their theology, all prove that they are real descendants of Abraham.” They certainly followed the Jews at one time in subjecting their male members to circumcision (comp. Saligniac, Itinerancy, 8, c. 1). One thing is peculiarly characteristic of the Jacobites — they practice the adoration of the saints, and particularly worship the mother of Christ. As teachers and saints, they revere some of the most prominent actors in the Church History of the early centuries, particularly Jacob of Sartig, Jacob of Edessa, Dioscorus, Severus, P. Fullo, and Jacob Baradeus; but Eutyches they ignore. (Compare Assemani, Bibl. Orient. 2, diss. de Monophys. § 8 and 10; Renandot, Hist. Patriarch. Alex. p. 133 sq.; id. Liturg. 2, 103).

The Jacobites also impose upon themselves excessive fasts: “five annual lents, during which both the clergy and the laity abstain not only from flesh or eggs, but even from the taste of wine, of oil, and of fish” (Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, 4, 551; comp. La Croze, Christianisme de l'Ethiopie, p. 352).

Their clergy are constituted on the model of a perfect hierarchy. “Extremely tenacious of their ecclesiastical status in this particular, they glory in an apostolical succession from St. Peter as the first bishop of Antioch, and exhibit what they hold to be an unbroken series of more than 180 bishops of that see from his day to our own.” This assertion they make in the face of the fact that they only started in the 6th century under Jacob, but they certainly ought to enjoy the same privileges with all other churches that lay claim to a direct apostolic succession (q.v.).

By the side of the patriarch, who holds the highest office in the Church, there is a secondary officer at the head of the Eastern Jacobites, the Maphrian (Syriac, מִפְרְיָנָא, i.e. the fructifier), or Primas Orientis, whose mission it is to ordain bishops, and also to consecrate the patriarch elect by the laying on of hands. He occupies, to a certain degree, the same position as the now obsolete Katholikos (Catholic) of the Nestorian Church, and is sometimes designated by that name. He resides at Mosul, and his jurisdiction extends over the Jacobites of the East residing beyond the Tigris and a portion of Mesopotamia; the rest of Mesopotamia, Asia  proper, Phoenicia, Palestine, Cilicia, and Armeifia are under the immediate control of the patriarch of Antioch. (On Ordination, see Etheridge, Syr. Chl. p. 147 sq.) With the diocese of the patriarch there comes in contact the patriarchate of the Copts (q.v.), and of late years both churches have sustained a bishop at Jerusalem.

The Jacobites are distinguished for the number of their convents, from which, as is the custom in all the Eastern churches, the higher officers of the Church are all chosen. These institutions are, perhaps for this reason also, under the supervision of the bishops.

At the time of its greatest prosperity the Jacobite Church produced many men remarkable for the profoundness of their views, their teachings, and their writings. No less than 150 archbishops and bishops have been counted in the different ages of the sect, of whom an account is given in the second part of J. G. Assemani's Bibliotheca Orientalis. The most eminent of them are John, bishop of Asia; Thomas of Harkel, who, in the beginning of the 7th century, revised the Philoxenian translation of the N.T.; Jacob of Edessa; the patriarch Dionysius I, in the first half of the 9th century, author of a Syriac chronicle, of which Assemani has made much use, and of which a part has' been published by Tullberg (Upsala, 1850); John, bishop of Dara, in the 9th century; Moses Bar-Kipha (t 913), whose treatise on Paradise was translated into Latin by Andr. Masius; Dionysus Bar-Salibi, bishop of Amid in the 12th century, author of commentaries on the Bible and other theological works (Assemani, 2, 156-211); Jacob, bishop of Tagrit in the 13th century; and especially Gregorius Abulfaragius; Bar- Hebraeus, in the 13th century, who was perhaps the greatest and noblest man of the Eastern Church; his death was mourned alike by Jacobites and Nestorians, by Greeks and Armenians, all of whom forgot the disputes which were agitating at that time the Eastern Church, and gathered at his grave to mingle their tears for the loss of a truly virtuous and great man. The work of Biblical criticism known as Recensio Karkaphensis is also, as shown by Wiseman (Horse Syr. Rome, 1828,8vo, p. 206,212), due to the Jacobite Church.

The present condition of this sect is thus described by the Rev. George Percy Badger (Nestorians and their Rituals, 1, 60) “The present hierarchy of the Jacobites in Turkey consists of a patriarch, who claims the title of ‘Patriarch of Antioch and successor of St. Peter,' eight metropolitans, and three bishops. Of these, one resides at Mosul, one in the convent of Mar  Mattai, in the same district, one at Urfat, one at Diarbekir, or Kharpût, one at Jerusalem, one at Mardin, three in Jebel Tûr, and two are called Temeloyo, i.e. universal, without any regular dioceses. The bishops generally are illiterate men, but little versed in Scripture, and entirely ignorant of ecclesiastical history. They scarcely ever preach, and their episcopal visitations are confined to occasional ordinations, and to the collection of tithes from their several dioceses. All of them can, of course, read the Syriac of their rituals, but few thoroughly understand it.... As might naturally be expected, the lower orders of the Syrian clergy are generally more illiterate than the bishops; and how can it be otherwise… Such being the awkwardness and inefficiency of their clergy, it is not to be wondered at that religious knowledge and vital godliness are at a very low ebb among the Syrian laity. Not-withstanding the comparative affluence of this community, I believe that there do not exist among them more than twenty small schools in the whole of Turkey, where their population amounts to something like 100,000 (Etheridge says 150,000). The following is a rough estimate, in villages of the proportion of their numbers in the different districts:

(1) Jebel Tûr, 150 villages; (2) district of Urfah and Gawar, 50 villages; (3) Kharpût, 15 villages; (4) Diarbekir, 6 villages; (5) Mosul, 5 villages; (6) Damascus, 4 villages, making in all 230 villages now inhabited by Syrians.”

(Comp. Richard Pococke, Travels in the East, II, 1, 208; Niebuhr. Reisebeschreib. vol. 2; Buckingham, Trav. in Mesopotamia, 1, 321,341; Robinson, Palestine, 3:460 sq.)

As early as the 14th century the Roman Catholic Church used her influence to effect a union of the Jacobite and Western churches under the sway of Rome. But, although many accessions have been obtained from the Jacobites, they have not yielded entire, as did the Copts in the 15th century. The first really important success the Romanists achieved in the 17th century, under Andreas Achigian, when the converts, at that time quite numerous, styling themselves “Syrian Catholics,” elected him as a rival patriarch. He was followed by Petrus (Ignatius, vol. 25), who did not continue long in office, as the opposition party proved too strong for Rome  (Assemani, 2, 482). This, however, by no means discouraged the Papists, for the undertaking was resumed shortly afterwards; and they have for some time past sustained in Syria a patriarch who resides at Haleb, and they have even “Catholic Jacobite convents.” The inferiority of the Syrian Catholics to the Jacobites has induced the Protestants of England and America to establish missions among them, and they have thus far met with tolerable success. See Assemani. Bibl. Or. 2; Diss. de Monophys. § 1-10; Neale, East. Church, 3 (see Index); Abudachus, Hisi. Jacobitarum (Oxf. 1700); Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Rom. Emp. (Harper's ed.), 4, 551 sq.; Migne, Dict. des Ordres religieux, 2, 561; Wetzer mid Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encylopadie, 6:400 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Jacobites (2)[[@Headword:Jacobites (2)]]

             the adherents of James II of England, particularly the non-jurors, who separated from the high Episcopal Church simply because they would not take the oath of allegiance to the new king, and who in the public services prayed for the Stuart family. They were most numerous in Scotland, but were much lessened by the defeat of the Pretender in 1745, and still more so by his death in 1788. SEE NON-JURORS.

## Jacobites, Order Of[[@Headword:Jacobites, Order Of]]

             a Romish order of mendicant monks, established by Innocent III in the 13th century, but which soon ceased to exist.

## Jacobs Well[[@Headword:Jacobs Well]]

             (πηγὴ τοῦ Ι᾿ακώβ), on the curb of which Christ sat down during his interview with the Samaritan woman of Sychar (Joh 4:6). It was a deep spring (Joh 4:11) in the vicinity of Shechem, near the road from Jerusalem, probably so called from having been dug by the patriarch Jacob (Joh 4:8; Joh 4:28) when dwelling in this neighborhood (Gen 33:18). It is still known by the same title, about half a mile south-east of Nablûs (Robinson's Researches, 3, 112), at the foot of Mount Gerizim (Arvieux, 2, 66; Schubert, 3:136). It is bored through the solid rock, and ‘kept covered with a stone by the Arabs (see Hackett's Illustrations p. 199 sq.). It is thus described by Porter in Murray's Handbook for Syria, 2, 340: “Formerly there was a square hole opening into a carefully built vaulted chamber, about ten feet square, in the floor of which was the true mouth of the well. Now a portion of the vault has fallen and completely covered up the mouth, so that nothing can be seen but a shallow pit, half filled with stones and rubbish.” Dr. Wilson (Lands of the Bible, 2, 57) carefully measured the well, and found it nine feet in diameter, and seventy-five feet deep. It was probably much deeper in ancient times, as there are signs of considerable accumulation of stones and rubbish below its present bottom; and Maundrell (March 24) says that in his time it was thirty-five yards, or one hundred and five feet deep. It contains at times a few feet of water, but at others it is quite dry. Over the well, there formerly stood a large church, built in the 4th century, but probably destroyed before the time of the Crusades, as Siewulf (p. 45) and Phocas do not mention it. Its remains are just above the well, towards the southwest, merely a shapeless mass of ruins among which are seen fragments of gray granite columns still  retaining their ancient polish (Robinson's Biblical Researches. 3, 132). (For older descriptions, see Hamesveld, 2, 396 sq.) SEE SHECHEM.

2. JACOB (Ι᾿ακώβ) was the name of the father of Joseph, the husband of the Virgin Mary (Mat 1:15; Mat 1:13). B.C. ante 40. SEE MARY.

## Jacobs Well (2)[[@Headword:Jacobs Well (2)]]

             The following is the latest description of this spot (Bir Yakub), taken from Lieut. Conder's Tent Work in Palestine, 1:71. A full account is given in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey, 2:172 sq.  "The tradition of Jacob's Well is one in which Jews, Samaritans, Moslems, and Christians alike agree. There are also other reasons which lead to the belief that the tradition is trustworthy; the proximity of Joseph's Tomb and of Sychar, and finally the fact of a well existing at all in a place abounding with streams, one of which is within one hundred yards' distance. No other important well is found near, and the utility of such a work can only be explained on the assumption that it was necessary for the patriarch to have water within his own land, surrounded as he was by strangers, who may naturally be supposed to have guarded jealously their rights to the springs. By digging the well Jacob avoided those quarrels from which his father had suffered in the Philistine country, pursuing a policy of peace which appears generally to have distinguished his actions.

"The well then, as being one of the few undoubted sites made sacred by the feet of Christ, is a spot of greater interest that any near Shechem. Its neighborhood is not marked by any very prominent monument, and, indeed, it would be quite possible to pass by it without knowing of its existence. Just east of the gardens of Balata, a dusty mound by the road half covers the stumps of three granite columns. After a few moments' search a hole is found south-west of them, and by this the visitor descends through the roof of a little vault, apparently modern. The vault stretches twenty feet east and west, and is ten feet broad, the hole in the pointed arch of the roof being in the north-east corner. The floor is covered with fallen stones, which block the mouth of the well; through these we let down the tape and found the depth to be seventy-five feet. The diameter is seven feet six inches, the whole depth cut through alluvial soil and soft rock, receiving water by infiltration through the sides. There appears to be occasionally as much as two fathoms of water, but in summer the well is dry. The little vault is built on to a second, running at right angles northwards from the west end, but the communication is now walled up. In this second vault there are said to be remains of a tessellated pavement, and the bases of the three columns above mentioned rest on this floor, the shafts sticking. out through the roof — a sufficient proof that the vault is modern."

## Jacobs, David[[@Headword:Jacobs, David]]

             a minister of the Lutheran Church; was born in Franklin County, Pa., Nov. 22, 1805. He was educated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Penn. (class of 1825). While at college he was particularly distinguished as a linguist, and in the absence of the professor of languages was requested to hear the recitations in Latin and Greek. He commenced his theological studies under the direction of the Rev. Dr. B. Kurtz, and completed them in' the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg in 1827. The same year he took charge of the classical department established in connection with the seminary, from which Pennsylvania College took its origin. He was very successful as a teacher. No one ever pursued his work more nobly, or with an aim more exalted. He received license to preach the Gospel in 1829, but his health was so delicate that he seldom officiated in the pulpit. He died Nov. 30, 1830, in the twenty-fifth year of his age, at Shepherdstown,Va., as he was returning from a trip to the South, whither he had gone in pursuit of health. In talent he was above the ordinary standard, a ripe scholar, and those who were brought in contact with him appreciated his excellent character, and acknowledged his eminent services.

## Jacobs, Michael, D.D[[@Headword:Jacobs, Michael, D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born in Franklin County, Pennsylvania, January 18, 1808. In 1823 he entered the preparatory department of Jefferson College, Cannonsburg, from which he eventually graduated. While there he joined the Presbyterian Church. After teaching in a boarding-school several months at Belair, Maryland, he moved in April 1829, to Gettysburg, where he taught mathematics in the Gettysburg Gymnasium, afterwards Pennsylvania College, in which he was elected professor of mathematics and natural Science. Having studied theology privately, he was licensed to preach in the fall of 1832. He was repeatedly president and treasurer of his synod, and for a time was secretary of the General Synod. For several years he was editor of the Linnean Record and Journal. In 1865 his department was restricted to mathematics. The following year he withdrew from college instruction. He died July 22, 1871. Although a voluminous writer, very little of his work was published beyond a number of review articles and a small volume entitled Notes on the Battle of Gettysburg. See Fifty Years in the Lutheran Ministry, 1878, page 228.

## Jacobson, Heinrich Friedrich[[@Headword:Jacobson, Heinrich Friedrich]]

             a German professor of canon law, was born June 8, 1804, at Marienwerder. He studied at Konigsberg, Berlin, and Gottingen, commenced his academical career at Konigsberg in 1826, was professor  there in 1831, and died March 19, 1868. He published, De Codicibus Gregoriano et Hermogeniano (Konigsberg, 1826): — Kirchenrechtliche Versuche zur Begrundung eines Systems des Kirchenrechts (1831): — De Fontibus Juris Ecclesiastici Borussici (1838): — Geschichte der Quellen des Kirchenrechts des Preussischen Staats (1837-44, 3 volumes): — Daas evangelische Kirchenrecht des Preussischen Staates und seiner Provinzen (Halle, 1864-66, 2 volumes). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:603 sq. (B.P.)

## Jacobson, Israel[[@Headword:Jacobson, Israel]]

             a Jewish rabbi of Germany, was born at Halberstadt, October 17, 1768. He was one of the earliest promoters of reform among his coreligionists. In 1801 he founded an educational establishment at Seesen, in Westphalia, in which Jewish and Christian boys were taught side by side. When the kingdom of Westphalia was erected, Jacobson had the ear of the government; a consistory was established, and he was made its president. In 1805 Jacobson introduced into his synagogue an organ, German hymns, confirmation, and the German sermon. The example set by him was followed by others. When, in 1815, the kingdom of Westphalia was buried under the ruins of Napoleon's empire, Jacobson settled at Berlin, where he established again a private temple of the modern style, in which he officiated as high-priest. He died September 13, 1828. See Jost, Jacobson und die neuern Richtungen in the Israelitische Annalen, 1:29 sq.; Kayserling, Bibliothek judischer Kanzelredner, 1:13 sq.; M'Caul, Sketches of Judaism and the Jews,. page 61 sq. (B.P.)

## Jacobson, Jacob Hirsch[[@Headword:Jacobson, Jacob Hirsch]]

             a Jewish ascetical writes of Germany, who died at Dresden, January 10, 1885, is the author of, Pirke Aboth oder Rabbinische Gannologie (Hebrew text with German translation and commentary, Breslau, 1840): — Israelitisches Gebetbuch (Hebrew and German, 1843): — דבר אמת ליעקב, eine Auswahl Israelitischer Kanzelvortrage zu religioser Belehrung und Erbauung: — Katechetischer Leitfaden beim Unterricht in der israelitischen Religion (7th ed. 1876): — Die Geschichten der heiligen Schriften (3d ed. 1875). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:5 sq. (B.P.)

## Jacobson, William, D.D[[@Headword:Jacobson, William, D.D]]

             an English prelate, was born at Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, in 1803. He matriculated at St. Edmund's Hall in 1823, migrated shortly afterwards to  Lincoln College, on obtaining a scholarship there, and, in 1829, having taken his degree, became a fellow of Exeter. He was made bishop of Chester in 1865, and died at Oxford, July 12, 1884. The chief works of bishop Jacobson were his new edition of Nowell's Catechisms, his reprint in six volumes of the Works of Bishop Sanderson, and his edition of the Remains of Clement, Ignatius, and Polycarp (1838; 4th ed. 1866, 2 volumes). (B.P.)

## Jacobus[[@Headword:Jacobus]]

             SEE JAMES.

## Jacobus Baradeus[[@Headword:Jacobus Baradeus]]

             a Monophysite bishop of Edessa, is said to have been born at Tela or Constantia, fifty-five miles east of Edessa, towards the close of the 5th century. He was early trained in the ministry, became a noted ascetic, was called to the Byzantine court, but lived there a complete recluse, and was made bishop nominally of Edessa, but virtually metropolitan, A.D. 541. Amid the disastrous and troublesome period in which he lived, his courage and energy prolonged the cause of the party to which he belonged, especially in the famous quarrel with Paul of Antioch. He died suddenly, July 30, 578. A Liturgy is incorrectly ascribed to him (Renaudot, Lit. Or. 1:332), also a Catechesis, largely used by the Jacobites (Cave, Hist. Lit. 1:524). See Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Jacobus Sarugensis[[@Headword:Jacobus Sarugensis]]

             made bishop of Botnae, a little town in the district of Sarug, in Osstroinae, at the age of sixty-seven, A.D. 519, and who died two years afterwards, is the author of very many ecclesiastical works, both in prose and poetry, chiefly of a ritualistic or epistolary character, for which see Smith, Dict. of Christ. Biog. s.v.

## Jacobus, Melanchthon Williams, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Jacobus, Melanchthon Williams, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Newark, N.J., September 19, 1816. He entered the sophomore class at Princeton College in his fifteenth year, and graduated in 1834 with the highest honors. In 1835 he entered Princeton Theological Seminary, where he not only regularly graduated, but spent a fourth year in study, at the same time assisting professor J. Addison Alexander in the department of Hebrew. In 1839 he was received by the  Presbytery of New York, and in September was ordained pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Brooklyn, N.Y. At the close of his twelve years pastorate here the Church was one of the most flourishing in the city. In the fall of 1850 he made a tour through Europe, Egypt, and Palestine, and returned with greatly improved health. During his absence the General Assembly, in May 1851, had elected him professor of Oriental and Biblical literature in the theological seminary at Allegheny, which position he accepted on his return, and was released from his pastoral charge, October 21, 1851.

In January 1858, in addition to his work in the seminary, he accepted a call to the Central Church of Pittsburgh, which he served for twelve years with marked success. In 1866 he made a second tour of Europe. He was moderator of the last General Assembly of the Old School Church in 1869, and conjointly with Reverend P.H. Fowler, D.D., presided at the opening of the first reunited assembly in 1870. He presented the able report on sustentation, which was adopted by the General Assembly of 1871, and was secretary of that scheme for three years, until it was merged into the Board of Home Missions in 1874. In 1876 he was elected secretary of the Board of Education, but declined the position that he might continue in the ministry. He died October 28, 1876. He had just attended a meeting of the Synod of Pittsburgh, and taken an active part in its proceedings. On the day preceding he had taught his seminary classes as usual. In 1848 Dr. Jacobus, while in Brooklyn, published the first volume of his Notes on the New Testament. Other volumes followed at intervals, the two volumes on Genesis appearing in 1864. These commentaries have had an immense sale, and are found among all denominations of Christians. Besides these he was the author of many other and smaller works. Dr. Jacobus stood in the front rank of the Biblical scholars of his age. As a preacher he maintained all through his ministry a high position, while on the platform his addresses were always happy and effective. He was a most energetic and persistent worker, and his industry was untiring. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1877, page 36.

## Jacoby, Ludwig S., D.D[[@Headword:Jacoby, Ludwig S., D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Old Strelitz, Mecklenburg, Germany, October 21, 1813. His parents being pious Jews, he was devoutly trained, and liberally educated, especially in the ancient languages. In 1835 he was baptized by a Lutheran minister. In 1838 he emigrated to the United States, and settled in Cincinnati, Ohio, as a physician. He also devoted himself to teaching, About that time he was spiritually converted,  under the preaching of Dr. Nast. In 1841 he was sent to St. Louis, Missouri, to start the first German mission in that city. Desiring to labor more immediately for his countrymen, he was sent, in 1849, to Bremen, Germany, where he formed a Methodist Episcopal Society. There he continued, faithful in the various offices of presiding elder, pastor, editor, book agent, and superintendent for twenty years. He then returned to the United States, and was transferred to the South-western German Conference, and stationed at Eighth Street charge, St. Louis. In 1873 he was made presiding elder of St. Louis district, whereon he labored faithfully until near his death, which occurred in St. Louis, Missouri, June 21, 1874. Dr. Jacoby's life was full of devotedness and energy, and his death full of peace and blessings. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1874, page 88; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Jacomb, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Jacomb, Thomas, D.D]]

             a pious Nonconformist divine who took a prominent part in the ecclesiastical affairs of England in the 17th century, was born in Leicestershire in 1622. He studied at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and subsequently became fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. During the Rebellion he obtained the living of St. Martin, Ludgate, but was ejected in 1662, during the Bartholomew ejectment of Nonconformists, and died  March 27, 1687. Stoughton (Eccl. Hist. of Engl. Ch. of the Restoration], 1, 165) says that Jacomb, while a member of the Savoy Conference SEE INDEPENDENTS, in which he figured very prominently, “described as a man of superior education, of a staid mind, of temperate passions, moderate in his counsels, and in the management of affairs, not vehement and confident, not imposing and overbearing, but receptive of advice, and yielding to reason.” He was one of the continuators of Poole's Annotations. His works, which are now scarce, are, A Treatise on Holy Dedication [on Psalms 30] (Lond. 1668, 8vo): — Several Sermons on the 8th Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans [18 on the 1James , 2 nd, 3rd, and 4th verses] (London, 1672, 4to). — Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.; Stoughton, Eccles. History (Ch. of the Restoration), 2, 504, 505.

## Jacopone De Todi[[@Headword:Jacopone De Todi]]

             SEE STABAT MATER.

## Jacquelot, Isaac[[@Headword:Jacquelot, Isaac]]

             a French Protestant theologian, was born at Vassy Dec. 16, 1647. He became a minister in 1668, and was colleague of his father, the pastor of Vassy, until obliged to leave in consequence of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. ‘He resided first at Heidelberg, then (1686) at La Haye, where he became pastor of a French congregation. In consequence of some trouble he had with Jurieu, Benoit, and others, he accepted an offer of the king of Prussia, who had heard him preach, and had learned to esteem Jacquelot, and in 1702 he settled at Berlin as pastor of a French church. He died there Oct. 20, 1708. He wrote Dissertations su l'Existence de Dieu (La Haye, 1697, 4to; Par. 1744, 3 vols. 12mo): — Dissertations sur lei Messie (La Haye, 1699, 8vo): — La Conformiti de la Foi avec la Raison (Amst. 1705. 8vo): — Reponses aux Entretiens composes par M. Bayle contre la Conformit, etc. (Amsterd. 1707, 8vo): — Traite de la veite et de l'inspiration du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament (Rotterd. 1715, 8vo): — Sermons (Gen. 1750, 2 vols. 12mo); and a number of controversial pamphlets against Benoït, Jurieu, Werenfels, etc. See Hist. des Ouvrages des Savants (Dec. 1708); Vie de Jacquelot (in the Dissertat. sur ‘Exist. de Dieu, Paris ed. 1744); Chauffepié, Dictionnaire; Niceron, Memoires (vol. 6); Haag, La France Protestante; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26, 367. (J. N. P.)

## Jacquemin, James Alexis[[@Headword:Jacquemin, James Alexis]]

             a French Roman Catholic priest, was born at Nancy Aug. 4, 1750. He entered the Church in early life, and was for a time vicar in a parish of his  native city. He met with considerable success in the pulpit, but when, in 1778, he was appointed professor of theology in the University of Nancy, he readily accepted this new position. During the first years of the French Revolution he was one of the editors of the newspaper called Le Catholique de Nancy. In 1791, refusing to adhere to the civil constitution of the clergy, he was obliged to leave France, and he settled in Germany, where he joined his bishop, De la Fare, also an exile. The latter having appointed him his vicar-general, Jacquemin returned to France, though exposed to great danger, during the Reign of Terror.” He subsequently became professor of philosophy in the College of Nancy. In 1823 he was made, bishop of St. Die, but age and infirmities soon compelled him to resign this office, and he retired to Nancy where he died, June 15, 1832. He wrote De Incarnatione Verbi Domini; Abreg des semoires de l'Abbe Baruel, pour servir a l'hist. du Jacobinisme (Hamburg [Nancy], 1801; Par. 1817, 2 vols. 12mo). See Henrion, Annuaire Biographique (1830-34); Biog. des Hommes vivants; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26, 219. (J. N.P.)

## Jacquemont, Francois[[@Headword:Jacquemont, Francois]]

             a French Jansenist, was born in 1757 at Been, in the diocese of Lyons, and died at St. Ettienne in 1835. He published, Instruction sur les Avantages et les Verites de la Religion Chretienne (1795): — Avis aux Fideles, etc. (1796): — Maximes de l'Eglise Gallicane (Lyons, 1818). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Jactitation of Marriage[[@Headword:Jactitation of Marriage]]

             is a suit which was formerly competent in the English ecclesiastical courts and now is competent in the English Divorce Court, to settle a question of disputed marriage. If a party boast or profess that he or she is married to another, the latter may institute the suit, and call upon the former to produce proof of-the marriage. If this is not done, then a decree passes which enjoins the party to perpetual silence on the subject. This remedy is now scarcely ever resorted to, for, in general, since lord Hardwick's Act (1766), there is sufficient certainty in the forms of legal marriage in England to prevent only one being in ignorance whether he or she is really married or not-a reproach which, however, is often made against the law of Scotland. The Scotch suit of a declarator of putting to silence, which is equivalent to jactitation of marriage, is often resorted to, the latest and most notorious instance of its use being that in the Yelverton marriage case.

## Jacubus[[@Headword:Jacubus]]

             (Ι᾿άκουβος v. r. Ι᾿άρσουβος, Vulg. Aecubus), given in the Apocrypha (1Es 9:48) as the name of one of the Levites who supported Ezra in  reading the law; evidently the AKKUB SEE AKKUB (q.v.) of the corresponding Heb. text (Neh 8:7).

## Jad Hachezaka[[@Headword:Jad Hachezaka]]

             SEE MAIMONIDES.

## Jada[[@Headword:Jada]]

             (Heb. Yada', יָדָע, knowing; Sept. Ι᾿αδαέ and Δουδαί), the last named of the two sons of Onam, a descendant of Judah through Jerahmeel; his two sons are likewise mentioned (1Ch 2:28; 1Ch 2:32); B.C. post 1612.

## Jadau[[@Headword:Jadau]]

             (Heb. (Yaddav', יִדִּו, probably by erroneous transcription for יַדּוֹ, Yiddo'; “Iddo;” rather than for יִדִּי, Yadday', id., as in the margin; Sept. Ι᾿αδαϊv v. r. Α᾿διά, Vulg. Jetdd), one of the “sons” of Nebo who divorced their Gentile wives after the Exile (Ezr 10:43). B.C. 459.

## Jaddai[[@Headword:Jaddai]]

             SEE JADAU.

## Jaddes[[@Headword:Jaddes]]

             a name of the priests of the genii among the islanders of Ceylon. The pagodas or chapels where they officiate have no revenue, and any pious person who builds a chapel officiates in it himself as priest. The exteriors of these chapels are painted with representations of halberds, swords, arrows, shields, and the like. The natives call these chapels Jacco, i.e. the devil's tenement, Jacco or Jacca signifying devil; the islanders of Ceylon, like many other savage tribes, worshipping the devil because of his wickedness and evil propensities (comp. Lubbock, Origin of Civilization, p. 159 sq.). The Jaddes, when he celebrates the festival of Jacco, shaves his head. See Knox, Desepition of Ceylon, pt. 4:ch. 5; Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. 1 499; Davy, Account of Ceylon, p. 118. (J. H. W.)

## Jaddui[[@Headword:Jaddui]]

             (Heb. Yaddu'a, יִדּוּע, known; Sept. Ι᾿εδδούα, Ι᾿αδού, Ι᾿δούα), the name of two men after the time of the Captivity.

1. One of the chiefs of the people who subscribed the sacred covenant drawn up by Nehemiah (Neh 10:21). B.C. cir. 410.  2. The son of Jonathan, and the last high-priest mentioned in the Old Testament (Neh 12:11; Neh 12:22). He is doubtless the person alluded to by Josephus (‘λαῳΣοᾷ, Ant. 11, 8, 3-6) as exercising the pontifical office at the time of the capture of Tyre by Alexander the Great (B.C. 332), and as coming forth from Jerusalem at the head of the priestly body to meet the advancing conqueror, and tender him the submission of the city. SEE ALEXANDER. In that case his name must have been inserted by “the great Synagogue” after the Scripture canon (q.v.) had been made up by Ezra (B.C. cir. 406). SEE CHRONICLES. “We gather pretty certainly that he was priest in the reign of the last Persian king Darius, and that he was still high-priest after the Persian dynasty was overthrown, i.e. in the reign of Alexander the Great. For the expression, ‘Darius the Persian' (Neh 12:22) must have been used after the accession of the Grecian dynasty; and, had another high-priest succeeded, his name would most likely have been mentioned. Thus far, then, the book of Nehemiah bears out the truth of Josephus's history, which makes Jaddua high-priest when Alexander invaded Judea. But Josephus's story of his interview with Alexander is not, on that account, necessarily true, nor his account of the building of the Temple on Mount Gerizim during Jaddua's pontificate, at the instigation of Sanballat, both of which, as well as the accompanying circumstances, may have been derived from some apocryphal book of Alexandrian growth, since lost, in which chronology and history gave way to romance and Jewish vanity. Josephus seems to place the death of Jaddua after that of Alexander (Ant. 11:8, 7). t Eusebius assigns twenty years to Jaddua's pontificate.” See Hervey, Genealogy of our Lord, p. 323 sq.; Jarvis, Church of the Redeemed, p. 291. SEE HIGH-PRIEST.

## Jadon[[@Headword:Jadon]]

             (Heb. Yadon', יָדוֹן, judge; Sept. has Εὐάρων [but most eds. omit],Vulg. Yadon), a Meronothite who assisted in reconstructing the walls of Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (Neh 3:7). B.C. 446.

## Jadon (2)[[@Headword:Jadon (2)]]

             (Ι᾿αδών) is the name attributed by Josephus (Ant. 8, 8, 5) to the man of God from Judah who withstood Jeroboam at the altar at Bethel-probably intending IDDO the seer. By Jerome (Qu. Hebr. on 2Ch 9:29) the name is given as Jaddo.

## Jadziel[[@Headword:Jadziel]]

             (Heb. Yasziel', יִּעֲזַיאֵל, comforted by God; Sept. Ι᾿ηούλ v.r. Ο᾿ζιήλ), a Levitical musician among those of the subordinate part (1Ch 15:18); doubtless the same with the AZIEL who was one of those that performed the soprano (1Ch 15:20). B.C. 1014.

## Jael[[@Headword:Jael]]

             (Heb. Yael', יָעֵל, a wild goat or ibex, as in Psa 104:18; Job 39:1; Sept. Ι᾿αήλ, Josephus Ι᾿άλη), the wife of Heber the Kenite, and the slayer of the oppressor of the Israelites (Jdg 4:17-22). B.C. 1409. Heber was the chief of a nomadic Arab clan who had separated from the rest of his tribe, and had pitched his tent under the oaks, which had, in consequence, received the name of “oaks of the wanderers” (A.V. plain of Zaanaim, Jdg 4:11), in the neighborhood of. Kedesh Naphthali. SEE HEBER. The tribe of Heber had maintained the quiet enjoyment of their pastures by adopting a neutral position in a troublous period. Their descent from Jethro secured them the favorable regard of the Israelites, and they were sufficiently important-to conclude a formal peace with Jabin, king of Hazor. SEE KENITE.

In the headlong rout which followed the defeat of the Canaanites by Barak, Sisera, abandoning his chariot the more easily to avoid notice (comp. Homer, II. v, 20), fled unattended, and in an opposite direction from that taken b)y his army. On reaching the tents of the nomad chief, he remembered that there was peace, between his sovereign and the house of Heber, and therefore applied for the hospitality and protection to which he was thus entitled (Harmer, Obs. 1 460). “The tent of Jael” is expressly mentioned either because the harem of Heber was in a separate tent (Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 3, 22), or because the Kenite himself was absent at the time. In the sacred seclusion of this almost inviolable sanctuary (Pococke, Easst, 2, 5) Sisera might well have felt himself absolutely secure from the incursions of the enemy (Calmet, Fragr. e. vo. 25); and although he intended to take refuge among the Keilites, he would not have ventured so openly to violate all idea of Oriental propriety by entering a woman's apartments (D'Herbelot, Bibliotheque Orientale, s.v. Haram) had he not received Jael's express, earnest, and respectful entreaty to do so. SEE HAREM.

He accepted the invitation, and she flung the quilt (הִשְּׂמַכָה, A.V. “a mantle;” evidently some part of the regular furniture of the tent) over him as he lay wearily on the floor. When thirst prevented sleep, and he asked for water, she brought him buttermilk in her choicest vessel, thus ratifying with the semblance of officious zeal the sacred bond of Eastern hospitality. Wine would have been less suitable to quench his thirst, and may possibly have been eschewed by Heber's clan (Jer 35:2). Curdled milk, according to the quotations in Harmer, is still a favorite Arab  beverage, and that this is the drink intended we infer from Judges 5, 25, as well as from the direct statement of Josephus (γάλα διεφθορὸς ἤδη, Ant. 5, 5, 4), although there is no reason to suppose with Josephus and the Rabbis (D. Kimchi, Jarchi, etc.) that Jael purposely used it because of its soporific qualities (Bochart, Hieroz. 1 473). But anxiety still prevented Sisera from composing himself to rest until he had exacted a promise from his protectress that she would faithfully preserve the secret of his concealment; till at last, with a feeling of perfect security, the weary and unfortunate general resigned himself to the deep sleep of misery and fatigue. Then it was that Jaël took in her left hand one of the great wooden pins (A.V. “nail”) which fastened down the cords of the tent, ant( in her right hand the mallet (A.V. “a hammer”) used to drive it into the ground, and, creeping up to her sleeping and confiding guest, with one terrible blow dashed it through Sisera's temples deep into the earth. With one spasm of fruitless agony, with one contortion of sudden pain, “at her feet he bowed, he fell; where he bowed, there he fell down dead” (Judges 5, 27). She then waited to meet the pursuing Barak, and led him into her tent, that she might in his presence claim the glory of the deed! SEE BARAK.

Many have supposed that by this act she fulfilled the saying of Deborah, that God would sell Sisera into the hand of a woman (Jdg 4:9; Josephus, Ant. 5, 5, 4), and hence they have supposed that Jaël was actuated by some divine and hidden influence. But the Bible gives no hint of such an inspiration, and it is at least equally probable that Deborah' merely intended to intimate the share of the honor which would be assigned by posterity to her own exertions. If, therefore, we eliminate the still more monstrous supposition of the Rabbis that Sisera was slain by Jaël because he attempted to offer her violence-the murder will appear in all its hideous atrocity. A fugitive had asked and received dakhil (or protection) at her hands-he was miserable, defeated, weary-he was the ally of her husband-he was her invited and honored guest-he was in the sanctuary of the harem-above all, he was confiding, defenseless, and asleep; yet she broke her pledged faith, violated her solemn hospitality, and murdered a trustful and unprotected slumberer. Surely we require the clearest and most positive statement that Jaël was instigated to such a murder by divine suggestion. Smith. SEE HOSPITALITY.

It does not seem difficult to understand, on merely human grounds, the object of Jaël in this painful transaction. Her motives seem to have been entirely prudential; and on prudential ‘grounds the very circumstance which  renders her act the more odious-the peace subsisting between the nomad chief and the king of Hazor-must to her have seemed to make it the more expedient. She saw that the Israelites had now the upper hand, and was aware that, as being in alliance with the oppressors of Israel, the camp might expect very rough treatment from the pursuing force, which would be greatly aggravated if Sisera were found sheltered within it. This calamity she sought to avert, and to place the house of Heber in a favorable position with the victorious party. She probably justified the act to herself by the consideration that, as Sisera would certainly be taken and slain, she might as well make a benefit out of his inevitable doom as incur utter ruin in the attempt to protect him. It is probable, however, that at first the woman was sincere in her proffers of Arab friendship; but the quiet sleep of the warrior gave her time to reflect how easily even her arm might rid her kindred people of the oppressor, and she was thus induced to plot against the life of her victim. It does not appear that she committed the falsehood, which she was requested by him to do, of denying the presence of any stranger if asked by a passer-by. See Kitto's Daily Bible Illustrations, ad loc.

It is much easier to explain the conduct of Jaël than to account for the apparently eulogistic notice which it receives in the triumphal ode of Deborah and Barak; but the following remarks will go far to remove the difficulty: There is no doubt that Sisera would have been put to death if he had been taken alive by the Israelites. The war-usages of the time warranted such treatment, and there are numerous examples of it. They had, therefore, no regard to her private motives,' or to the particular relations between Heber and Jabin, but beheld her only as the instrument of accomplishing what was usually regarded as the final and crowning act of a great victory. The unusual circumstance that this act was performed by a woman's hand was, according to the notions of the time, so great a humiliation that it could hardly fail to be dwelt upon in contrasting the result with the proud confidence of victory which had at the outset been entertained (Jdg 5:30). Without stopping to ask when and where Deborah claims for herself any infallibility, or whether, in the passionate moment of patriotic triumph, she was likely to pause in such wild times to scrutinize the moral bearings of an act which had been so splendid a benefit to herself and her people, we may question whether any moral commendation is directly intended. What Deborah stated was a fact, viz. that the wives of the nomad Arabs would undoubtedly regard Jaël as a public benefactress, and praise her as a popular heroine. “She certainly-  was not ‘blessed' as a pious and upright person is blessed when performing a deed which embodies the noblest principles, and which goes up as a memorial before God, but merely as one who acted a part that accomplished an important purpose of heaven. In the same sense, though in the opposite direction. Job and Jeremiah cursed the day of their birth; not that they meant to make it the proper subject of blame, but that they wished to mark ‘their deep sense of the evil into which it had ushered them-mark it as the commencement of a life-heritage of sorrow and gloom.

In like manner, and with a closer resemblance to the case before us, the psalmist pronounces happy or blessed those who should dash the little ones of Babylon against the stones (Psa 137:9), which no one who understands the spirit of Hebrew poetry would ever dream of construing into a proper benediction upon the ruthless murderers of Babylon's children. as true heroes of righteousness. It merely announces, under a strong individualizing trait, the coming recompense on Babylon for ‘the cruelties she had inflicted on Israel; her own measure should be meted back to her: and they who should be instruments of effecting it would execute a purpose of God, whether they might themselves intend it or not. Let the poetical exaltation of Jaël be viewed in the light of these cognate passages, and it will be found to contain nothing at variance with the verdict which every impartial mind must be disposed to pronounce upon her conduct. It is, in reality, the work of God's judgment, through her instrumentality, that is celebrated, not her mode of carrying it into execution; and it might be as just to regard the heathen Medes and Persians as a truly pious people because they are called God's ‘sanctified ones' to do his work of vengeance on Babylon (Isa 13:3), as, from what is said in Deborah's song, to consider Jaël an example of righteousness” SEE DEBORAH.

As to the morality of the act of Jaël for which she is thus applauded, although it can not fairly be justified by the usages of any time or people, yet the considerations urged by Dr. Robinson (Biblical Repos. 1831, p. 607) are of some force: “We must judge of it by the feelings of those among whom the right of avenging the blood of a relative was so strongly rooted that even Moses could not take it away. Jaël was an ally by blood of the Israelitish nation; [Sisera, the general of] their chief oppressor, who had mightily oppressed them for the space of twenty years, now lay defenseless before her; and he was, moreover, one of those whom Israel was bound by the command of Jehovah to extirpate. Perhaps, too, she felt called to be the instrument of God in working out for that nation a great deliverance by  thus exterminating the chieftain of their heathen oppressor. At least Israel viewed it in this light; and, in this view, we can not reproach the heroine with that as a crime which both she and Israel felt to be a deed performed in accordance with the mandate of heaven.” We must, moreover, not forget the halo with which military success gilds every act in the popular eye, and that, in times of war, many things are held allowable and even commendable which would be reprobated in peace. Dr. Thomson, indeed (Land and Book, 2, 146 sq.), justifies Jaël's course by the following considerations:

1. Jabin, although nominally at peace with the Kenites, had doubtless inflicted much injury upon them in common with their neighbors the Israelites, and may have been — probably was — especially obnoxious to Jaël herself.

2. We are not to assume that Bedouin laws were of strict force among the settled Kenites.

3. Jaël must have known her act would be applauded, or she would not have ventured upon it.

4. There is every reason to believe she was in full sympathy with the Israelites, not only from friendly, but also religious grounds; and the neutrality of the Kenites seems to be mentioned merely to account for Sisera's seeking her tent, although he appears to have felt himself insecure.

Nor did her promise of protection contain any warrant against violence at her hands, but only of secretion from the hostile army. SEE SISERA.

The Jaël mentioned in Deborah's song (Jdg 5:6)” In the days of Shamgar the son of Anath, in the days of Jaël, the highways were unoccupied, and the travelers walked through byways”-has been supposed by some (e.g. Gesenius, Lex. s.v.; Dr. Robinson, ut supra; Furst, and others) to have been a local judge of the Israelites in the interval of anarchy between Shamgar and Jabin. It is not necessary, for this supposition, to make Jaël the name of a man, for the case of Deborah shows that the place of judge might be occupied by a female. The reasons for this supposition are,

1. That the state of things described in Jdg 5:6 as existing in Jaël's days, is not the state of things existing in the days of Jaël. the wife of Heber, whose time was famous for the restoration of the nation to a better.

2. That the wife of a stranger would hardly have been named as marking an epoch in the history of Israel. (See Bertheau in the Exeyet. Ifandbuch, ad loc.) But there is no evidence either of such an interval or of such a judgeship; and it is, therefore, more natural to refer the name to the wife of Heber as the most prominent character of the period referred to, the recollection of her late act giving her a distinction that did not previously attach to her. The circumstance that the name Jaël is masculine in the Hebrew is of no force, as it is freely used (literally) of the female deer (Pro 5:19, “roe”). SEE JUDGES.

## Jaenbert[[@Headword:Jaenbert]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, received his education at St. Augustine's, 'and was consecrated at Canterbury, February 2, 766, by Egbert, archbishop of York. The great event of this episcopate is the conversion of the bishopric of Lichfield into a metropolitan see by Offa, king of Mercia, and the consequent spoliation, with the loss of dominion, authority, and dignity, of the archbishop of Canterbury. There was much to render the last years of Jaenbert's life melancholy, for the prospects of his country were gloomy in the extreme. Thwarted and discomfited to the last, Jaenbert perceived that his orders to be buried at St. Augustine's would not be obeyed by his chapter if he died without the walls of the monastery, and he therefore  sought an asylum in the place endeared to him by the recollection of younger and happier days. He commanded his stone coffin to be prepared; his episcopal robes were arranged by his bedside; his soul was comforted by the psalms sung and the Scriptures read to him by brethren who could sympathize with him in his fallen fortunes. He died August 11, 790. See Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 1:242 sq.

## Jaeshik[[@Headword:Jaeshik]]

             in Lamaism, was a Buddha, who brought Buddhism to Thibet, A.D. 407. Jakshiamuni, the fifth divine Burchan, and the supreme god of the Lamaites, caused him to spring forth out of the beautiful Padmaflower, knowing what sanctity he would thereby receive, and authorized him to bring about the salvation of men. Jaeshik undertook, however, only to save the men living in the snowy countries of the north; and he promised to carry out this plan with all perseverance, though his head should split into ten and his body into a thousand parts. He first descended into the kingdoms of hell, and visited the kingdom of monsters (Birid), then that of animals, of men, of evil genii, Assuri and Tagri, and there destroyed all pains and torture; for as soon as his holy mouth spoke the saving words, "Om-ma-nipad-mal-hum," hell no longer existed. After having accomplished so much, he began his journey on earth, and travelled through the countries beyond the mountains of snow. There also he spoke his magic words, destroyed evil, brought good from heaven, and led men to the true religion. Next he ascended into the country of the deities on the Red Mountain.

There, to his consternation, he again saw many millions of beings unmercifully tortured by being bathed in the Otang Sea, or sea of fire. The tortures of these unfortunates brought forth a tear from each one of his eyes, out of which there sprang two goddesses, who promised to assist him, and, placing themselves in his eyes, their power was manifested by the glances of Jaeshik. He spoke the above mentioned six words also here, saved the doomed, and converted them to faith in the supreme god Jakshiamuni, so that his work was almost finished. But all the saved were not yet strong in the faith, and this troubled him. He longed for the blessed land of eternal happiness, his home; and suddenly his head split into ten parts and his body into a thousand. Burchan joined the latter together again, and consoled him by saying that his body would become the holiest  sanctuary of the world. The thousand parts were to become so many hands, each with one eye, and were to represent so many monarchs.

## Jafb, Mardechai ben-Abraham[[@Headword:Jafb, Mardechai ben-Abraham]]

             a famous Jewish author, resided in 1561 at Venice, whence, during a persecution of the Jews, he retreated to Bohemia, and became rabbi in the synagogues of Grodno, Lublin, Kremnitz, and Prague. He is the author of the Lebushim, a series of ten works, which hold a high place in the classics of modern Judaism. The general title of the series is לבוש מלכות, Royal Apparel, from Est 8:15; and the collection itself is sometimes called לבושor ספר הלבושים. It consists of

(1) Lebush tekeleth, or "the Purple Robe;"

(2) Lebush ha-chor, or "the White Vestment;"

(3) Lebush atereth zahab, or "the Crown of God;"

(4) Lebush butz veargaman, or "the Vestment of fine linen and purple;"

(5) Lebush ir Shushai, or "the Vestment of the City of Shushan." These five treatises turn upon the objects of the ritual codices of the Arba Turim of Jacob ben-Asher (q.v.), and the Shulchan Aruch of Joseph Karo (q.v.). The remaining five lebushinz are exegetical, cabalistic, and philosophical. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:7 sq.; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, page 457; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), page 136. (B.P.)

## Jafe, Samuel[[@Headword:Jafe, Samuel]]

             a rabbi at Constantinople in the latter part of the 16th century, is the author of homilies on the Midrashim, on the Pentateuch, and on Esther, Lamentations, and Ruth. He afterwards published them under the title of יפה תואר. He also published homilies on the haggadoth of the Palestinian Talmud. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:9 sq.; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), page 136. (B.P.)

## Jaffe Phillip[[@Headword:Jaffe Phillip]]

             a celebrated modern Jewish scholar, was born at Schwersenz, near the city of Posen, in Prussian Poland, about 1820. His early education he received first at the high school of his native town, and then under the care of the father of the writer of this article. After graduating at the Gymnasium of Posen, he began his university career by the study of medicine, and duly obtained his degree. He declined, however, to comply with the wishes of his friends to enter the medical profession, and continued his stay at the university, devoting himself to his favorite studies, history and philology. In 1843 he gave to the world a' History of the German Empire under Lothair the Saxon, and, owing to the excellence of this work, he subsequently became a regular contributor to Pertz's Monument of Germaniae Historica. His articles and essays -the outgrowth of most laborious researches--were read eagerly, and admired by all scholars interested in the history and literature of Germany, and led ultimately to his appointment as “extraordinary” professor of history at the University of Berlin. He was the first Jew upon whom the honor of such a distinguished appointment was conferred by the Prussian government. He now further distinguished himself by a contribution to the history of the papacy-Regesta Pontifico Roman. ad MCXCVIII (Berol. 1851, 4to) — a work which at once was acknowledged a masterpiece in its department, and will forever remain valuable for the chronological records of the Roman hierarchy. In 1868 Jaffe embraced Christianity evidently with a design to further promotion, from which, by his religious profession, he seemed to be barred. But he soon repented of the step, and so great became the conflict in his heart that he committed suicide in the summer of 1870. (J. H. W.)

## Jaga[[@Headword:Jaga]]

             in Hindusm, is one of the costliest and most, honored sacrifices, which the Brahmins offer to the sun and the planets, and at which strictly no one from  any other caste is allowed to be present. In the spring of the year a certain spot is selected and cleansed. A hut is built, in which several hundred Brahmins can be accommodated with seats; in the centre of this the holy pillar is erected, Mahadewa's symbol. Around this a fire is kindled by rubbing together two pieces of wood; and now all that can find room crowd into the hut. The remaining Brahmins surround the holy place, so hat no profane eye desecrate the sanctuary. Then a widow is strangled (blood is not allowed to be shed); the liver is roasted with butter, divided in as many parts as there are Brahmins, and given to them on a slice of bread, which they are obliged to eat. Whoever does this is said to be specially purified and made sinless; and the Brahmin who kindled the fire and performed the sacrificial ceremony may take a part of the fire to his home, where he is to keep it constantly burning, and at his death he is permitted to have his funeral pile kindled with it, by virtue of which he enters paradise immediately, without any transmigration of his soul. Of course, under the English rule these barbarities are no longer permitted.

## Jagel, Abraham[[@Headword:Jagel, Abraham]]

             an Italian Rabbi, flourished at Monselice in the second half of the 16th and the first half of the 17th century. He is distinguished as the author of an able Jewish catechism of doctrine and morals, which he published under the title of לֶקִח טוֹב (Venice, 1587, 8vo, and often). It was translated into Latin by Carpzov, Odhel, Van der Hardt, and by De Veil. The latter published it with the Hebrew text: Doctrina Bona (London, 1689, 8vo). It was also translated into German, entitled Das Buch von Guten Judischen Lehrens (Lpz. 1694). Jagel became a convert to Romanism, and was baptized under the name of Camillo near the beginning of the 17th century, and was in 1619 and 1620 Roman censor of all Hebrew books. He wrote also several books on the Jewish doctrines and usages, of which a complete list, with the translations that have been made of them, is given by Furst, Biblioth. Jud 1:2; Jud 1:10 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Jagello[[@Headword:Jagello]]

             SEE POLAND.

## Jager, Johann Wolfgang[[@Headword:Jager, Johann Wolfgang]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Stuttgart, March 17, 1647, and died at Tubingen, April 2, 1720, doctor and professor of theology, chancellor, and provost. He is the author of, Historia Ecclesiastica, etc. (1710, 2 volumes fol.; Hamburg, 1709, 1717): — Examen Quietismi: — Separatismus Hodiernus sub Examen Vocatus: — De Doctrina Communicationis Idiomatum: — Compendium Theologiae Positivse. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:285, 481, 579, 887. (B.P.)

## Jager, Nathan[[@Headword:Jager, Nathan]]

             a Lutheran minister, born in 1823, was educated for the sacred ministry first at Gettysburg Theological Seminary, and, completing his course with the Rev. J.P. Hecht, of Easton, was dedicated to the pastoral office in the summer of 1845. His first charge was at Orwigsburg, whence he removed to Lyken's Valley; thence successively to Falkner's Swamp, Upper Mount Bethel, and Reiglesville, Bucks County, Penn., where he died, Jan. 2, 1864. He was one of a large family of Lutheran ministers, consisting of his grandfather, father-in-law, brother-in-law; and a number of other relatives of the same name. His literary and theological attainments were very respectable, acquired amid difficulties that would have disheartened most other men. He studied when others slept, performing during the day the laborious duties of large pastorates, and pursuing his studies at night. His theological knowledge was quite extensive. He was an earnest man, and an energetic laborer in the cause of Christ.

## Jagger, Ezra[[@Headword:Jagger, Ezra]]

             a Methodist minister, was born at Southampton, Long Island, N.Y., Feb. 27,1806. He was licensed to preach in 1833, and joined the New York  Conference the year following, and successively filled the circuits of Huntington, Hempstead, White Plains and Greenburg, Westport, Weston and Easton Village, Burlington, Derby, Southold and Cutchogue, Farmingdale, Smithtown, and, at last, once again Huntington. He died April 22, 1850. Jagger was a man of strict integrity, great benevolence, mild and unassuming in manner, and most beloved where best known. He was eminently a man of prayer, and devoted to his Master's work. — Smith (W. C.), Sacred Memories (N. Y. 1870, 12mo), p. 206, 207.

## Jaggernaut, or Jaggernaut Puri, or Puri[[@Headword:Jaggernaut, or Jaggernaut Puri, or Puri]]

             is the name of a town on the sea-coast of Orissa (85º 54' long., and 19° 45' lat.), celebrated as one of the chief places of pilgrimage of the Hindus in India. It contains a temple erected to Vishnu in A.D. 1198, in which stands an idol of this Indian deity, called Jaggernaut (commonly Juggernaut), a corruption of the Sanscrit Jagamnnaha, i.e. lord of the world. “The idol is a carved block of wood, with a frightful visage, painted black, with a distended mouth of a bloody color. On festival days the throne of the idol is placed upon a stupendous movable tower sixty feet high, resting on wheels, which indent the ground deeply as they turn slowly under the ponderous machine. Attached to it are six ropes of the length and size of a ship's cable, by which the people draw it along. The priests and attendants are stationed around the throne, on the car, and occasionally address the worshippers in libidinous songs and gestures. Both the walls of the temple and the sides of the car are covered with the most indecent emblems, in large and durable sculpture.

Obscenity and blood are the characteristics of the idol's worship.” The origin of this idolatrous worship (which gained its notoriety especially by the fanaticism which has induced, and still induces, thousands of Hindus to sacrifice their lives, in the hope of attaining eternal bliss, by throwing themselves under the wheels of the chariot bearing the idol) is as follows: “A king desirous of founding a city sent a learned Brahman to pitch upon a proper spot. The Brahman, after a long search, arrived upon the banks of the sea, and there saw a crow diving into the water, and, having washed its body, making obeisance to the sea. Understanding the language of the birds, he learned from the crow that if he remained there a short time he would comprehend the wonders of this land. The king, apprized of this occurrence, built on the spot where the crow had appeared a large city, and a place of worship. The rajah one night heard in a dream a voice saying, ‘On a certain day cast thine eyes on the sea-shore, when there will arise out of the water a piece of wood fifty-two  inches long, and one and a half cubits broad; this is the true form of the deity; take it up, and keep it hidden in thine house seven days; and in whatever shape it shall then appear, place it in the temple, and worship it.' It happened as the rajah had dreamed, and the image, called by him Jagganntatha, became the object of worship of all ranks of people, and performed many miracles.” Another legend, however, relates that “the image arising from the water was an avatara, or incarnation of Vishnu; it was fashioned by Viswakarmam, the architect of the gods, into a fourfold idol, which represented the supreme deity, and the temple itself was erected over it, and inaugurated by the god Brahma and his divine court.” This may have given rise to the supposition that the worship of Jaggernaut (as Max Muller [Chips, 1, 57] spells it) was originally in honor of Vishnu. See Newcomb, Cyclop. of Missions, p. 495: Sterling, Account of Orissa (see Index)

## Jaghatai-Turki [Tartar] (or Tekke Turcoman) Version Of The[[@Headword:Jaghatai-Turki [Tartar] (or Tekke Turcoman) Version Of The]]

## Jagnepawadam[[@Headword:Jagnepawadam]]

             in Hindaism, is the cord of the Brahmins, a sacred mark or sign of the highest caste, which no one else is allowed to carry under severe penalties. It is made of nine threads of wool, which are long enough to be wound one hundred and eight times around the hand (because of the one hundred and eight legends of Brahma). These nine threads are divided into three parts, corresponding to the three Vedas, or holy books, and they are then: suspended over the right shoulder, so as to touch the hip under the left arm. This Brahmin-cord places him who carries it above the reach of the civil law.

## Jagouth[[@Headword:Jagouth]]

             (or Yaghuth), one of the five principal gods of the ancient Arabians. He was usually represented in the form of a lion, and is mentioned by name in the Koran.

## Jaguis[[@Headword:Jaguis]]

             are the hermits of the Banians, a sect in East India. There are three distinct classes of them: (1) the Van-aphrastas, (2) the San-jasiis, and (3) the Avadoutas. The Vean-aphrastas live in forests, many of them married and having children, feeding on the herbs and fruits that grow wild; but they scruple to pluck up the root of anything, considering it a sinful act, as they believe the soul to be contained in the root supposing everything to possess a spiritual life; and, of course, believing also the transmigration of souls. The San-jasiis affect greater abstinence, oppose matrimony, betel, and all pleasures whatsoever. They have but one daily meal, served only on earthen-ware, and live on alms. Their garments they dye with red earth, and always carry a long bamboo cane in their hands. ‘his class is a regular nomad tribe; they do not even stay two nights in the same place. They are taught in their sacred writings to look forward with desire to the separation of the soul from the body. Lust, anger, avarice, pride, revenge, and the love of this world they consider their most formidable enemies, and pray to their gods to deliver them from one and all of these sins. The last-named class, the Avadoutas, forsake their families, both their wives and their offspring, and anything that would make one of them dependent on the other for production. Thus they deny themselves even the use of those things which the other two classes of Jaguis are wont to enjoy. They are habilitated only with a small piece of linen cloth to cover their sex. Their food they procure from strangers, to whose houses they go when hungry, and eat anything that is offered them. These devotees especially frequent  the banks of the sacred Hindu rivers and the neighborhood of great temples, both for religious motives and in order to obtain most readily alms and food, particularly milk and fruits. They have one Oriental custom, viz. rubbing their body with ashes, no doubt to free themselves from the stain of sin. See Dissert. on the Religion, etc., of the Banians, apud Relig. Cer. vol. 3; Craufurd, Sketches of the Hindoos, 1, 235 sq.; Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. 1, 499. (J. H.W.)

## Jagur[[@Headword:Jagur]]

             (Heb. Yagur', יָגוּר, place of sojourn; Sept. Ι᾿αγούρ v. r. Α᾿σώρ), a city on the south or Ildumean border of Judah, mentioned between Eder and Kinah (Jos 15:21). “Its name might perhaps indicate that it was one of the fortified camping-grounds of the border Arabs” (Kitto). “The Jagur, quoted by Schwarz (Palest. p. 99) from the Talmud as one of the boundaries of the territory of Ashkelon, must have been further to the northwest” (Smith). The position of the town here considered can only be conjectured as not very far from the Dead Sea. It is not mentioned among the towns set off to Simeon (Jos 19:2-8), though it probably was one of them. It was possibly situated in wady Jurrah, which runs into the southwest end of the Dead Sea.

## Jah[[@Headword:Jah]]

             (Heb. Yah, יָהּ, a contraction for יַהוָֹה, Jehovah, Psa 68:4, elsewhere rendered “Lord”). SEE JEHOVAH; SEE HALLELUJAH. It also enters into the composition of many Heb. names, as ADONIJAH, ISAIAH, etc.

## Jahath[[@Headword:Jahath]]

             (Hebrew Yach'ath, יִחִת, prob. for יִחֶדֶתunion; Sept. Ι᾿έθ, but Ι᾿εέθ in 1Ch 6:43, and Ι᾿γάθ v.r. Ι᾿άθ in 1Ch 24:22), the name of a descendant of Judah and of several Levites.

1. A son of Shimei and grandson of Gershom, the son of Levi (1Ch 23:10); yet no such son is mentioned in 1Ch 23:9, where the three sons of Shimei are by some error (probably the transposition of the latter clause) attributed to his brother Laadan, while in 1Ch 23:11 Jahath is stated to have been “chief” (i.e. most numerous in posterity) of the four sons of Shimei. A similar disagreement appears in the. parallel passage (1 Chronicles 6), where Jahath (1Ch 6:43) occurs as the son of Gershom (prob.  by the transposition of Shimei's name into the preceding verse), and again (1Ch 6:20) as a son of Libnah (i.e. Laadan), instead of Shimei (comp. Zimnah, the son of Jahath, 1Ch 6:20; 1Ch 6:42). B.C. considerably post 1856.

2. Son of Reaiah (or Haroeh), of the posterity of Hezron, and father of two sons (1Ch 4:2). B.C. post 1612.

3. One of the sons of Shelomoth (or Shelomith). a descendant of Izhar, of the family of Kohath, appointed to a prominent place in the sacred services by David (1Ch 24:22). B.C. 1014.

4. One of the Levitical overseers of the Temple repairs instituted by Josiah; he belonged to the family of Merari (2Ch 34:12). B.C. 623.

## Jahaz[[@Headword:Jahaz]]

             (Heb. Yat'hats, יִהִוֹ, trodden down, Isa 15:4; Jer 48:34; Sept. Ι᾿ασσά; also with הlocal and in pause, י הְצָה, Yach'tsah, Num 21:23, Sept. εἰς Ι᾿ασσά; Deu 2:32, Sept. εἰς Ι᾿ασά; and this even with a prefix, בְּי הְצָה, Jdg 11:20, Sept. εἰς Ι᾿ασσά; but likewise with הparagogic, יִהְצָה, Yah'tsach, Sept. Ι᾿ασσά, Jos 13:18; A. Vers. “Jahaza;” Ι᾿ασά, Jer 48:21, “Jahazah;” Ι᾿ασσά, Jos 21:36, “Jahazah;” ῾Ρεφάς v.r. Ι᾿ασσά, 2 Chronicles 6:78, “Jahzah”), a town beyond the Jordan, where Sihon was defeated, in the borders of Moab and the region of the Ammonites (Num 21:23; Deu 2:32; Jdg 11:20); situated in the tribe of Reuben (Jos 13:18), and assigned to the Merarite Levites (Jos 21:36; 1Ch 6:78). In Isa 15:4; Jer 48:21, it appears as one of the Moabitish places that suffered from the transit of the Babylonian conquerors through the “plain country' (i.e. the Mishor. the mod. Belka). The whole country east of the Dead Sea had originally been given to the Moabites and Ammonites (Gen 19:36-38; Deu 2:19-22); but the warlike Amorites from the west of the Jordan conquered them, and expelled them from the region north of the river Amon. From the Amorites the Israelites took this country, but subsequently the Ammonites claimed it as theirs (Jdg 11:13), and on the decline of Jewish power the Moabites and Ammonites again took possession of it. Hitzig (Zu Jesa. ad loc.) regards Jahaz and Jahzah as different places (so Keil on Joshua ad loc., urging that they are distinguished in the passages of Jeremiah); but this is unnecessary (so Winer, Real. s.v. Jahaz), and at variance with the  philology. It appears to have been situated on the- edge of the desert (see Raumer, Zug dc. Isr. — p. 53; Hengstenberg, Bileame, p. 239). See Exodus. ‘From the terms of the narrative in Numbers 21 and Deuteronomy 2 we should expect that Jahaz was in the extreme south part of the territory of Sihon, but yet north of the River Arnon (see Deu 2:24; Deu 2:36; and the words in Deu 2:31, “begin to possess”), and in ‘exactly this position a site named Jazaze is mentioned by Schwarz (Palest. p. 227, “a village to the south-west of Dhiban”); but this lacks confirmation, especially as Eusebius and Jerome (Ozomnasf s. Ι᾿εσσά, Jassa) place it between Medeba (Μηδαμών) and Dibon (Διβούς,'Deblathaim); and the latter states that “Jahaz lies opposite the Dead Sea, at the boundary of the region of Moab.” These requirements are met by supposing Jahaz to have been situated in the open tract at the head of wady Waleh, between Arnun on the east, and Jebel Humeh on the west.

## Jahaza[[@Headword:Jahaza]]

             (Jos 13:18) or Jaha'zah (Jos 21:36; Jer 48:21). SEE JAHAZ.

## Jahaziah[[@Headword:Jahaziah]]

             (Heb. Yachzeyah', יִחְזְיָה, beheld by Jehovah; Sept. Ι᾿αζίας) son of Tiknvai, apparently a priest, one of those deputed by Ezra to ascertain which of the Jews had married Gentile wives after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:15). B.C. 459.

## Jahaziel[[@Headword:Jahaziel]]

             (Hebrew Yachaziel', יִחֲזַיאֵל, beheld by God; Sept. Ι᾿εζιήλ, Ι᾿αζιήλ, Ο᾿ζιήλ, Α᾿ζίήλ), the name of five men. SEE JAHZEEL.

1. The third “son” of Hebron, the grandson of Levi through Kohath (1 Chronicles 23:19; 24:33). B.C. probably post 1618, perhaps 1014.

2. One of the Benjamite warriors who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:4). B.C. 1055.

3. One of the priests who preceded the sacred ark with trumpets on its removal to Jerusalem (1Ch 16:6). B.C. cir. 1043.

4. The son of Zechariah, a Levite of the family- of Asaph, who predicted to Jehoshaphat his triumph over the host of the Moabites with such decided assurances. SEE JEHOSAPHAT. He is nowhere else mentioned in Scripture, but his prophecy on this occasion is given in full: “Then upon Jahaziel, the son of Zechariah, the son of Benaiah, the son of Jeiel, the son of Mattaniah, a Levite of the sons of Asaph, came the Spirit of the Lord in the midst of the congregation; and he said, Hearken ye, all Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem, and thou, king Jehoshaphat, thus saith the Lord unto you, Be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude; for the battle is not yours, but God's. ‘o-morrow go ye down against them: behold, they' come up by the cliff of Ziz; and ye shall find them at the end of the brook, before the wilderness of Jeruel. Ye shall not ‘need to fight in this battle: set yourselves, stand ye still, and see the salvation of the Lord with you, O Judah and Jerusalem: fear not, nor be dismayed; to-morrow go out against them, for the Lord will be with you” (2Ch 20:14-17). B.C. cir. 896.

5. One of the”sons” of Shechaniah, whose son (Ben-Jahaziel, but his name is not otherwise given; indeed, there is evidently some confusion in the text; comp. 2Ch 20:3) is said to have returned from Babylon ‘litl 300 males of his retainers (Ezr 8:5). B.C. ante 459. SEE SHECHANIAH.

## Jahdai[[@Headword:Jahdai]]

             (Heb. Yahday', יָהְדָּי, prob. grasper; Sept. Ι᾿αδαϊv), a descendant apparently of Caleb, of the family of Hezron; his sons' names are given, but, as his own parentage is not stated (1Ch 2:47), it can only be conjectured that lie was the son of the preceding Gazez, the son (different from the brother) of Haran (1Ch 2:46). B.C. prob. post 1612. Various other suggestions regarding the name have been made, as that Gazez, the name preceding, should be Jahdai (Houbigant, ad loc.); that Jahdai was a concubine of Caleb (Grunenberg quoted by Michaelis, Adnof. ad loc.), etc.; but these are mere groundless suppositions (see Burrington, 1, 216; Bertheau, Comment. ad loc.).

## Jahdiel[[@Headword:Jahdiel]]

             (Heb. Yachdidl', יִחְדַּיאֵל, made joyful by God; Sept. Ι᾿εδιήλ), one of the famous chieftains of the tribe of Manasseh resident in northern Bashan (1Ch 5:24). B.C. apparently 720.

## Jahdo[[@Headword:Jahdo]]

             (Heb. Yeachdo' יִחְדּוֹ, his union; otherwise for יִחְדּוֹן, united; Sept. Ι᾿εδδαί), son of Buz and father of Jeshishai, of the descendants of Abihail, resident in Gilead (1Ch 5:14). B.C. between 1093 and 782.

## Jahed, Aba-Osman-Amro[[@Headword:Jahed, Aba-Osman-Amro]]

             a Mohammedan doctor of the sect of the Motazelites. The name of Jahed, by which he is generally designated, is only a surname given to him on account of his brilliant eyes. He was thoroughly acquainted with Greek literature. He gained a great many adherents by his writings and eloquence. Among his theological books one is cited. as being composed in favor of Ali, and containing more than a thousand traditions respecting him. The best of his works, according to Ibn-Khallican, who cites but two, is a treatise on animals, probably borrowed largely from Greek writers. Jahed died at Bussora, A.D. 869. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Jahleelite[[@Headword:Jahleelite]]

             (Num 26:26). SEE JAHLEEL. Jah'mai (Heb. Yachmzay', יִחְמִי, protector; Sept. Ι᾿εμού), one of the “sons” of Tola, grandson of Issachar (1Ch 7:2). B.C. cir. 1658.

## Jahleil[[@Headword:Jahleil]]

             (Heb. Yachleel', יִחְלְאֵל, hoping in God Sept. Α᾿χοήλ), the last named of the three sons of Zebulon (Gen 46:14; Num 26:26). His descendants are called JAHLEEITES (Heb. Yachleeli', יִחְלְאֵלַי, Sept. Α᾿χοηλί, Num 26:26). B.C. 1856.

## Jahn, Johann[[@Headword:Jahn, Johann]]

             a distinguished German Roman Catholic theologian and Orientalist, was born at Taswitz, in Moravia, June 18, 1750. He studied at the Gymnasium of Znaym, the University of Olmütz; and the Rom. Cath. Theological Seminary of Bruck, entered the Church, and was for some time a priest at Mislitz. In 1782 he received the doctorate from OlmUtz, and, after having filled with great distinction the position of professor of Oriental languages and Biblical hermeneutics at Bruck, he was, in 1789, called to the University of Vienna as professor of the Oriental languages, dogmatics, and Biblical archaeology. At this high school he labored successfully for seventeen years, amid suspicions and petty persecutions from the court of Rome which pained his ingenuous spirit. Some words in the preface of his Einleit. in, d. Gött. Bucher d. alten Bundes (Vienna, 1703, 1802, 1803, 2 vols. 8vo); the assertion that the books of Job, Jonah, Judith, and Tobit are didactic poems; and that the demoniacs in the N.T. were possessed with dangerous diseases, not with the devil, were made charges against him.

In 1792 complaints of his unsoundness were laid before the emperor Francis II by cardinal Migazzi, which resulted in the appointment of a special commission to examine the charges. Although it was decided that Jahn's views were not heterodox, they cautioned him to be more careful in. the future in expressing opinions likely to lead to interpretations contrary to  the dogmas of the Church, and even suggested a change of the obnoxious passages (comp. Henke, Achiuf. d. neueste Kirchengeschichte, 2, 51 sq.; P. J. S. Huth, Versuch einer Kirchengesch. d. 18ten Jahrh. 2, 375, 376). Though he honestly and willingly submitted, his detractors continued their machinations till he was (in 1806) removed from the congenial duties of an office to which he had dedicated his life, and was made, merely, of course, to prevent scandal which might have resulted from a deprivation of all dignity, canon or Domherr in the metropolitan church of St. Stephen. Even before he was compelled to resign his professorship, two of his books, Introductio in libros sacros Veteris Testamenti in compendium redacta (Vienna, 1804), and Archaeologica Biblica in compendium redacta (Vienna, 1805), which were then very popular among the university students, were condemned and placed on the Index, without their author being heard in his defense. Jahn died Aug. 16, 1816. Besides the works which we have had occasion to cite, and a series of grammars and chrestomathies on the Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, and Chaldee languages, he wrote, Biblische Archäologie (Vienna, 1797-1805, 5 vols.; vols. 1 and 2, 2nd edition, 1817-1825): — Lexicon Arabico Latinuns, Chrestonathice Arabicae accomodatum (Vien. 1802): this work was considered the best of its kind until the publication of a similar production by Sylvester de Sacy: — Biblia Hebraica digessit, et graviores lectionum varietates adjecit (Vien. 1806, 4 vols. royal 8vo): Enchiridion Hermeneuticae generclis tabularum, etc. (Vienna, 1812; nwith an Appendix hermeneut., s. exercitationes exegeticce, Vienna, 1813): — Vatcinia Prophetarum de Jesu Messit, commentarius criticus in libros propheticos Veterie Testamenti (Vien. 1815), etc. Sometime after his death appeared Nacchtrie zu Jahn's theologischen Werken, published from his MSS. (Tübingen, 1821), which contained six interesting dissertations on various Biblical subjects, and with them some letters of Jahn's, giving a clew to the motives of the persecutions directed against him. Jahn's memory deserves to be cherished by all true lovers of Oriental scholarship. He furnished textbooks for the study of those languages superior to any of his time, and, although they are at present obsolete, he certainly aided modern scholarship by furnishing superior tools. As a theological writer he was clear and methodical, and his numerous works, of which several enjoy an English dress, “diffused a knowledge of Biblical subjects in places and circles where the books of Protestants would scarcely have been received. The latter, however, have appreciated his writings fully as much as Roman Catholics. He was not profound in any one thing, because he scattered his  energies over so wide a field; but he was a most useful author, and one of his books (the Archaeology) is still the largest and best on the subjects of which it treats.” As a theologian of the Romish Church he was certainly exceedingly liberal, so much so that Hengstenberg (on the Pentateuch) rather finds fault with him. See Felder, Gelehrt. Lex. d. Kathol. Geistlichkeit, 1, 337; H. Doring, D. gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands 2, 7 sq.; Meusel, Gelehrt. Deutschlands (5th ed.), 3:510; 10:13; 11:994; 14:255; 18:254; 23:18; Ersch u. Gruber, Allg. Encyk.; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. s.v.; Werner, Gesch. d. Kathol. Theol. p. 273 sq.

## Jahzah[[@Headword:Jahzah]]

             (1Ch 6:78). SEE JAHAZ.

## Jahzeel[[@Headword:Jahzeel]]

             (Heb. Yachtseel', יַחְצְאֵל, allotted by God; Sept. Α᾿σιήλ), the. first named of the sons of Naphtali (Gen 46:24). His descendants are called JAHZEELITES (Heb. Yachtseeli', יִחְצְאֵלַי, Sept. Α᾿σιηλί, Num 26:48). In 1Ch 7:13, the name is written JAHZIEL (יִחְצַיאֵל, Yhchtsiel', id.; Sept. Ι᾿ασιήλ). B C. 1856.

## Jahzeelite[[@Headword:Jahzeelite]]

             (Num 26:48). SEE JAHZEEL.

## Jahzerah[[@Headword:Jahzerah]]

             (Heb. — Yachze'rah, יִחְזֵרָה, returner; but Gesenius prefers to read יִחְזְיָה, i.e. Jahaziah; Sept. Ι᾿εζρίας v.r. Ε᾿ζιρά, Vulg. Jezra), son of Meshullam and father of Adiel, a priest (1Ch 9:12). B.C. long ante 536. He is probably the same with AHASAI, the father of Azareel (Neh 11:13), since the preceding and the following name are alike.

## Jahziel[[@Headword:Jahziel]]

             (1Ch 7:13). SEE JAHZEEL.

## Jailor[[@Headword:Jailor]]

             (δεσμοφύλαξ, guard of a prisoner, Act 16:23; Act 16:27; Act 16:36). SEE PRISON.

## Jainas[[@Headword:Jainas]]

             the name of a very powerful heterodox sect of Hindus particularly flourishing in the southern and western parts of Hindustan. Their name, Jainas, signifies followers of Jina, the generic name of deified saints; but, as these saints are also called Arhat, the sect is frequently ‘called Arhatas. The tenets of this sect are in several respects analogous to those of the Buddhists SEE BUDDHISM, but they resemble in others those of the Brahmanical Hindus. Like the Buddhists, they deny the divine origin and authority of the Veda (which, however, they do not hesitate to quote if the doctrines of the latter are conformable to the Jaina tenets), and worship certain saints whom they consider superior to the other beings of their pantheon. They differ, indeed, from them in regard to the history of these personages, but the original notion which prevails in this worship-is the same. Like the Brahmanical Hindus, on the other hand, they admit the institution of caste, and perform the essential ceremonies called Sanskdras (q.v.), and recognise some, of the subordinate deities of the Hindu pantheon at least apparently, as they do not pay especial homage to them, and as they disregard completely all those Brahmanical rites which involve the destruction of animal life. The Jainas have their own Puranas and other religious books, which in the main confine themselves to a delineation of their Tarthankharas, or deified teachers of the sect. The Vedas of the Brahmans they supply by their Siddhdntas and Aganmas.

Their peculiar doctrines are that “all objects, material or abstract, are arranged under nine categories, called Tatwas (truths or principles), of which we need notice only the ninth and last, called Moksha, or liberation of the vital spirit from the bonds ‘of action, i.e. final emancipation. In reference to it the Jainas not only affirm that there is such a state, but they define the size of the emancipated souls, the place where they live, their tangible qualities, the duration of their' existence, the distance at which they are from one another, their parts, natures, and numbers. Final emancipation is only obtained ‘in a state of manhood (not in that of a good demon, or brute), while in possession ‘of five senses: while possessing a body capable of voluntary motion, in a condition of possibility; while  possessing a mind, through the sacrament of the highest asceticism, in that path of rectitude in which there is no retrogression; through the possession of perfect knowledge anti vision; and on the practice of abstinence.' Those who attain to final liberation do not return to a worldly state, and there is no interruption to their bliss. They have perfect vision and knowledge, and do not depend on works (see J. Stevenson, The Kalpa Sûtra and Nava Tattwa). The principles of faith, as mentioned before, are common to all classes of Jainas, but some differences occur in the practice of their duties, as they are divided into religious and lay orders Yatis and Srâvakas. Both, of course, must place implicit belief in the doctrines of their saints; but the Yati has to lead a life of abstinence, taciturnity, and continence; he should wear a thin cloth over his mouth to prevent insects from flying into it and he should carry a brush to sweep the place on which he is about to sit, to remove any living creature out of the way of danger; but, in turn, he may dispense with all acts of worship, while the Srâvakas has to add to the observance of the religious and moral duties the practical worship of the saints, and a' profound reverence for his more pious brethren. The secular Jaina must, like the ascetic, practice the four virtues--liberality, gentleness, piety, and penance; he must govern his mind, tongue, and acts; abstain at certain, seasons from salt, flowers, green fruits, roots, honey, grapes, tobacco; drink water thrice strained, and never leave a liquid uncovered, lest an insect should be drowned in it; it is his duty, also, to visit daily a temple where some of the images of the Jaina saints are placed, walk round it three times, make an obeisance to the image, and make some offerings of fruits or flowers, while pronouncing some such formula as ‘Salutation to the Saints, to the Pure Existences, to the Sages, to the Teachers, to all the Devout in the world.'

The reader in a Jaina temple is a Yati, but the ministrant priest is not seldom a Brahman, since the Jainas have no priests of their own, and the presence of such Brahmanical ministrants seems to have introduced several innovations in their worship. In Upper India the ritual in use is often intermixed with formulas belonging more properly to the Saiva and Sakta worship (see Hindu Sects under INDIA SEE INDIA ), and images of Siva and his consort take their place in Jaina temples. In the south of India they appear, as mentioned before, to observe also all the essential rites or Sanskaras of the Brahmanical Hindu. The festivals of the Jainas are especially those relating to events in the life of their deified saints; but they observe, also, several common to other Hindus, as the spring festival, the Sripanchami, and others.”  The sect is divided into two principal factions-the Digambaras and the Swetâmbaras. The name of the former signifies “sky-clad,” or naked, and designated the ascetics who went unclad; but at present they wear colored garments, and dishabilitate only at mealtimes. The name of the latter faction means “one who wears white ‘garments.” But it is not mainly in dress that these two factions are distinct from each other; there are said to be no less than seven hundred different points upon which they split, 84 of which are considered vital by each party. Thus, e.g. “the Swetâmbaras decorate the images of their saints with ear-rings, necklaces, armlets, and tiaras of gold and jewels, whereas the Digambaras leave their images without ornaments. Again, the Swetâmbaras assert that there are twelve heavens and sixty-four Indras, whereas the Digambaras maintain that there are sixteen heavens and 100 Indras. In ‘the south of India the Jainas are divided into two castes; in Upper Hindustan, however, they are all of one caste. It is remarkable that amongst themselves they recognize a number of families between which no intermarriage can take place, and that they resemble in this respect also the ancient Brahmanical Hindus, who established similar restrictions in their religious codes.

“As regards the pantheon of the Jaina creed, it is still more fantastical than that of the Brahmanical sects (whence it is borrowed to a great extent), but without any of the poetical and philosophical interest which inheres in the gods of the Vedic time. The highest rank amongst their numberless hosts of divine beings divided by them into four classes, with various subdivisions-they assign to the deified saints, whom they call Jina, or Arhat, or Tirthcakara, besides a variety of other generic names. The Jainas enumerate twenty-four Tirthakaras of their past age, twenty-four of the present, and twenty-four of the age to come; and they invest these holy personages with thirty-six superhuman attributes of the most extravagant character. Notwithstanding the sameness of these attributes, they distinguish the twenty-four Jinas of the present age from each other in color, stature, and longevity. Two of them are red, two white, two blue, two black; the rest are of a golden hue, or a yellowish-brown. The other two peculiarities are regulated by them with equal precision, and according to a system of decrement, from Rishabha, the first Jina, who was 500 poles in stature, and lived 8,400,000 great years, down to Malhdvra, the twenty- fourth, who had degenerated to the size of a man, and was no more than forty years on earth-the age of his predecessor, Parswanatha, not exceeding-100 years. The present worship is almost restricted to the last  two Tirthakaras; and, as the stature and years of these personages have a reasonable possibility, H. T. Colebrooke inferred that they alone are to be considered as historical personages. As, moreover, amongst the disciples of Mahavira there is one, Indrabhfiti, who is called Gautama, and as Gautama is also a name of the. founder of the Buddha faith, the same distinguished scholar concluded that, if the identity between these names could be assumed, it would lead to the further surmise that both these sects are branches of the same. stock. But against this view, which would assign to the Jaina religion- an antiquity even higher than- 543 B.C. (the date which is commonly ascribed to the apotheosis of Gautama Buddha), several reasons are alleged by professor Wilson. As to the real date, however, of the origin of the Jaina faith. as the same scholar justly observes, it is immersed in the same obscurity which invests all remote history amongst the Hindus. We can only infer from the existing Jaina literature, and from the doctrines it inculcates, that it came later into existence than the Buddhist sect.” See Colebrooke, Miscellaneous Essays; Wilson, Works, 1 (Lond. 1862); Trevor, India, its Natives and Missions, p. 109 sq. SEE INDIA; SEE HINDUISM.

## Jairite[[@Headword:Jairite]]

             (2Sa 20:26). SEE JATR, 2.

## Jairus[[@Headword:Jairus]]

             (Ιάειρος, SEE JAIR ), an otherwise unknown ruler of the synagogue at Capernaum, whose only daughter Jesus restored to life (Mar 5:22; Luk 8:41; comp. Mat 9:18). A.D. 27. Some have wrongly inferred from our Savior's words, “The maid is not dead(, but sleepeth” (Hautenberg, in the Hannov. Beiträg. z. Nutz. u. Vergnüg. 1761, p. 88; Olshausen, Comment. 1, 321), that the girl was only in a swoon (see Neander, Lebene Jesu, p. 347).

## Jairus (2)[[@Headword:Jairus (2)]]

             (Ι᾿αίϊρος) also occurs in the Apocrypha (Esther 11:2) as a Graecized form of the name of JARI SEE JAIR (q.v.), the father of Mordecai (Est 2:5).

## Jais, Aegidius[[@Headword:Jais, Aegidius]]

             a Benedictine, was born at Mittenwald, Bavaria, March 17, 1750. In 1770 he joined his order, was in 1778 professor at the Salzburg Gymnasium, and in 1803 professor of theology there. In 1814 he retired from public duties, and died December 4, 1822. He published, Predigten (Munich, 1803, 2 volumes): — Katechismus (Wurzburg, 1811): — Handbuch zum Unterrichte in der christ kathol. Glaubens-und Sittenlehre (1821), and other ascetical works. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:112, 241, 267, 346, 378. (B.P.)

## Jaish, Baruch Ibn[[@Headword:Jaish, Baruch Ibn]]

             SEE IBN-JAISH.

## Jakan[[@Headword:Jakan]]

             (1Ch 1:42). SEE JAAKAN.

## Jakeh[[@Headword:Jakeh]]

             (Heb. Yakeh', יָקֵה, pipous; Sept. δεζάμενος [reading' קְחָה],-Vulg. vomens [reading יָקֵא]), a name given as that of the father of Agur, the author of the apothegms in Pro 30:1 sq. Interpreters greatly differ as to the person intended. SEE AGUR. The traditional view is that which gives the word a figurative import (q. d. יַקְּהָה, obedience, sc. to God);  and it will then become an epithet of David, the father of Solomon, a term appropriate to his character, and especially so as applied to him by a son. Others understand a real name of some unknown Israelite; and, in that case, the most probable supposition is that it denotes the father of the author of some popular maxims selected by “the men of Hezekiah” (perhaps composed by them, or in their time), and thus incorporated with the proverbs of Solomon. But the allusion to these latter compilers in Pro 25:1, appears only to relate to an editing on their part of literary effusions (in part, perhaps, retained in the memory by oral recitation) which are expressly assigned to Solomon as their author. SEE PROVERBS.

Prof. Stuart (Comment. ad loc.) adopts the suggestion of Hitzig (in Zeller's Theol. Yahrb. 1844, p. 283), assented to by Bertheau (Keurzgef. Exeg. Handb. ad loc.), and renders the clause thus: “The words of Agur, the son of her who was obeyed (reading יַקְהָהּ) in Massa;” and in an extended comparison with the parallel passage (Pro 21:1),defends and illustrates this interpretation, making Jakeh to have been the son and successor of a certain queen of Arabia Petraea, chiefly on the ground that the phrase דַּבְרֵי לְמוּאֶל מֶלֶךְ מִשָּׂא will bear no other translation than The words of Lenmuel, kitzq of Massa. But if the construction be thus rendered more facile in this passage, it is more difficult in the other, where it בַּןאּיָקֶה הִמִּשָּׂאcannot be brought nearer his version than The son of Jakeh of allssa. Even this rendering violates in both passages the Masoretic punctuation, which is correctly followed in the Auth. Vers.; and the interpretation proposed, after all, attributes both names (Agur and Lemuel) to the same person, without so good reason for such variation as there would be if they were ascribed as epithets to Solomon. SEE ITHIEL.

## Jakim[[@Headword:Jakim]]

             (Heb. Yakimn', יָקַים, establisher), the name of two men. SEE JEHOTKAH.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿λιακείμ v.r. Ι᾿ακίμ, Vulg. Jacim.) The head of the twelfth division of the sacerdotal order as arranged by David (1Ch 24:12). B.C. 1014.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿ακείμ v. r. Ι᾿ακίμ Vulg. Jacim.) One of the “sons” of Shimhi, a Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:19). B.C. apparently cir. 588.

## Jakobi, Adam Friedrich Ernst[[@Headword:Jakobi, Adam Friedrich Ernst]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born October 27, 1733. He studied at Jena, acted for some time as private tutor, went in 1763 as military chaplain to Holland, and was in 1775 appointed superintendent by duke Ernest of Gotha, Jakobi died April 3, 1807. He wrote, Diss. Theologica de Peccatis Apostolorum Actualibus (Jena, 1754): — Exercitatio Exegetico- Theologica de Monogamia (Gotha. 1776), besides a number of historical and pedagogical works. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Jakshiamuni[[@Headword:Jakshiamuni]]

             in Lamaism, is the supreme god of the Thibetians, identical with Buddha of India, an incarnation of Vishnu, who appears for the fourth time to save men. He is the present sovereign of the universe. After him there will yet come nine hundred and ninety-six Buddhas, before the salvation of men shall be finished. The inhabitants of Thibet, Mongolia, Tartary, China, and Japan hold him to be the only god, creator and giver of their religion.

## Jakusi[[@Headword:Jakusi]]

             the Japanese divinity of physic. “His idol is placed in a small temple richly adorned, standing upright on a gilt tarate flower, or faba AEgyptiaca, under one half of a large cockle-shell extended over his head, which is encircled with a crown of rays. He has a scepter in his left hand, and in his right hand something unknown. The idol is gilt all over. The Japanese, as they pass by, never fail to pay their reverence to this golden idol, approaching the temple with a low bow, and bareheaded, when they ring a little bell hung up at the entrance, and-then, holding both their hands to their foreheads, repeat a prayer. The Japanese relate that this temple was erected to Jakusi by a pious but poor man, who, having' discovered an excellent medicinal power, gained so much money by it as to be able to give this testimony of his gratitude to the God of physic.” Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. 1, 499.

## Jakut[[@Headword:Jakut]]

             SEE SIBERIA.

## Jalaguier, Prosper Frederic[[@Headword:Jalaguier, Prosper Frederic]]

             a French Protestant theologian, was born August 21, 1795. Having acted as pastor at several places, Jalaguier was called in 1833 to Montauban, to fill temporarily the chair of Christian ethics. Two years later he was appointed professor of dogmatics, and occupied this office till his death at Montauban, March 22, 1864. He published, Le Temoignage de Dieu (1851): — Authenticite du Nouveau Testament (eod.): — Inspiration du Nouveau Testament (eod.): — Simple Expose de la Question Chretienne (1852): — Du Principe Chretien et du Catholicisme, du Rationalisme et du Protestantisme (1855): — Une Vue de la Question Scripteraire (1863). In these works he defended with great firmness the reality of a supernatural revelation and the religious authority of the Scripture, against the writers of the Revue de Strasbourg. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Jaldabaoth[[@Headword:Jaldabaoth]]

             SEE IALDABAOTH.

## Jalinder[[@Headword:Jalinder]]

             in Hindu mythology, was one of the mighty demons which, sprung from Danu, are classed and recognised under the name of Danu was. He was dreaded by all the gods, because he was unconquerable; but this was only by the marvellous virtue and purity of his wife, who favored no one in heaven or on earth. The demon challenged Shiva, and fought with him in Mahadewa's form, and would have come off victorious had not Vishnu come to the assistance of the god. This' he (lid by taking on the form of a demon just like Jalinder, and, coming to the wife of the latter, overcame her virtue, and immediately the demon's strength left him, so that he was conquered and killed.

## Jalkut[[@Headword:Jalkut]]

             (יִלְקוּט). i.e., collection, is the title of a Aidrashic catena of traditional expositions from upwards of fifty different works of all ages, many of which are of great value. This Midrash extends over the whole Bible. The latest edition is the one published at Warsaw (1876-77). The author of the Jalkut is Simeon Cara (q.v.). (B.P.)

## Jalloof Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Jalloof Version Of The Scriptures]]

             This dialect (also called Jolof, Woloff, Guiluf, etc.),.is spoken by a large tribe near Bathurst, Gambia, West Africa, numbering about 50,000 souls. In 1881, the British and Foreign Bible Society, at the request of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, resolved to print a tentative edition of 500 copies of the gospel of Matthew. The translation was made by Rev. R. Dixon, of Bathurst, Gambia, who had used his version in the services, and found it was understood and liked by the people. See Bible of Every Land, page 407. (B.P.)

## Jalon[[@Headword:Jalon]]

             (Heb. Yalon', יָלוֹן, lodger; Sept. Ι᾿αλών v.r. Ι᾿αμών), the last-named of the four sons of Ezra, of the tribe of Judah, and apparently of a family kindred with that of Caleb (1Ch 4:17). B.C. prob. cir. 1618.

## Jam Moesta Quiesce Querela[[@Headword:Jam Moesta Quiesce Querela]]

             is the beginning of the grand burial-hymn of Prudentius (q.v.). This hymn, which, as Trench says, is "the crowning glory of the poetry of Prudentius," brings before us the ancient worship in deserts and in catacombs, and of  which Herder says that no one can read it without feeling his heart moved by its touching tones. The first stanza runs thus in the original:

"Jam moesta quiesce querela,

 Laerimas suspendite, matres,

 Nullus suma pignora plangat,

 Mors haec reparatio vitae est."

And in Caswall's translation:

"Cease, ye tearful mourners,

 Thus your hearts to rend,

 Death is life's beginning,

 Rather than its end."

A German translation is also found in Schaff's Deutsches Gesangbuch, No. 468. (B.P.)

## Jama[[@Headword:Jama]]

             in Hindu mythology, is the ruler of a division of the infernal region (Nark), and the highest judge there, who decides whether the departed souls are to be admitted to heaven or go to hell, in which latter case they begin their wanderings through life anew. A mirror, made of pure fire, portrays to him the deeds of all men. On a golden scale, held by his assistants, he weighs human deeds, and leads those found wanting to Nark, the others to Suerga (heaven). He is a protecting spirit of virtue and justice, and the most honored, companion of Shiva. Nevertheless, he is represented in a frightful appearance, with hideous features, a number -of arms, heavy weapons, and riding on a black buffalo with four horns. He lives in Jamapur (city of Jama).

## Jamabo[[@Headword:Jamabo]]

             SEE JAMABO.

## Jamaica    [[@Headword:Jamaica    ]]

             one of the largest islands of the West Indies, was discovered by Columbus in 1494, and received in 1514 the name Isle de San Jatyo. In 1560 the native population had become nearly extinct. For a time Jamaica ‘remained under the administration of the descendants of Diego, the son of Columbus; subsequently it fell by inheritance to the house of Braganza; in 1655 it was occupied by the English, and in 1670 formally ceded to England, which has ever since retained possession of it. The importation of slaves ceased in 1807, and in 1838 the slaves obtained their entire freedom. The Negro population increased very rapidly, and, according to a census taken in 1861, there were, in a total population of 441,264, only 13,816  whites, mostly English, against 346,374 Negroes and 81,065 mulattoes. The colored population has always complained of being oppressed and ill treated by the former slaveholders, who own nearly the whole of the landed property, and a large number of them have withdrawn from the towns and plantations into the interior of the island, where they have formed a number of new settlements. In October 1865, a Negro insurrection broke out, in the course of which several government buildings were stormed by the insurgents, and a number of plantations plundered. The English governor, Eyre, suppressed the insurrection with a severity which caused his suspension from office, and the appointment of a special commission of investigation. The latter had, however, no practical result and the Queen's Bench, to which the case of governor Eyre had been referred by the jury, declined to institute a trial.

Before the abolition of slavery the planters were in general opposed to the religious instruction of the slaves. In 1754 the Moravian Brethren commenced a mission in Jamaica, encouraged by several of the planters, who presented them an estate called Carmel. Their progress was but slow. From the beginning of the mission to 1804 the number of Negroes baptized was 938. From 1838, when complete liberty was granted to the Negroes, the Moravian mission prospered greatly; and in 1850 the number of souls under the care of the mission at the several stations was estimated at 1300. In 1842 an institution for training native teachers was established. In 1867 the mission numbered 14 churches and chapels, with 11,850 sittings, 9350 attendants at divine worship, and 4460 members. The number of schools was 17, and of scholars 30. The mission of English Wesleyans was commenced by Dr. Coke in 1787. It soon met with violent opposition, and the Legislative Assembly of the island and the town council of Kingston repeatedly passed stringent laws for cutting off the slave population from the attendance of the Wesleyan meetings, and for putting a stop to the labors of the missionaries.

From 1807 to 1815 the missionary work was accordingly interrupted, and it was only due to the interference of the home government and the English governors of Jamaica that it could be resumed. But every insurrectionary movement among the Negroes led to a new outcry against the missionaries, in particular the Wesleyan, against whom, at different times, special laws were issued. A great change, however, took place in public opinion after the abolition of slavery, when the House of Assembly of the island and the Common Council of Kingston made grants to aid in the erection of Wesleyan chapels and schools. In 1846 the number  of Church members in connection with the Wesleyan mission amounted to 26,585; but from that time it began to decrease, and in 1853 had declined to 19,478. In 1867 the Wesleyans had 75 churches and chapels, with 34,105 sittings, 24,210 attendants of public worship, 26 ministers, 14,661 members, 5107 Sunday-scholars, and 36 day schools, with 2563 scholars. The English Baptists entered upon their mission in Jamaica in 1814. It soon became very prosperous: in 1839 it numbered 21,000. and in 1841, 27,706 members; in 1887, 32,342 members, 144 churches, and 78 out-stations. They have a college at Calabar, with theological instruction. In 1888 the United Presbyterians had in Jamaica 46 churches, 32 ministers, and 8814 members; the United Methodists 10 churches, 9 ministers, and 3403 members. The general religious statistics in 1867 were as follows:

Altogether, the number of persons under religious instruction was estimated in 1867 at 154,000, and the churches and chapels together could seat 174,000 per-sons. Formerly the Church of England was the State church, and was supported by the local Legislature, but in 1868 the state grant was abolished. The island is the see of an Anglican bishop and of a Roman Catholic vicar apostolic. (A. J. S.)

## Jamandaga[[@Headword:Jamandaga]]

             (or Macha Alla) was one of the supreme deities of the Kalmucks. He is represented somewhat like Herli-Kan, but differs from that deity in possessing six arms. His color is blue, and the palms of the hands and the soles of his feet are red. Flowers and skulls are his crown, and snakes his armlets and anklets, while a snake hangs over both shoulders. His girdle is a string of human heads. In one hand he holds a sceptre, in another two cords. In two he holds drinking-vessels, and in the fifth and sixth the hide  of an animal. This frightful god crushes with his feet a form which has human arms and feet, but a head resembling an elephant's. This idol is also surrounded by good and evil demons.

## Jamanduga[[@Headword:Jamanduga]]

             in Thibetanian mythology, is one of the eight fearful gods (Nadman- Dobshot), who by their might destroy evil, protect the world, and are zealously worshipped by the followers of Lamaism. Jamanduga is an emanation of the god Monsushari. Jakshiamuai, the supreme god; gave him the most hateful appearance that he could devise, in order that he might conquer the frightful Tshotshitshalba, the most dreaded of all evil demons, who continually seeks to destroy the world. In this form Jamanduga is of a bluish color, surrounded by flames of fire, and has ten heads, in three rows, one of which is that of a bull, another that of a goat, and the rest distorted human faces; but the last and topmost one is that of a beautiful maiden, to denote-his divine nature. Twenty arms carry the deadliest weapons and instruments of torture, and with twenty feet he walks on a heap of crushed men. SEE JAMANDAGA.

## Jamas[[@Headword:Jamas]]

             in the mythology of the Antilles, was the mother of the great spirit Jokahuna, whom Tonatiks sent to the earth in his stead. This goddess was worshipped on the island Quisqueja (Hayti). She had an idol there, at whose side two servants stood, one to call the gods together, when the goddess wanted to send, them out to fulfil her wishes, the other to punish the disobedient.

## Jambawat[[@Headword:Jambawat]]

             in Hindu mythology, was an Avatar, an incarnation of the supreme god, in the form of a giant bear. Rama (an incarnation of Vishnu) appeared for the purpose of conquering Ravana, the giant king of Ceylon. The gods all supported the latter, with armies of apes, of bears, and other animals. Brahma gave the bears a king, Jambawat, who came out of the mouth of the god, and who possessed the spirit of Brahma. He now wished to make the expedition to Ceylon alone, but Krishna fought three days with him, until he recognised the supremacy of Vishmnu (whose incarnation Krishna was). Then he followed Rama, with his entire army of bears, and assisted him in conquering Ceylon and its ruler.

## Jamblichus, or Iamblichus[[@Headword:Jamblichus, or Iamblichus]]

             (Ι᾿άμβλιχος), a celebrated Neoplatonic philosopher of the 4th century, was born at Chalcis, in Caele-Syria. What little we know of his life is derived from the works of Eunapius, a Sophist, whose love of the marvelous renders his testimony doubtful authority. He seems, however, to have studied under Anatolius and Porphyry, and resided in Syria until his death, which occurred during the reign of Constantine the Great, and probably before A.D. 333 (Suidas, s.v. Ι᾿άμβλιχος; Eunapius, Iamblich.). He was deeply versed in the philosophical system of Plato and Pythagoras, as well as in the theology and philosophy of the Egyptians and Chaldaeans, and enjoyed great reputation, being by some of his contemporaries considered even the equal of Plato. In his life of Pythagoras he appears as a Syincretist, or compiler of different systems, but without critical talent. So far as can be gathered from fragments in his works in Proclus's commentary on the Vimmeus, he went even further than his teachers in subtlety of arguments, subdividing Plotinus's trinity, and deriving there from a series of triads. “‘Iamblichus distinguishes first three purely intelligible triads, then three intellectual ones, thus forming the νοητήν enneatical series, and the νοεράν.

By the side of the great triad he places  inferior ones, νέοι δημίουργοι, whose mission it is to transcript the action of the former. He is also distinguished from Plotinus and Porphyry by an almost superstitious regard for numerical formulas. All the principles of his theology can be represented by numbers: the monad. the supreme unit, principle of all unity, as well as of all diversity; two, the intellect, the first manifestation or development of unity; three, the soul, or δημίουργοι, the principle' which brings all progressive beings back to unity; four, the principle of universal harmony, which comprises the causes of all things; eight, the source of motion (χώρησις), taking all beings away from the supreme principle to disperse them through the world; nine, the principle of all identity and of all perfection; and finally, ten, the result of all the emanations of the τὸ ῎Εν. Neither Plotinus nor Porphry,' whatever their regard for Pythagoras's doctrines, ever went to such an extent in reducing their principles to numerical abstractions” (Vacherot, Hist. Critique de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie, vol. 2). Jamblichus did not acquiesce in the doctrine of the earlier Neoplatonists, but thought that man could be brought into direct communication with the Deity through the medium of theurgic rites and ceremonies, and thus attached great importance to mysteries, initiations, etc. He wrote a number of works, the most important of which are:

1. Περὶ Πυθαγόρου αίρέσεως intended as a preparation for the study of Plato, and consisting originally of ten books, five of which are now lost. The principal extant are Περὶ τοῦ Πυθαγορικοῦ βίου (published first by J. Arcerius Theodoretus, Franeker, 1598, 4to; best ed. L. Kuster, Amst. 1707, 4to; and Th. Kiessling, Lpz. 1815, 2 vols. Svo); Προτρεπτικοὶ λόγοι εἰς φιλοσοφίαν (Th. Kiessling, Lpz. 1813, 8vo); — Περὶ κοινης μαθηματικῆς ἐπιστήμης (Ulloison, Anecdota Graeca, 2, 188 sq.; J. G. Fries, Copenhagen, 1790, 40): — Τὰ θεολογούμενα τῆς ἀριθμητικῆς (Ch. Wechel, Paris, 1543, 4to; Tr. Ast, Lpz. 1817, 8vo).

2. The Περῖ μνστηρίων, in one book, in which a priest named Abammon is introduced as replying to a letter of Porphyrius. He endeavors to vindicate-the truth purity, and divine origin of Egyptian and Chaldee theology, and maintains that man, through theurgic rites, may commune with the Deity. There has been some controversy concerning the authenticity of this work, but Tennemann and other eminent critics think there are no good reasons why the authorship should be denied to Iamblichus. It was published by Ficinus (Venice, 1483, 4to, with a Latin transl.); N. Scutellius (Rome, 1556, 4to), and Th. Gale (Oxf. 1678, fol.,  with a Latin transl.), etc. See Ielunapius, Vitae Sophist.; Julian, Orat. 4; 146; Epist. 40; Dodwell, Excercit. de State Pythgy. 1704; Hebenstreit, Dissertatio de Jamcablici Doctrina, Leipz. 1704, 4to; Brucker, Historia critica Philosophice , 2, 260, 431; Tillemont, Hist. des Empereurs, — 6, 246; Tennemann, Gesch. der Philosophie, 6, 246; Ritter, Gesch. der Philosophie, 4, 647; Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, vol. 4, pt. 3:p. 50; Tiedmann, Geist der Spekulat. Philosophie, 3:453; Jules Simon, Histoire de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie, 2, 187-265. — Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography, 2, 549; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26:305 sq.; Lardlner, Works, vol. 8; Butler, Hist. Anc Philos. 1, 76, 77; 2, 321,329. SEE NEOPLATONIS.

## Jambres[[@Headword:Jambres]]

             (Ι᾿αμβρῆς, prob. of Egyptian etymology), a person mentioned as one of those who opposed loses (2Ti 3:8). B.C. 1658. SEE JANNES.

## Jambri[[@Headword:Jambri]]

             Shortly after the death of Judas Maccabatus (B.C. 161), “the children of Jambri” are said to have made a predatory attack on a detachment of the Maccabean forces, and to have suffered reprisals (1Ma 9:36-41). The name does not occur elsewhere, and the variety of readings is considerable: Ι᾿αμβρί, Ι᾿αμβρεϊvν, Α᾿μβροί, Α᾿μβρί; Syr. Ambrei. Josephus (.At. 13:1, 2) read οί αιου παῖδες, and it seems almost certain that the true reading is Α᾿μρί (-εί), a form which occurs elsewhere (1Ki 16:22; Joseph. Ant. 8:12 5, Α᾿μαρῖνος; 1Ch 27:18, Heb. עָמְרַי,Yulcg. Atmri; 1Ch 9:4, Α᾿μβραϊvμ, i.e. Amorites.

It has been conjectured (Drusius, Michaelis, Grimm, 1Ma 9:36) that the original text was בני אמורי, “the sons of the Amorites,” and that the reference is to a family of the Amorites who had in early times occupied the town Medeba (1Ma 9:36), on the borders of Reuben (Num 21:30-31).

## James[[@Headword:James]]

             or rather JACOBUS (Ι᾿άκωβος, the Graecized form of the name Jacob), the name of two or three persons mentioned in the New Test.  1. JAMES, THE SON OF ZEBEDEE (Ι᾿άκωβος ὁ τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου), and elder brother of the evangelist John, by one or the other of which relationships he is almost always designated. Their occupation was that of fishermen, probably at Bethsaida, in partnership with Simon Peter (Luk 5:10). On comparing the account given in Mat 4:21, Mar 1:19, with that in John 1, it would appear that James and John had been acquainted with our Lord, and had received him as the Messiah, some time before he called them to attend upon him statedly a call with which they immediately complied. A.D. 27. Their mother's name was Salome (Mat 20:20; Mat 27:56; comp. with Mar 15:40; Mar 16:1). We find James, John, and Peter association several interesting occasions in the Savior's life. They alone were present at the transfiguration (Mat 17:1; Mar 9:2; Luk 9:28); at the restoration to life of Jairus's daughter (Mar 5:42; Luk 8:51); and in the garden of Gethsemane during the agony (Mar 14:33; Mat 26:37; Luk 21:37). With Andrew they listened in private to our Lord's discourse on the fall of Jerusalem (Mar 13:3). James and his brother appear to have indulged in false notions of the kingdom of the Messiah, and were led by ambitious views to join in the request made to Jesus by their mother (Mat 20:20-23; Mar 10:35). From Luk 9:52, we may infer that their temperament was warm and impetuous. On account, probably, of their boldness and energy in discharging their apostleship, they received from their Lord the appellation of Boanerges (q.v.), or Sons of Thunder (for the various explanations of this title given by the fathers, see Suiceri Tlhes. Eccles. s.v. Βροντή, and Licke's , Commentar, Bonn, 1840, Einleitung, c; 1, § 2, p. 17). SEE JOHN.

James was the first martyr among the apostles (Act 12:1), A.D. 44. Clement of Alexandria, in a fragment preserved by Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiastes 1, 9), reports that the officer who conducted James to the tribunal was so influenced by the bold declaration of his faith as to embrace the Gospel and avow himself also a Christian; in consequence of which, he was beheaded at the same time.

For legends respecting his death and his connection with Spain, see the Roman Breviary (in Fest. S. Jac. Ap.), in which the healing of a paralytic and the conversion of Hermogenes are attributed to him, and where it is asserted that he preached the Gospel in Spain, and that his remains were translated to Compostella. See also the fourth book of the Apostolical History written by Abdias, the (pseudo) first bishop of Babylon (Abdias, De historias certaminis Apostolici, Paris, 1566); Isidore, De viti et obitu  SS. utriusque Testam. No. LXXIII (Hagonome, 1529); Pope Calixtus I's four sermons on St. James the Apostle (Bibl. Paetr. Magn. 15:324); Mariana, De Adventet Jacobi Apostoli Majoris in Hispaniam (Col. Agripp. 1609); Baronius, Martyrologieum Romanum ad Jul. 25, p. 325 (Antwerp, 1589); Bollandus, Aeta Santorum ad Jul. 25; 6:1-124 (Antwerp, 1729); Estius Comlmm. in At. Ap. c. 12; Anot. in diffiora loca S: Script. (Col. Agripp. 1622); Tillemont, Memoires pour sertcir a l'Histoire Ecclesiastique des six premiers siecles, 1, 899 (Brussels, 1706). As there is no shadow of foundation for any of the legends here referred to, we pass them by without further notice. Even Baronius shows himself ashamed of them; Estius gives them up as hopeless; and Tillemont rejects them with as much contempt as his position would allow him to show. Epiphanius without giving, or probably having any authority for or against his statement, reports that St. James died unmarried (S. Epiph. Adv. Haer. 2, 4, p. 491, Paris, 1622), and that, like his namesake, he lived the life of a Nazarite (ibid. 3:2, 13, p. 1045).

2. JAMES, THE “SON” OF ALPHAEUS (Ι᾿άκωβος ὁ τοῦ Α᾿λφαίου), one of the twelve apostles (Mar 3:8; Mat 10:3; Luk 6:15; Act 1:13). A.D. 27-29. His mother's name was Mary (Mat 26:56; Mar 15:40); in the latter passage he is called JAMES THE LESS (ὁ μικρός, the Little), either as being younger than James, the son of Zebedee, or on account or his low stature (Mar 16:1; Luk 24:10). There has been much dispute as to whether this is the same with “JAMES, THE LORDS BROTHER” (Gal 1:19); but the express title of Apostle given to him in this last passage, as well as in 1Co 15:7 (comp. also Act 9:27), seems decisive as to their identity--no other James being mentioned among the Twelve except “James, the- brother of John,” who was no near relative of Christ. Another question is whether he was the same with the James mentioned along with Joses, Simon, and Judas, as Christ's brethren (Mat 13:55; Mar 6:3). This depends upon the answer to two other questions: 1st. Is the term “brother” (ἀδελφός) to be taken in the proper sense, or in the general signification of kinsman, in these texts? The use of the title in the last two passages, as well as in Joh 2:12; Mat 12:46-50; Mar 3:31-35; Luk 8:19-21; Act 1:14, in explicit connection with his mother, and in relations which imply that they were members of his immediate family, most naturally requires it to be taken in its literal sense, especially as no intimation is elsewhere convened to the contrary. SEE BROTHER.

Nor can the term “‘sisters” (ἀδελφαί), employed in the same connection (Mat 13:56; Mar 6:3), be referred to other than uterine relatives. This inference is sustained by the striking coincidence in the names of the brothers in the list of the apostles (namely, James, Judas, and apparently Simon, Luk 6:15-16; Act 1:13) with those in the reference to Christ's brothers (namely, James, Judas, Simon, and Joses, Mat 13:55; Mar 6:3), and also by the fact that “James the Less and Joses” are said to be the sons of the same Mary who was “the wife of Cleophas” (Mar 15:40; and Mat 27:56; comp. with Joh 19:25). 2nd. Who is this “Mary, the wife of Cleophas?” In the same verse (Joh 19:25) she is called “his [Christ's] mother's sister” (ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ ἀδελφὴ τῆς μητρὸς αὑτοῦ, Μαρία ἡ τοῦ Κλωπᾶ, και ἡ Μαγδαληνή); and, although some interpreters distinguish between these appellations, thus making four females in the enumeration instead of three, yet the insertion of the distinctive particle Kai, “and,” between each of the other terms, and its omission between these, must be understood to denote their identity. It is manifest, however, that no two sisters German would ever have the same name given to them, an unprecedented oversight that would produce continual confusion in the family; besides, the law did not allow a man to be married to two sisters at the same time (Lev 18:18), as Joseph in that case would have been; nor would either of these objections be obviated by supposing the two Marys to have been half- sisters. The only plausible conjecture is that they are called sisters (i.e. sisters-in-law), because of their marriage to two brothers, Cleophas and Joseph; a supposition that is strengthened by their apparent intimacy with each other, and their similar connection with Jesus intimated in Joh 19:25. Cleophas (or Alphaeus) seems to have been an elder brother of Joseph, and dying without issue, Joseph married his wife (probably before his marriage with the Virgin, as he seems to have been much older than she) according to the Levirate law (Deu 25:5); on which account his oldest son by that marriage is styled the (legal) son of Cleophas, as well as (reputed half-) brother of Jesus. SEE ALPHAEUS, MARY.

This arrangement meets all the statements of Scripture in the case, and is confirmed by the declarations of early Christian writers. (See No. 3, below.) The only objection of any force against such an adjustment is the statement, occurring towards the latter part of our Savior's ministry, that “neither did his brethren believe on him” (Joh 7:5), whereas two of them, at least, are in this way included among his disciples (namely, James and Jude, if not Simon); and, although they are mentioned in Act 1:14  as subsequently yielding to his claims, yet the language in Joh 7:7 seems too decisive to admit the supposition that those there referred to sustained so prominent a position as apostles among his converts.

A more likely mode of reconciling these two passages is to suppose that there were still other brothers besides those chosen as apostles, not mentioned particularly anywhere (perhaps only Joses and one younger), who did not believe on him until a very late period, being possibly convinced only by his resurrection. Indeed, if three of these brethren were apostles, the language in Act 1:13-14, requires such a supposition; for, after enumerating the eleven' (including, as usual, James, Simon, and Jude), that passage adds, “tamed with his brethren.” Whether these mentioned brothers (as indeed may also- be said of the sisters, an/d perhaps of Simon) were the children of Mary, Cleophas's widow, or of the Virgin Mary, is uncertain; yet in the expression “her first-born son,” applied to Jesus (Luk 2:7), as well as in the intimation of temporary abstinence only in Mat 1:25, there seems to be implied a reference to other children SEE VIRGIN; but, be that as it may, there can be no good reason given why such should not have been the case; we may therefore conjecture that while James, Simon, Jude, and Joses were Joseph's children by Cleophas's widow, and the first three were of sufficient age to be chosen apostles, all the others were by the Virgin Mary, and among them only some sisters were of sufficient age and notoriety at Christ's second visit to Nazareth to be specified by his townsmen (Mat 13:55; Mar 6:3), Joses and the children of the Virgin generally being the “brethren” that did not believe in Jesus till late (Joh 7:5; Act 1:14). SEE JUDE.

To the objection that if the Virgin had had other children, especially sons (and still more, a half-son, James, older than any of them), she would not have gone to live with the apostle John, a comparative stranger, it may be replied that they may have been still too young (except James, who was already charged with the care of his own mother), or otherwise not suitably circumstanced to support her; and if it had been otherwise, still the express direction of Jesus, her eldest. son, would have decided her residence with “the beloved disciple,” who was eminently fitted, as Christ's favorite, no less than by his amiable manner? and comparative affluence, to discharge that duty. SEE JOHN. (See Meth. Quart. Rev. Oct. 1851, p. 670-672.) See on the No. 3, below.

There have been three principal theories on the subject:

1. For the identity of James, the Lord's brother, with James the apostle, the son of Alphaeus, we find (see Routh, Reliq. Sacr. 1, 16, 43, 230  [Oxon. 1846]) Clement of Alexandria (Hypotyposeis, bk. 7, apud Eusebius, H. E. 1, 12; 2, 1) and Chrysostom (in Gal 1:19). This hypothesis, being warmly defended by St. Jerome (in Mat 12:49) and supported by St. Augustine (Contra Faust. 22, 35, etc.), became the recognized belief of the Western Church.

2. Parallel with this opinion, there existed another in favor of the hypothesis that James was the son of Joseph by a former marriage, and therefore not identical with the son of Alpheus. This is first found in the apocryphal Gospel of Peter (see Origen, in Mat 13:55), the Protevangelium of James, and the Pseudo-Apostolical Constitution of the 3rd century (Thilo, Cod. Apocr. 1, 228; Const. Apost. 6:12). It is adopted by Eusebius (Comm. inl Esai. 17:6; H. E. 1, 12; 2, 1). Perhaps it is Origen's opinion (see Comm. in Joh 2:12). St. Epiphanius, St. Hilary, and St. Ambrose we have already mentioned as being on the same side. So are Victorinus (Vict. Phil. in Gal. apud laii Script. yet. nov. coll. [Romm, 1828]) and Gregory Nyssen (Olp. 2, 844, D. [Paris ed. 1618)], and it became the recognized belief of the Greek Church.

3. The Helvidian hypothesis, put forward at first by Bonosus, Helvidius, and Jovinian, and revived by Herder and Strauss in Germany, is that James, Joses, Jude, Simon, and the sisters were all children of Joseph and Mary, while James the apostle and James the son of Alphaeus (whether one or two persons) were different from, and not alin with these “brothers and sisters” of our Lord. English theological writers have been divided between the first and second of these views, with, however, a preference on the whole for the first hypothesis. See, e.g. Lardner, 6. 495 (London, 1788); Pearson, Minor Works, 1, 350 (Oxf. 1844), and On the Creed, 1, 308; 2, 224 (Oxford, 1833); Thorndike, 1, 5 (Oxf. 1844); Horne's Introd. to I. S. 4:427 (Lond. 1834), etc. On the same side are Lightfoot, Witsits, Lampe, Baumgarten, Semler, Gabler. Eichhorn, Hug, Bertholdt, Guericke, Schneckenburger, Meier. Steiger, Gieseler, Theile. Lange, Taylor (01. 5, 20 [London, 1849]),Wilson (Op. 6, 673 [Oxf. 1859]), and Cave (Life of St. James) maintain the second hypothesis with Vossius, Basnage, Valesius, etc. The third is held by Dr. Davidson (Introd. New Test. vol. 3) and by Dean Alford (Greek Test. 4:87). Our own position, it will be perceived, combines parts of each of these views, maintaining with  (1) the identity of the two Jameses, with (2) the Levirate marriage of Joseph and the widow of Alphneus, and with (3) that these were all the children of Joseph and in part of Mary.

SEE JAMES, EPISTLE OF (below).

3. JAMES, THE BROTHER OF THE LORD (ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίον [Gal 1:19]). Whether this James is identical with the son of Alphaeus is a question which Dr. Neander pronounces to be the most difficult in the apostolic history; it may be well, therefore, to consider more particularly under this head the arguments that have been urged in support of the negative. We read in Mat 13:55, “Is not his mother called Mary, and his brethren James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas?” and in Mar 6:3,” Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary and brother of James and Joses, and of Judah and Simon? and are not his sisters here with us?” Those critics who suppose the terms of affinity in these and parallel passages to be used in the laxer sense of near relations have remarked that in Mar 15:40 mention is made of “Mar, the mother of James the Less and of Joses;” and that in Joh 19:25 it is said “there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother and his mother's sister, Mary, the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene;” they therefore infer that the wife of Cleophas is the same as the sister of the mother of Jesus, and consequently that James (supposing Cleophas and Alphaus to be the same name, the former according to the Hebrew, the latter according to the Greek orthography) was a first cousin of our Lord, and on that account termed his brother, and that the other individuals called the brethren of Jesus stood in the same relation. It is also urged that in the Acts, after the death of James, the son of Zebedee, we read only of one James; and, moreover, that it is improbable that our Lord would have committed his mother to the care of the beloved disciple had there been sons of Joseph living, whether the offspring of Mary or of a former marriage. Against this view it has been alleged that in. several early Christian writers, James, the brother of the Lord, is distinguished from the son of Alphaeus, that the identity of the names Alphaeus and Cleophas is somewhat uncertain, and that it is doubtful whether the words “his mother's sister,” in Joh 19:25, are to be considered in apposition with those immediately following-” Mary, the wife of Cleophas,” or intended to designate a different individual, since it is highly improbable that two sisters should have had the same name. Wieseler (Studien und Kritiken, 1840, 3:648) maintains that not three, but  four persons are mentioned in this passage; and that, since in Mat 27:56, and Mar 15:40, besides Mary of Magdala, and Mary, the mother of James and Joses, Salome also (or the mother of the sons of Zebedee) is named as present at the Crucifixion, it follows that she must have been the sister of our Lord's mother. But, even allowing that the sons of Alphaeus were related to our Lord, the narrative in the Evangelists and the Acts presents some reasons for suspecting that they were not the persons described as “the brethren of Jesus.”

(1.) The brethren of Jesus are associated with his mother in a manner that strongly indicates their standing in the filial relation to her (Mat 12:46; Mar 3:31; Luk 8:19; Mat 13:56, where “sisters” are also mentioned); they appear constantly together as forming one family (John 2, 12): “After this he went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brethren, and his disciples” (Kuinoel, Comment. in Mat 12:46).

(2.) It is explicitly stated that at a period posterior to the appointment of the twelve apostles, among whom we find “the son of Alphseus,” “neither did his brethren believe in him” (Joh 7:5; Lücke's Comment.). Attempts, indeed, have been made by Grotius and Lardner to dilute the force of this language, as if it meant merely that their faith was imperfect or wavering-” that they did not believe as they should;” but the language of Jesus is decisive: “My time is not yet come, but your time is always ready; the world cannot hate you, but me it hateth” (compare this with Joh 15:18-19 : “If the world hate you,” etc.). As to the supposition that what is affirmed in John's Gospel might apply to only some of his brethren, it is evident that, admitting the identity, only one brother of Jesus would be left out of the “company of the apostles.”

(3.) Luke's language in Act 1:13-14, is opposed to the identity in question; for, after enumerating the apostles, among whom, as usual, is “James, the son of Alphneus,” he adds, “they all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication with the women, and Mary, the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren.” From this passage, however, we learn that by this time his brethren had received him as the Messiah. That after the death of the son of Zebedee we find only one James mentioned, may easily be accounted for on the ground that probably only one, “the brother of the Lord,” remained at Jerusalem; and, under such circumstances, the silence of the historian respecting the son of Alphieus is not more strange than respecting several of the other apostles, whose names never occur after the  catalogue in Act 1:13. Paul's language in Gal 1:19 has been adduced to prove the identity of the Lord's brother with the son of Alphmeus by its ranking him among the apostles, but others contend that it is by no means decisive (Winer, Grammatik, 4th edit., p. 517; Neander, History of the Planting, etc., 2, 5 [ Engl. translation]). Dr. Niemeyer (Charakteristik der Bibel, 1, 399 [Halle, 1830]) enumerates not less than five persons of this name, by distinguishing the son of Alphaeus from James the Less, and assuming that the James last mentioned in Act 1:13 was not the brother, but the father of Judas. Amidst this great disagreement of views (see in Winer's Realwr. s.v. Jacobus; Davidson's Introd. to the N.T. 3, 302 sq.; Horne's Introduction, new ed. 4:591, n.; Princeton Review, Jan. 1865), the most probable solution of the main question is that given above (No. 2), identifying James, the son of Alphaeus or Cleophas with one of the apostles, the literal brother of our Lord, and the son of Mary, the sister-in-law of the Virgin by virtue of the marriage of both with Joseph (but see Alford, Proleg. to vol. 4:pt. 1 of his Comment. p. 88 sq.). This Levirate explanation is summarily dismissed by Andrews (Life of our Lord, p. 108) and Mombert (in the Am. edit. of Lange's Commentary, introd. to epist. of James, p. 19) as “needing no refutation;” but, although conjectural, it is the only one that makes it possible for James to have been at once Christ's brother and yet the son of Alphaeus. If he was likewise the same with the son of Mary, the wife of Cleophas, the theory may be said to be demonstrated. Other treatises on the subject are Dr. Mill's Accounts of our Lord's Brethren Vindicated (Cambridge, 1843); Schaff, Das Verhaltniss des Jacobus, Bruders des Herrn, und Jacobus Alphai (Berlin, 1842); Gabler, De Jacobo, epistole eidems atscriptce auctaori (Altorf, 1787). For other monographs, see Volbeding, Index Progratmatum, p. 31.

If we examine the early Christian writers, we shall meet with a variety of opinions on this subject. Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiastes 2, 1) says that James, the first bishop of Jerusalem, brother of the Lord, son of Joseph, the husband of Mary, was surnamed the Just by the ancients on account of his eminent virtue. He uses similar language in his Evangelical Demonstration (3, 5). In his commentary on Isaiah he reckons fourteen apostles, viz. the twelve, Paul, and James, the brother of our Lord. A similar enumeration is made in the “Apostolic Constitutions” (6, 14). Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and Theophylact speak of James, the Lord's brother, as being the same as the son of Cleophas. They suppose that Joseph and Cleophas were brothers,  and that the latter dying without. issue, Joseph married his widow for his first wife, according to the Jewish custom, and that James and his brethren were the offspring of this marriage (Lardner's Credibility, 2, 118; Works, 4:548; 1, 163; 5, 160; Hist. of. Heretics, ch. 12 § 11; Works, 8:527; Supplement to the Credibility, ch. 17, Works, 6:188). A passage from Josephus is quoted by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 2, 23), in which James, the brother of “him who is called Christ,” is mentioned (Ant. 20:9, 1); ‘but in the opinion of Dr. Lardner and other eminent critics, this clause is an interpolation (Lardner's Jewish Testimonies, ch. 4; Works, 6:496). That James was formally appointed bishop of Jerusalem by the Lord himself, as reported by Epiphanius (Haeres. 78), Chrysostom (Hom. 11 in 1 Coa. 2), Proclus of Constantinople (De Trad. Div. Liturg.), and Photius (Ep. 157), is not likely. Eusebius follows this account in a passage of his history, but says elsewhere that he was appointed by the apostles (V. Eccl. 2, 23). Clement of Alexandria is the first author who speaks of his episcopate (Hypotyposeis, bk. 6, apud Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 2, 1), and he alludes to it as a thing of which the chief apostles, Peter, James, and John, might well have been ambitious. The same Clement reports that the Lord, after his resurrection, delivered the gift of knowledge to James the Just, to John, and Peter, who delivered it to the rest of the apostles, and they to the seventy. These views of the leadership of James in the college of the apostles agree with the account in Acts (Act 9:27; Act 12:17; Act 15:13; Act 15:19). According to Hegesippus (a converted Jew of the 2nd century) James, the brother of the Lord, undertook the government of the Church along with the apostles (μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων).

He describes him as leading a life of ascetic strictness, and as held in the highest veneration by the Jews (ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccles. 2, 23). But in the account he gives of his martyrdom some circumstances are highly improbable (see Routh, Religuice Sacrae, 1, 228), although the event itself is quite credible (A.D. 62). In the apocryphal Gospel according to the Hebrews, he is said to have been precipitated from a pinnacle of the Temple, then assaulted with stones, and at last dispatched by a blow on the head with a fuller's pole (Lardner's Supplement, ch. 16, Works, 8, 174; Neander, Planting, etc., 2, 9, 22). Epiphanius gives the same account that Hegesippus does, in somewhat different words, having evidently copied it for the most part from him. He adds a few particulars which are probably mere assertions or conclusions of his own (Haeres. 29, 4; 78, 13). He calculates that James must have been ninety-six years old at the time of his death, and adds (on the authority, as he says, of Eusebius, Clement, and others) that he wore the πέταλον on his forehead, in which  he probably confounds him with St. John (Polyc. apud Eusebius, Histor. Eccles. 5, 24. But see Cotta, De lain. pontf. App. Joan. Jac. et Marci [Tüb. 1755]). Gregory of Tours reports that he was buried, not where he fell, but on the Mount of Olives, in a tomb in which he had already buried Zacharias and Simon (De glor. mart. 1, 27). The monument-part excavation, part edifice which is now commonly known as the “Tomb of St. James,” is on the east side of the so-called Valley of Jehoshaphat. The tradition about the monument in question is that St. James took refuge there after the capture of Christ, and remained, eating and drinking nothing, until our Lord appeared to him on the day of his resurrection (see Quaresmius, etc., quoted in Tobler, Siloah, etc., p. 299). The legend of his death there seems to be first mentioned by Maundeville (A.D. 1320-: see Early Trav. p. 176). By the old travelers it is often called the “Church of St. James.” Eusebius tells us that his chair was preserved down to his time (on which see Heinichen's Excursus [Exc. Iliad Euseb. Hist. Ecc 7:19, vol. 4:p. 957, ed. Burton]). We must and a strange Talmudic legend which appears to relate to James. It is found in the Midrash Koheleth, or Commentary on Ecclesiastes, and also in the Tract Abodah Zarah of the Jerusalem Talmud. It is as follows: “R. Eliezer, the son of Dama, was bitten by a serpent, and there came to him Jacob, a man of Caphar Secama, to heal him by the name of Jesu, the son of Pandera; but R. Ismael suffered him not, saying, That is not allowed thee, son of Dama.' He answered,' Suffer me, and I will produce an authority against thee that is lawful,' but he could not produce the authority before he expired. And what was the authority? This: ‘Which if a man do, he shall live in them' (Lev 18:5). But it is not said that he shall die in them.” The son of Pandera is the name that the Jews have always given to our Lord when representing him as a magician. The same name is given in Epiphanius (Haeres. 78) to the grandfather of Joseph, and by John Damascene (De Fide Orth. 4:15) to the grandfather of Joachim, the supposed father of the Virgin Mary. For the identification of James of Secama (a place in Upper Galilee) with James the Just, see Mill (Historic. Criticism of the Gospel, p. 318, Camb. 1840). For the apocryphal works attributed to James, see JAMES, SPITRIOUS WRITINGS OF.

## James I of England and VI of Scotland[[@Headword:James I of England and VI of Scotland]]

             was the only offspring of Mary, queen of Scots, by her second husband, Henry Stuart, lord Darnley, who, through his father, Matthew Stuart, earl of Lennox, being descended from a daughter of James II, had some pretensions to the succession of the Scottish throne in case of Mary dying without issue. He was the grandson, as Mary was the granddaughter, of Margaret Tudor through whom the Scottish line claimed and eventually obtained the inheritance of the crown of England after the failure of the descendants of Henry VIII. The son of Mary and Darnley (or king Henry, as he was called after his marriage) was born in the castle of Edinburgh June 19,1566, and was baptized according to the Roman Catholic ritual in Stirling Castle December 17 following, by the names of Charles James. The murder of Darnley took place Feb. 18, 1567, and was followed by Mary's marriage with Bothwell on May 15 of the same year; her capture by the insurgent nobles, or Lords of the Congregation as they called themselves, at Carberry, on June 14; her consignment as a prisoner to the castle of Lochleven on the 17th, and her forced resignation of the crown on July 24, in' favor of her son, who was crowned at Stirling on the 28th as James VI, being then an infant of a little more than a year old. It was at this time that the final struggle was raging in Scot-land between the two great interests of the old and the new religion, which, besides their intrinsic importance, were respectively identified with the French and the English alliance, and which, together with the old and the new distribution of the property of the kingdom, made the minority of James stormy beyond even the ordinary experience of Scottish minorities. Before his mother's marriage with Both we he had been committed by her to the care of the earl of Mar; and James's education was mainly entrusted to Mar's brother, Alexander Erskine, and other distinguished Scotch scholars, among whom figured most prominently the Protestant George Buchanan, a zealous adherent of the Presbyterian Church, During the minority of the young king, the earl of Morton had been assigned the regency; but Jamns's guardians being anxious to control themselves the affairs of state, in 1578 Morton was  driven from power, and James nominally assumed the direction ‘of affairs. Morton, however, soon succeeded, in re-establishing himself, and held the government for another short period, when he was finally deposed, and the young king again obtained the control of state affairs. — He was. at this time only twelve years of age, and was assisted by a council of twelve nobles. Once more great rejoicings were manifest throughout the land. All parties hailed the event as the inauguration of a new era, and to all it seemed to bring the prospects of power and prosperity.

Presbyterians relied on the early training of the prince; Romanists on the descendency of the young ruler, and, regarding his mother as in some sense a martyr to their cause, supposed that it would naturally enough influence James to incline to, if not openly espouse Romanism. The pope wrote pleasant letters to the young monarch, and Jesuits were dispatched with all haste to serve, in the garb of Puritans, the cause of Rome. The greater, then, was the discontent among his Roman Catholic subjects when James showed predilections for the Presbyterian Church. Shortly after his accession, the “Book of Policy,” which up to our day remains the guide of the Scottish Church in ecclesiastical government and other affairs of a similar nature, was issued. Another very important step taken was the publication of a confession of faith by the General Assembly, which the king approved and swore to (comp. Sack, Church of Scotland, 2, 5 sq.). New presbyteries were established throughout the realm, and it seemed as if the Puritans were to be the only favorites, when, on a sudden, by a successful conspiracy of a party of nobles, James was imprisoned, with the endeavor to force him to more favorable actions in behalf of his Roman Catholic subjects. The whole affair is known in English history as the “Raid of Ruthven.” A counterplot in 1583 secured the freedom of the monarch, but from henceforth a new policy was inaugurated, in which he was wholly controlled by the nobles of his court. In 1584 five resolutions were published, known as the “black resolutions,” which aimed at the total abrogation of the Presbyterian Church. Severe persecutions followed, and it seemed for a time as if James had actually turned to Romanism. After the death of his mother, Elizabeth courted the favor of James, and a treaty was finally concluded between them by which the two kingdoms bound themselves to an offensive and defensive alliance against all foreign powers who should invade their territories, or attempt to disturb the reformed religious establishments of either. This action, of course, at once favored the Protestant subjects of James; for his severity assumed towards them previous to this alliance was due, no doubt, to his endeavor to secure, in view of the persecution of his  mother by Elizabeth, an alliance with Spain, a strong Roman Catholic power. It was supposed that the execution of his mother would naturally drive him to an alliance with Spain, but James, although “he blustered at first under the sting of the insult that had been offered him,” was soon pacified, reflecting upon the necessity of a friendly relation with Elizabeth if he would maintain his chance for the English throne.

Accordingly, James lent his assistance to Elizabeth in the preparations to repel the attack of the Spanish armada. Still more gracious seemed the attitude of James towards the Puritans on his return from Norway (1589), whither he had gone to espouse princess Anne, the second daughter of Frederick II, king of Denmark. At the meeting of the General Assembly of the Presbyterians in 1590 he attended and spoke highly of their establishment, and in 1592 he caused, by an act of Parliament, the establishment of the Presbyterian Church as a national form of religion. This action the Scottish Church regarded as their true charter, but they soon learned that James had only favored them because outward circumstances had necessitated this course, and that inwardly he had changed to an avowed admirer of episcopacy, and inclined even towards popery; “so that the alliance of Church and State in this case was one of a very frangible nature.” To make matters worse, both parties cherished the loftiest opinions of their poalers and rights. Various unsuccessful treasonable attempts against the government had kept the people in a high pressure of excitement, and when it was ascertained that these attempts were supported, if not instigated, by the court and nobility of Spain, having for their especial object the intimidation of the irresolute monarch, and the re-establishment of Romanism, first in Scotland, and finally in England also, the people desired the severe punishment of the traitors. James, however, inflicted only a very mild punishment, and the dissatisfied multitude began loudly to condemn the policy of their king. The Church also criticized James's course, and a contest ensued that assumed very much the appearance of the commencement of a civil war. Nearly all the aristocracy and the upper classes, however, were with the king; and by an unusual exertion of vigor and firmness, very seldom manifested in his personal history, James was enabled not only completely to crush the insurrection, but to turn the occasion to account in bringing the Church into full subjection to the civil authority. In the course of the following year, 1598, the substance of episcopacy, which James by this time had come to espouse openly, and in which lie was governed by the maxim “No bishop, no king,” was restored, in a political sense, by seats in Parliament being given to about fifty  ecclesiastics on the royal nomination. Even the General Assembly was gained over to acquiesce in this great constitutional change.

By the death of Elizabeth in 1603 James finally reached the object for which he had striven for many years, and which had induced him even to court the favor of the murderer of his own mother. On March 24 he succeeded to the throne of England, and by virtue of this act became spiritual head of the Church of England. “That Church had already enjoyed the honor of having the grossest of voluptuaries for its supreme head; it was now to enjoy the honor of having the greatest liar, and one of the greatest drunkards of his age, in the same position” (Skeats). As in the Church of Scotland the contest had been waged between Romanists and Protestants for the favor of the throne, so in England the Established Church, the Episcopal, and the Puritans were arrayed against each other, and James was called upon to settle the dispute. Biased in favor of the episcopacy, James, however, decided on a conference of the two parties, anxious to display his “proficiency in theology,” and “determined on giving both sides an opportunity of applauding his polemical skill, and making his chosen line of conduct at least appear to result from partial inquiry” (Baxter, Engl. Ch. History, p. 550).

As yet no separation had taken place, neither had the Puritans even renounced episcopacy, nor did they question regal supremacy; they only objected to being bound against the dictates of their conscience to the observance of certain performances; they desired purity of doctrine, good pastors, a reform in Church government and in the Book of Common Prayer; in short., a removal of all usages which savored of Romanism. A conference (q.v.) was consequently assembled at Hampton Court in January, 1604, and the points of difference discussed in James's presence, he himself taking, as might have been expected, a conspicuous and most undignified part. “Church writers, in dealing with this subject, have felt compelled to employ language of shame and indignation at the conduct of the king and the bishops of this period, which a Nonconformist would almost hesitate to use” (Skeats). On the episcopal side appeared archbishop Whitgift, assisted by bishops Bancroft, Bilson, and others; on the side of the Puritans appeared four divines, headed by the celebrated Dr. Reynolds, at that time president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. “It is obvious, from the whole proceedings, that the conference was summoned for a purpose opposed to its ostensible aim. It was not intended to bring the two parties in the Church-into harmony, but to give occasion for casting out one of them” (Skeats). The attitude of the king  pleased the churchmen, and “the prelates accepted him with devout gratitude. The more his character became revealed to them, the greater was their satisfaction. When he al most swore at the Puritans, Whitgift declared that his majesty spoke by the especial assistance of God's Spirit (comp. Baxter, Ch. Hist. of England, p. 559), and Bancroft that he was melted with joy, for that, since Christ's time, such a king had not been.

When he driveled they held up their hands in amaze at his wisdom.” Indeed, it seems that “the two parties fully understood each other. James had quite sufficient cunning to detect the ambitious designs of the prelates, and the prelates had sufficient learning, and sufficient knowledge of the theory of morals, to know that they were dealing with a dissembler and a fool. But it served their purposes to play into each other's hands. The king could put down Puritanism in the Church, and ‘Harry' all Brownists and Anabaptists out of the land, and the bishops, in their turn, could exalt the supremacy of the monarch” (Skeats). But, as if the ungenerous and ungracious action of the king had not yet reached the climax, the Hampton Court Conference Convocation met in the year following, and framed a new set of canons to insure conformity. “These laws-laws so far as the clergy are concerned-- still deface the constitution and character of the English Episcopalian Church.... They are now little else than monuments of a past age of intolerance, and of the combined immobility and timidity of the ecclesiastical establishments of the present day. Old bloodhounds of the Church, with their teeth drawn and their force exhausted, they are gazed at with as much contempt as they once excited fear” (Skeats). Baxter (p. 563) says of these laws, “Some of them have become obsolete, others inoperative through counter legislation; but no consistent clergyman can forget that they constitute the rule of his pledged obedience, although there may be cases in which attention to the spirit rather than the letter will best insure the object of their enactment.” But some good sprang also from the Hampton Court Conference; results which none probably had anticipated. “Reynolds, the Puritan, had suggested a new translation of the Bible by his majesty's special sanction and authority. The vanity of the king was touched, and the great work was ordered to be executed.” SEE ENGLISH VERSIONS.

But what, perhaps, decided him in his course, if decision could ever become manifest in the actions of James I, to identify himself wholly with the Episcopalians, was the gunpowder plot (q.v.), which was maturing about this time (1604-5). It exterminated in James the last vestiges of favor for Romanism when he found that from Rome he never could expect anything but a death-warrant unless the English Church changed to a  Roman Catholic State Church. And if James had declared in Parliament in 1604 “that he had never any intention of granting toleration to the Catholics,” he could now be justified in adding “that he would drive every one of them from the land,” as he did threaten to do towards all Nonconformists. As if the conspiracy, which had fortunately failed, was not worthy the censure even of Rome. but deserved commendation, one of the principal leaders, the Jesuit Garnet, was even canonized by the Roman court, of course not openly on the strength of his assistance in the diabolical project, but “L on the faith of a pretended miracle, his face having, it was said been seen in a straw sprinkled with his blood.” Thus Rome “did its very best to identify, or at least to confound, one of the most diabolical projects ever conceived, with the evidences of transcendent sanctity” (Baxter, p. 565), and for Rome's treachery the honest Puritans of England were made to suffer. The policy of the king (who by this time had assumed the title of king of Great Britain) was, however, not to be confined to England. In Scotland also the power of the Puritans was to be utterly broken, and the episcopate to be re-established. In August, 1606, a Parliament was held at Perth which had this object in view, and the decision arrived at, by a union of the nobility and the prelatic faction, to erect seventeen bishoprics, and to bestow on these newly-created prelates the benefices, honors, and privileges heretofore awarded to those of the Roman Catholic Church. After having properly disposed of the leaders of the Scottish Church, a General Assembly was unconstitutionally convened at Linlithgow on Dec. 10, 1606. As most of the synods opposed its acts, new persecutions were the issue. Feb. 16, 1610, the king established two ecclesiastical tribunals, to be presided over by the two archbishops, and designated these tribunals as “Courts of High Commission,” uniting the two shortly after their establishment.

This ecclesiastical tribunal, a sort of Inquisition, combined the attributes of a temporal and spiritual tribunal; but it was bound to no definite laws, and was armed with the united terrors of civil and ecclesiastical despotism. On June 8, 1610, a meeting was finally held at Glasgow, and there, b means of bribes, which are said to have reached the not inconsiderable sum of £300,000 sterling, the prelatic measures were carried, and all opposition nominally overcome. But the people by no means seemed ready to coincide with the opinion of the king, and many were the disturbances that prevailed throughout the land. Whatever work had to be done to further the royal schemes was done quietly, and no General Assembly met until August, 1616, this time held at Aberdeen, and especially celebrated in the history of Scotland by the issue  of a new confession of faith projected by the prelatic party, and which, although tolerably orthodox, was remarkably at variance with the discipline of the Established Church. Affairs assumed another and more serious turn in the summer of 1617, when James, on a visit which he paid to Scotland, succeeded, though not without great difficulty, in securing from Parliament, which he had newly summoned, as well as from the General Assembly, the approbation of such regulations as, along with other innovations previously made since his accession to the throne of England, brought the Scottish Church-in government, in ceremonies, and in its position in relation to the civil power-very nearly to the model of the ecclesiastical establishment of England. Change, however, as the king might, the constitution and ordinances, almost without number, published again and again, public opinion by no means altered even for a moment, and the 19th century still finds Scotland true to her Puritanical notions of the 16th century. The king had succeeded in securing the adoption of the “five articles of Perth” (q.v.); he had succeeded in suppressing the Scotch Presbyterian Church, but he failed to conquer it.

In England, also, the shortsighted policy of James now brought distrust and discredit. The execution of Raleigh and the denial of assistance to the Protestant Bohemians, both sacrifices to the court of Spain, the latter even at the expense of his son-in-law, whom the Bohemians had chosen for their king, hardly justify Baxter in the statement that king James's object was the consolidation of the Protestant interests, and that “his treatment of the Puritans was marked by a leniency strongly contrasting with the more vigorous course adopted by his predecessors, and naturally occasioning a difference of opinion as to its wisdom and propriety”. (p. 568). If toleration was the policy of James I, it did not manifest itself against the Independents, who,” after repeated and fruitless applications for toleration” (Baxter, p. 572), were obliged to go to distant lands to find a place where they could follow the dictates of their conscience. Certainly the state did not pay the expenses of these pilgrim fathers in 1619 because they were Puritans, but simply because they were likely to settle and to cultivate land otherwise almost worthless. In 1624 James was finally driven, both by the opposition of Parliament to his policy in seeking a closer alliance with Spain and by the clamor of the people for a war with that country, to dispatch an army into Germany to recover his son-in-law's possessions. But, as if his measure of tribulation was not yet full, this enterprise proved a total failure, and brought discredit upon the English name. The king also  assumed a ridiculous attitude on the question of the observance of the Sabbath. Roman Catholicism is wont to look upon Sunday as a holiday; the Puritans, however, desired it observed as a Christian day of rest. To counteract these efforts, James published a “Book of Sports,” advising the people that Sunday was not to be a day mainly for religious rest and worship, but of games and revels (Skeats, p. 47). SEE SABBATARIAN CONTROVERSY.

This reign, so detrimental to the interests of the English and Scottish State and the Church of Christ, were finally brought to a termination by the death of James, March 27, 1625. Severe as may have been some of the historians who have written the fate of this king, none can be said to have exaggerated the many despicable features of his character; and we need not-wonder that his vacillating course towards his subjects, favoring first the Puritans, then the Episcopalians; tightening first the reins, and then loosening them against the Romanists-all inspired, not by the true spirit of toleration, but by artful designs, well enable us to repeat of him Macaulay's judgment, that James I was “made up of two men-a witty, well-read scholar, who wrote, disputed, and harangued, and a nervous, driveling idiot who acted.”

James I was a voluminous writer, and, though he was far from deserving the surname which the flattery of his contemporaries accorded him, “Solomon the Second,” he was certainly not wholly destitute of literary ability, and, had he pursued a literary life instead of governing a state, it is barely possible that he might have earned a much higher position among his fellow beings. It brings to mind the prophetic utterance of his tutor, that James was better fitted to be a scholar than a ruler. The writings of James which deserve mention here are, Fruitful Meditation upon a part of the Revelation of St. John (Lond. 1588): — Daemonologia, a dialogue in three books in defense of the belief in Witches (Lond. 1597, 4to); and yet the king withal hesitated not to punish his subjects for a like faith: — Βα. — (ΤΚΞτΧβ Αωποᾷ; instructions to his son Henry (who died Nov. 6, 1612), in which James laid down his opinions on the power of the throne over the State and Church, and which, for the doctrines it contained on Church government, was censured as libelous by the Synod of St. Andrew's (Lond. 1599): — Triplici Nodo Triplex Caneus, an apology for the oath of allegiance that ‘James exacted of his Roman Catholic subjects, which was answered by cardinal Bellarmine, and produced a long controversy and many other publications on both sides, for an account of which, see a note by Dr. Birch in the Appendix to. Harris's Life of James: — Protestatio  Antivorstia, in qua rex suam exponit sententiam de confederatorum ordinum effectu et actis in catusa Vorstii (London, 1612), the successor of Arminius as professor of ‘divinity at the University of Leyden, whom he accused of heresy, SEE VOSTIUS, etc. A complete edition of his works was published in folio (London, 1616), and a Latin translation by bishop Mountague in 1619. A more complete edition was published at Frankfort on the Main in folio in 1689. He is also said to have written a metrical version of the Psalms, completed up to ‘the 31st Psalm (Oxf. 1631, 12mo). See James Welwood, Memoirs of the most material Transactions in England for the last 100 Years preceding the Revolution (London, 1700, 8vo); Peyton, Divine Catastrophe of Kingly Family of the House of Stuart (1731, 8vo); Wilson, Life and Reign of King James I (1653, fol., and reprinted in Bp. Kennet's Complete History, vol. 2); Lingard, History of England, vols. 8 and 9; Baxter, Ch. Hist. ch. xiii; Collier, Eccles. Hist.; Hallam, Constit. Hist. (see Index); Raumer, Gesch. v. Europe, vol. 5; Rudloff, Gesch. d. Reformation in Scotland, vol. 1; Soame, Elizabethan History, p. 515 sq.; Skeats, History of the Free Churches of England, p. 35 sq.; Hunt (the Rev. John), Religious Thought in England (Lond. 1870, 8vo), vol. 1, ch. 2 and 3; English Cyclop. s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6:381 sq. SEE ENGLAND (CHURCH OF); SEE PURITANS. (J. H.W.)

## James II Of England And VII Of Scotland[[@Headword:James II Of England And VII Of Scotland]]

             son of Charles I and Henrietta Maria; was born October 15, 1633. In 1643 he was created duke of York. In 1648, during the civil war, which resulted in the decapitation of his father, he made his escape to Holland, and thence to France, where his mother resided. The early education of the duke of York. had, by the wish of his father, been entrusted to Protestants, but his mother, a bigoted Romanist, now improved her opportunity, and the young prince was surrounded by Roman Catholic influences, and, to be more readily inclined to Popery, was assured that the unfortunate end of his father was due only to his strict adherence to Protestantism, and that no prince could hold the reins of government successfully who was not supported by Rome. In 1652 he ‘entered the French army under general Turenne, and served in it until the peace concluded with Cromwell (October,. 1655) obliged James to quit the territory of Louis XIV. He was then offered a position in the army of Spain, which he accepted.'

At the Restoration (May, 1660) he returned to England, and was immediately made lord high admiral of England. In the ensuing wars with Holland (1664-1672), which are generally supposed to have been instigated by this  prince and his brother for the especial purpose of crushing the Dutch as a Protestant people, and to disable them from interfering with the re- establishment of popery in England, to which they themselves inclined, he twice commanded the English fleet. and was eminently successful. In 1660 he married Anne, daughter of Lord Chancellor Hyde, and the reason generally assigned for this act is that the lady was far gone with child when the marriage was contracted. But she lived only a few years (she died March 31, 1671), suffering, it is' supposed, from neglect, if not the positive ill-usage of her husband, who, not withstanding his professions of zeal for religion, indulged in a large share of the reigning licentiousness and kept a mistress almost from the date of his marriage. A few months before her death the duchess had signed a declaration of her reconciliation to the ancient religion (Romanism, of course), and shortly afterward the duke also publicly avowed his conversion to popery, an act which, although his concealed inclinations had been long suspected, did not fail to create a great sensation, especially as, from his brother's want of issue, he was now looked upon as Charles's probable successor to the throne of England. On the passage, in the beginning of 1673, of the Test Act, which required all officers, civil and military, to receive the sacrament according to the usage of the Established Church, the duke was, of course, obliged to resign the command of the fleet and the office of lord high admiral. These duties were, however, assigned to a board of commissioners, consisting of his friends and dependants, so that he still virtually remained at the head of the naval affairs. On Nov. 21, 1673, he married again; this time a Roman Catholic princess, Mary Beatrix Eleanora, daughter of Alphonso IV, duke of Modena, a lady then only in her fifteenth year.

During the great irritation against the Roman Catholics which followed the publication of the Titus Oates (q.v.) popish plot in 1678-79, the duke of York, by the advice of king Charles II, quitted England and took up his residence on the Continent. While he was absent efforts were made to exclude him from the throne, which would have been successful had not Parliament suddenly been prorogued (May 27, 1679). In 1680 he returned again to England, but so great was the opposition towards him that Charles was obliged to send him down to govern Scotland. The odium in which the duke of York now stood among the English was further manifest by a second attempt to pass in Parliament a bill excluding him from the right of succession to the throne, which again failed by another prorogation of the council of the nation. This time, no doubt, the effort was mainly the result  of the discreditable relation which the prince sustained towards the Meal- tub Plot, an attempt on the part of his co-religionists to counteract-and in this they were grievously disappointed-the effect of the Titus Oates plot discoveries.

In 1682, when Charles was involved in difficulties with his concubine, the duke of York was invited over, and he improved the opportunity, and knew so well how to make himself an indispensable counselor of his brother, that, in spite of the Test Act he became (much more than Charles himself) “the mainspring and director of the conduct of public affairs.” On the death of Charles II, Feb. 6, 1685, he succeeded to the throne, strangely enough, without the least opposition. His pledge to the people was, “I shall make it my endeavor to preserve this government, both in Church and State, as it is now by law established,” a declaration which seemed rather necessary from a disciple of popery. It must, however, also be acknowledged that James II “began his reign with a frank and open profession of his religion, for the first Sunday after his accession he went publicly to mass, and obliged father Huddleston, who attended his brother in his last hours, to declare to the world that he died a Roman Catholic” (Neale, Puritans, Harper's edition, 2, 315).

But if the people, though hesitatingly, yet tacitly, submitted tot the freedom of the king' to worship according to the dictates of his conscience, and even suffered Romanism, the very name of which, just at this time, was despised by nearly every English subject, to claim their ruler for its convert, yet his display of the theory that a king was not subject to the criticisms of his people--in short, his theory of absolute supremacy soon aroused the nation from their lethargy, though it did not at once appear that the community would ever seek to relieve itself from the calamity which it had just incurred. Greater still became the anxiety of the nation when it appeared that, “in spite of his own solemn engagements to govern constitutionally, and heedless of ominous intimations which reached him, in the shape of addresses, that the religion of his subjects was dearer to them than their lives, he proceeded to carry out his projects with a recklessness amounting to infatuation” (Baxter, Ch. Hist. p. 637). Right in his first measures, king James showed, says Hume (Hist. of England, Harper's edition, 6:286), “that either he was not sincere in his professions of attachment to the laws, or that he entertained so lofty an idea of his own legal power that even his utmost sincerity would tend very little to secure the liberties of the people.” Not satisfied with his avowed confession of Romanism, he even made unnecessary and offensive displays of his religious principles and thereby greatly wounded the pride of his subjects.

The mass was openly celebrated  with great pomp at Westminster in Passion Week of this year (1685); an agent was sent to Rome to announce the king's submission to the so-called vicar of Christ; a close alliance was entered into with France; and it was even generally hinted that “the Church of England was in principle so closely allied to the Roman Catholic that it would not be difficult to prepare the way for the readmission of the English into the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church” (comp. Sir John Dalrymple, Memoirs of Great Britain, Append. pt. 1, p. 100-113; Fox, Hist. of early Part of the Reign of James 1 I). All this, too, was done at a time when “there was among the English a strong conviction that the Roman Catholic, where the interests of his religion were concerned, thought himself free from all the ordinary rules of morality; nay, that he thought it meritorious to violate those rules, if by so doing he could avert injury or reproach from the Church of which he was a member;” at a time when “Roman Catholic casuists of great eminence had written in defense of equivocation, of mental reservation, of perjury, and even of assassination,” and the fruits of this odious school of sophists were seen in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the murder of the first William of Orange, the murder of Henry III of France, the numerous conspiracies which had been formed against the life of Elizabeth, and, above all, the Gunpowder Plot, and when all these could constantly be cited “as instances of the close connection between vicious theory and vicious practice”-a series of crimes which, it was alleged, had every one of them been prompted or applauded by Roman-Catholic priests (comp. Macaulay, Hist. of England, Harper's edit., 2, 5 sq.).

It was certainly sheer madness (and we need not wonder that the so-claimed successor of Peter even so declared it) to still further aggravate the opposition of his subjects by persecution for religious belief. Himself anxious to obtain for the members of his own confession complete toleration, which, after all, was only “natural and right,” it seems simply preposterous to find him persecuting the Puritans. ‘Almost immediately after his accession to the throne James II convoked the Parliament of Scotland, where the majority of the population was firmly attached to the Presbyterian discipline, and where prelacy was abhorred “as an unscriptural and as a foreign institution,” and demanded new laws against the unruly Presbyterians, who already “closely associated the episcopal polity with all the evils produced by twenty-five years of corrupt and cruel misadministration.” In a slavish spirit, the Scottish Parliament complied with the royal request, forbidding under the death penalty preaching in any Presbyterian conventicle whatever, and even attendance on such a conventicle in the open air (May  8, 1685). — A short time after, the Parliament of England also was convoked (May 19), which, as readily as the Scottish, complied with the demands of the king, but, to his great sorrow, nevertheless evinced the possibility of opposition to popery, for which he was anxious to secure concessions.

But while both Parliaments were thus slavishly submitting to the wishes of the absolutist, the countries were invaded, and this afforded the king a favorable pretext for the introduction of Romanists into the ranks of the army, in spite of the legal test of conformity to the Established Church which was required to be taken by every person filling any public office; and when, after a successful suppression of the insurrectionary attempts, the king reassembled Parliament in November, he not only stated that these Roman' Catholics would now be continued, but requested extra supplies for the increase of the army, evidently for the purpose of adding largely men of his own confession to the rank and file of the army; and when the people seemed unwilling to grant this request, the king peremptorily prorogued Parliament, after it had sat a little more than a week. James, however, was determined to continue the policy initiated, and ordered patents to be made out under the great seal for every Roman Catholic officer that he had appointed, and upon the same principle continued the benefices of some Protestant divines who claimed to have been converted to Romanism. Quite different continued to be his dealings with the dissenters. Everywhere they were made to feel “the weight of the arm of the conqueror,” especially in the provinces that had lately been subject to invasion, to which the Papists, as well as High-Churchmen, claimed that dissenters had lent their aid. “Thus were the Nonconformists ground between the Papists on the one hand and the High-Church clergy on the other, while the former made their advantage of the latter, concluding that when the dissenters were destroyed, or thoroughly exasperated, and the clergy divided among themselves, they should be a match for the hierarchy, and capable of establishing that religion which they had been so long aiming to introduce” (Neale, Puritans, 2, 319). Roman Catholic churches were everywhere opened, Jesuits and regular priests came in numbers from abroad, schools were opened under their control in the English metropolis even, men were forbidden to speak disrespectfully of the king's religion, and all seemed turning in favor of Rome, when at length the eyes of the clergy of the State Church were opened, and they deemed it high time to preach against the dangerous tendencies.

An open rupture with the State Church had become inevitable; for the king, haying been made acquainted with the position which the clergy of the Church of  England had taken to recover the people, who were deserting their churches in numbers, and to rescue the Protestant religion from the danger into which it had fallen, sent circular letters to the bishops, accompanying them with an order to prohibit the inferior clergy from preaching on the controverted points of religion. It could not be otherwise than that these persevering attempts of his against the established religion, as well as upon the law of the land, should eventually involve him in a dispute with the Episcopalians, to be productive of the most important consequences. Finding that to carry his schemes in favor of Romanism he must strengthen himself by the opponents of the State Church, he suddenly, in the beginning of April, 1687, published the famous Declaration of Indulgence, a paper at once suspending and dispensing with all the penal laws against dissenters, and all tests, including even the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, heretofore required of persons appointed to offices civil or military; but at the same time he repeated his promise, “already often repeated and often violated, that he would protect the Established Church in the enjoyment of her legal rights.” At first the dissenters hailed the seeming approach of a new sera, and great were the rejoicings in behalf of a declaration which secured them liberty of conscience, and threw open the doors of the prison that had so long barred them; and the king felt not a little encouraged in his new-chosen course when addresses came to him from some of the dissenters (though they afterwards proved to have represented only a small faction; comp. Neale, Puritans, 2, 328).

Emboldened, he immediately showed his predilections for his own Church.' In Ireland, all places of power under the crown were put into the hands of Romanists. The earl of Castlemaine was at the same time publicly sent as ambassador extraordinary to Rome to express the king's obeisance to the pope, and to effect the reconcilement of the kingdom with the “holy see.” In return the pope sent a nuncio to England, who resided openly in London during the remainder of the reign, and was solemnly received at court, in the face of the act of Parliament declaring any communication with the pope to be high treason. Four Roman Catholic bishops were consecrated in the king's chapel, and sent to exercise the episcopal function, each in his particular diocese. In Scotland and England, as well as in Ireland, offices of all kinds, both in the army and in the state, were now filled with Roman Catholics; even those of the ministers and others who had shown themselves disposed to go furthest along with the king were dismissed, or visibly lost his favor, if they refused to conform to the ancient religion. At last James's “eye was delighted with the aspect of catholicity imparted to his metropolis by the  spectacle of monks traversing its streets in the habits of their respective orders, he was gratified by the presence of an Italian prelate, D'Adda, as nuncio from the pope; and he entertained a sanguine hope of obtaining a Parliament elected under the new corporation charters, which should furnish a majority of his adherents, while the lords were to be swamped by a creation of peers compliant with his wishes.

The Nonconformists, he calculated, would support his views as long as their support would be important, and he was weak enough to imagine that his declaration of indulgence placed him in favorable contrast with the French monarch, to whose exiled Protestant subjects, since the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1684), England was affording its hospitality, not aware that his subjects were sufficiently acquainted with the genius and tactics of his religion to know that indulgence and persecution were but indifferent instruments for its propagation, adapted to the different circumstances of an ascendant or a declining Protestantismone and the same spirit actuating the sovereigns of France and of Great Britain, in pursuance of common religions, in subservience to similar political objects” (Baxter, Ch. Hist. p. 639). The dissenters, in particular, soon learned to comprehend the reality of the situation-that a league of the court and Romanism was dependent on their assistance for its success to overawe the Episcopalians and secure victory to popery; and when they did comprehend the scheme, “notwithstanding the renewed sufferings to which they might be exposed, they took part against it. . Independents, Baptists, and Quakers vied: with each other in showing them (the Episcopal clergy) their sympathy…. None of them-not even Penn (q.v.) —was in favor of the toleration of Roman Catholicism. No man who valued the civil liberties of England dreamed of giving a foothold to the professors of that intolerant creed. Three generations had not sufficed to wipe out the memory of its curse on England. Thousands still living could recollect the Vaudois massacres, and the streets of London were at that moment crowded with sufferers from the revocation of the Edict of Nantes” (Skeats, p. 83). The Nonconformists, almost as a body, refused to recognize the legality of the indulgence, mainly, of course, because they saw in the encroachment against the law a prerogative which, if not resisted, might lead ultimately to the establishment of popery as the religion of the state. But, whatever were the reasons of the dissenters the attempt of the king to gain their-support evidently failed, and it became daily more apparent that the war which the ring had opened with the Church must soon reach a climax. An attempt had already been made to compel the University of Cambridge to confer a  degree of Master of Arts on a Benedictine monk. This was not persevered in; but soon after, a vacancy having happened in the presidency of Magdalen College, Oxford, the vice-president and fellows were ordered by royal mandate to fill it up by the election of a person named Farmer, a late convert to popery for whom was afterwards substituted Parker, bishop of Oxford who avowed himself a Romanist at heart), and on their refusal were cited before an ecclesiastical commission and expelled. SEE HOUGH, JOHN (1).

Determined, if possible, to gain over the Nonconformists, whose aid he evidently needed to carry out successfully his projects, James published, April 27, 1688, a second declaration of indulgence to. dissenters, and commanded it to be read by the clergy immediately after divine service in all the churches of England. On this, Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, and six bishops-Lloyd of St. Asaph, Ken of Bath and Wells, Turner of Ely, Lake of Chichester, White of Peterborough, and Trelawney of Bristol-met in the archbishop's palace at Lambeth, May 18, and drew up a petition to the king, representing their aversion to obey the order, for many reasons, and especially because the declaration was founded upon such a dispensing power as Parliament had often declared illegal. For this they were all, June 8, sent to the Tower, on the charge of publishing a false; fictitious, malicious, pernicious, and seditious libel. The history of the trial, and the verdict of Not guilty by the jury, June 29, 1688, which the nation approved, and which was hailed by the whole kingdom as a great national triumph, forms one of the most glowing passages in the splendid narrative of Macaulay (2, 293). This defeat, however, in no degree checked for a moment the infatuated king. To quote the summary of Hume, “He struck out two of the judges, Powel and Holloway, who had appeared to favor the bishops; he issued orders to prosecute all those clergymen who had not read his declaration, that is, the whole Church of England, two hundred excepted; he sent a mandate to the new fellows whom he had obtruded on Magdalen College to elect for president, in the room of Parker, lately deceased, one Gifford, a doctor of the Sorboilne, and titular bishop of Madaura; and he is even said to have nominated the same person to the see of Oxford.” It was in the midst of this great contest with the Church and the nation that, June 10, a son was claimed to have been born to James, received, however, by the people with a strong suspicion that the child was supposititious, and that the queen had never been delivered or been pregnant at all. For this notion, however, it is now generally admitted that there was no good ground.

But the fact that a direct heir had been born, who, in all probability, would restore popery, in  which, no doubt, he would be instructed from earliest infancy, turned the Protestants' eyes towards James's son-in-law, the prince of Orange, “for the deliverance of their country from the perils with which it was threatened; and James, before the end of September, learned with consternation that his own son-in-law, in obedience to their call, was preparing to land upon his coasts.” On the night of the same day on which the seven prelates of the English Church had been pronounced not guilty, an invitation was dispatched to William, prince of Orange, signed by seven of the leading English politicians, to come over to England and occupy the throne, November 5, William landed at Torbay with 14,000 men. Vainly did James now attempt to regain his subjects' confidence by retracing his steps; no one would trust his promises, made in the hour of misfortune, and, finding himself deserted not only by the nation, but even by his own children, he retired to France, where he was hospitably received by his co- religionist and royal friend, Louis XIV, and obliged to live upon a pension settled upon him by the king of the French until his death, Sept. 6, 1701. For England his exit “effected a revolution (November, 1688) which has deserved the epithet of glorious, not less through its bloodless character than from its identification with those civil and religious liberties which it secured to every class of Englishmen.” See, besides the authorities cited under James I, Hetherington, Ch. of Scotland, 2, 146 sq.; Stoughton, Ecclesiastical Hist. of England (see Index); Macaulay, Hist. of England, vol. 1 and 2; Clarke, Life of James 1 (Lond. 1816. 2 vols. 4to); Debary, Hist. of the Church of England from James II to 1717 (Lond. 1860, 8vo), chap. 1-5; Macpherson, Hist. of Great Britain, 1, 450 sq.; Burnet, Reign of James If (ed. 1852). SEE PRESBYTERIANXS; SEE SCOTLAND; SEE IRELAND; SEE ENGLAND. (J. H.W.)

## James of Edessa, etc[[@Headword:James of Edessa, etc]]

             SEE JACOB OF EDESSA, etc.

## James, Epistle Of[[@Headword:James, Epistle Of]]

             said, according to Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 2, 23), to be the first of the so- called Catholic epistles (καθολικαί), as being addressed to classes of  Christians rather than to individuals or particular communities. SEE EPISTLES, CATHOLIC.

I. Authorship. — As the writer simply styles himself “James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, the question as to whom this may designate has been a subject of keen and prolonged controversy, since, as Eusebius has again remarked, there were several of this name. James the Great, or the son of Zebedee, was put to death under Herod Agrippa about the year 44 and, therefore, the authorship cannot with any propriety be ascribed to him, though a Syriac MS., published by Widmandstadt, and an old Latin version, published by Mhartianay and Sabatier, make the assertion. The authorship has been assigned by not a few to James the Less, ὁ μικρός, the son of Alpheus or Cleophas, and by others to James, the Lord's brother. Many, however, maintain that the two names were borne by the same individual, James being called the Lord's brother either as being a cousin or adoptive brother of Jesus (Lange, art. Jacobus in Herzog's Encyklopadie), or as a son of Joseph by a Levirate connection with the widow of Cleophas-the opinion of Epiphanius and Theophylact; or as a son of Joseph by a former marriage-the view of St. Chrysostom, Hilary, Cave, and Basnage. On the other hand, it is held by some that James, son of Alphaeus, and James, brother of our Lord, w-ere distinct persons, the latter being a uterine brother of Jesus, and standing, according to the representation of the Gospels, in the same relation with him to their common mother Mary-as in Mat 12:47; Mat 13:55; Mar 6:3; Joh 2:12; Act 1:14. On the whole, we are inclined to the former hypothesis, but we cannot enter into the question, referring the reader to the previous article, and to that on BROTHERS OF OUR LORD. There are also three excellent monographs on the subject: Blom, Theol. Dissert. de τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς κυρίου (Lugd. Bat. 1839); Schaff, Das Verhaltniss des Jacobus Bruders des Herms (Berlin, 1842); Wijbelingh, Quis est epistolae Jacobi Scriptor? (Groningen, 1854). For the other side, see Mill on the Mythical Interpretation of the Gospels, p. 219, ed. sec., 1861. Dr. Mill held the perpetual virginity of Mary, or that she was, in ecclesiastical language, ἀειπαρθένος, and thus virtually forecloses the entire investigation. It serves little purpose to sneer at those who hold the opposite theory as having their prototypes in the Antidicoimarianites or Helvidians of the 4th century.

According to our view, the author of this epistle was the Lord's brother, and an apostle, or one of the twelve. In Gal 2:9, Paul classes him  with Peter and John, all three being pillars (στῦλοι). He is said by Hegesippus (Eusebius, Hist. 2, 23) to have received the government of the Church, μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, not plost postilos, as Jerome wrongly renders it, but along with the apostles-as the natural rendering is-or was received by them into a collegiate relation. In the pseudo-Clementines, and in the Apostolical Constitutions, how-ever, he is traditionally separated from the apostles. It is quite groundless on the part of Wieseler (Studien unid Kritiken, 1842), Stier, and Davidson to argue that the James mentioned in the first chapter of Galatians is a different person from the James referred to in the second chapter. Again, we have Paul distinctly acknowledging the high position of the brethren of the Lord when he ranges them between “other apostles” and “Cephas” in 1Co 9:5. By universal consent James was called ὁ δίκαιος, and, being martyred, was succeeded by a cousin, Symeon, second of the cousins of the Lord, and a son of Alphelus (ὄντα ἀνεψιὸν τοῦ Κυρίου δεύτερον). Thus James was the superintendent of the Church at Jerusalem, and, probably on account of continuous residence, possessed of higher influence there than Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, who could only. be an occasional visitor. “Certain from James” (τινὲς ἀπὸ Ι᾿ακωβου) went down to Antioch, before whom Peter prevaricated, as if he had stood in awe of the stricter Judaic principles of James and his party (Acts 15; Galatians 2). It seems, therefore, very natural that one occupying this position in the theocratic metropolis should write to his believing brethren of the Dispersion. He sympathized so strongly with the myriads of the Jews who believed and yet were zealous of the law-- ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου that for their sakes, and to ward off their hostility, he advised the apostle Paul to submit to an act of conformity. This conservative spirit, this zeal for the law at least as the moral rule of life, and this profession of Christianity along with uniform obedience to the “customs,” seem to us characteristic elements of the epistle before us.

The opinion that the author of this epistle was different from James, the son of Alpheeus, and not an apostle, is held by Clement, Herder, De Wette, Neander, Kern, Schaff, Winer, Stier, Rothe, and Alford. Davidson, while holding the opinion that the Lord's brother and James the apostle are different persons, ascribes the epistle to the latter. But the theory seems to violate all the probabilities that may be gathered from the early fathers and historians. That James, the Lord's brother, is James the apostle, is an  opinion maintained by Baronius, Lardner, Pearson, Gabler, Eichhorn, Hug, Guericke, Meier, Gieseler, Theile, and the most of other writers.

II. Canonical Authority. — The epistle is found in the Syriac Peshito in the 2nd century, a version which circulated in the neighborhood of that country to which' James and his readers belonged, and the translator and his coadjutors must have had special historical reasons for inserting James in their canon, as they exclude the Second and Third Epistles of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse. There are clauses in Clement of Rome (Ad Cor. 32) and in Hermas (Mandat. 12, 15) which probably may refer to correspondent portions of this epistle, though, perhaps, they may only allude directly to the Septuagint. The quotation from the Latin version of Irenaeus (Adyers. Haeres. 4:16) appears to be more direct in the phrase “et amicus Dei vocatus est.” But this phrase, found also in Clement, seems to have been a' current one, and Philo calls Abraham by the same appellation. We cannot, therefore, lay such immediate stress on these passages as is done by Kern, Wiesinger, and others, though there is a presumption in favor of the opinion that passages in the apostolical fathers, bearing any likeness of style or thought, to the apostolical writings, were borrowed from them, as either direct imitations or unconscious reproductions. This epistle is quoted by Origen (In Joan., in Operat, 4, 306); and the Latin version of Rufinus uses the phrase Jacobus apostolus as a preface to a quotation. This father quotes the epistle also as ascribed to James — ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ι᾿ακώβου ἐπιστολῇ; though, as Kern remarks, Origen says that the doctrine “faith without works is dead” is not received by all οὐ συγχωρηθέν. Clement of Alexandria does not quote it, but Eusebius says that he expounded all the Catholic Epistles, including, however, in the range of his comments the Epistle of Barnabas and the so-called Apocalypse of Peter. Tertullian seems to make no reference to it, though Credner supposes an allusion to 2, 23 in the second book Adversus Judaeos (Opera, ed. Oehler, 2, 704). Eusebius places it among the Antilegomena (Histor. Eccles. 2, 23; 3:25), saying of the epistle, under the first reference, after he had just spoken of its author's death, ἰστέον δὲ ὠς νοθεύεται μέν, etc., “It is reckoned spurious--not many of the ancients have mentioned it;” subjoining, however, that it and Jude were used in most of the churches. In other places Eusebius quotes James without hesitation, calling the epistle by the sacred title of γραφή, and its author ὁ ἱερὸς ἀπόστολος. Jerome is very explicit, saying that James wrote one epistle, which some asserted had been published by another in his name,  but that by degrees and in process of time (“paullatim tempore procedente”) it obtained authority. Jerome's assertion may arise from the fact that there were several persons named James, and that confusion on this point was one means of throwing doubt on the epistle. There seems to be also an allusion in Hippolytus (ed. Lagrarde, p. 122) to 2, 13, in the words ἡ γὰρκρίσις ἀνίλεώς ἐστι τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος.

It was at length received by the Council of Carthage in 397, and in that century it seems to have been all but universally acknowledged, both by the Eastern and Western churches-Theodore of Mopsuestia. being a marked exception, because of the allusion in it (5, 11) to the book of Job. At the period of the Reformation its genuineness was again called in question. Luther, in his preface to the N.T. in 1522, comparing it “with the best books of the N.T.,” stigmatized it as “a right strawy epistle (eine recht stroherne Pistel), being destitute of an evangelic character.” Cyril Lucar had a similar objection, that Christ's name was coldly mentioned, and that only once or twice, and that it treated merely of morality-(“sole a ia moralita attende” — Lettres Anecdotes, p. 85, Amsterdam, 1718). Erasmus had doubts about it, and so had cardinal Cajetan, Flacius, and the Magdeburg centuriators. Grotius and Wetstein shared in these doubts, and they are followed by Schleiermacher, Schott, De Wette, Reuss, the Tübingen critics Baur and Schwegler, and Ritschl in his Entstehuny der Alt-kathol. Kirchle, p. 150. These recent critics deny its apostolic source, and some of them place it in the 2nd century, from its resemblance in some parts to the Clementine homilies. But it is plain that the objections of almost all these opponents spring mainly from doctrinal and not from critical views, being rather originated and sustained by the notion formed of the contents of the epistle than resting on any proper historical foundation. We have not space to go over the several objections, such as the absence of the term apostle from the inscription, though this is likewise not found in several of Paul's epistles; the want of individuality in the document, though this may easily be accounted for by the circumstances of the author in relation to his readers; and the apparent antagonism to the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith, which we shall afterwards consider.

It is of no avail to object, with Wetstein and Theile, that James refers to the apocryphal writings, a practice unknown till a later period, for Theile's array of passages (Prolegomena, p. 46) does not prove the statement, as Huther's reply to this and other similar objections has shown at length, and step by step. Nor, lastly, can it be said that the Greek style of the epistle betrays a culture which the author could not possess. The style is nervous, indeed,  and is more Hebraistic in its general structure than in its individual phrases, as in its short and pithy clauses, the absence of logical formula, the want of elaborate constructions, its oratorical fervor, and the simple and direct outflow of thoughts in brief and often parallelistic clauses. Intercourse with foreign Jews must have been frequent in those days, and there are always minds which, from natural propensity, are more apt than others to acquire a tasteful facility in the use of a tongue which has not been their vernacular. Taking all these things into account, we have every reason to accept the canonical authority of this epistle, the trial it has passed through giving us fuller confidence in it, since the principal objections are the offspring either of polemical prejudice, or of a subjective criticism based more on esthetic tendencies than historical results. Ranch has faintly objected to the integrity of the epistle, asserting that the conclusion of 5, 12-20, may be an interpolation, because it is not in logical harmony with what precedes; but he has had no followers, and Kern, Theile, Schneckenburger, and others have refuted him-logical sequence being a form of critical argument wholly inapplicable to this epistle. (See Davidson, Introd. to N.T. 3, 331 sq.) SEE ANTILEGOMIENA.

III. The Persons for whom the Epistle is intended. The, salutation is addressed “to the Twelve Tribes which are scattered abroad” (ταῖς δώδεκα φυλαῖς ταῖς ἐν τῇ διασπορᾶ'/). They were Jews, ἀδελφοί - brethren or believing Jews, and they lived beyond Palestine, or in the Dispersion. Such are the plain characteristics, national and religious, of the persons addressed. There are, however, two extremes of religious opinion about them. Some, as Lardner, Macknight, Theile, Credner, and Hus, imagine that the epistle is meant for all Jews. But the inscription forbids such a supposition. The tone of the epistle implies that “the servant of the Lord Jesus Christ” addressed fellow-believers'-” brethren” “begotten” along with himself (ἡμᾶς) “by the word of truth,” and all of them bearing the “good name” (καλὸν ὄνομα). The first verse of the second chapter implies also that they held “the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory,” and they are exhorted not to hold it inconsistently, along with manifest respect of persons, or showing unfounded social preferences. They are told besides, in Jam 5:7, to exercise patience, ἕως τῆς παρου σίαγ τοῦ Κυρίου, till the public promised advent of the Lord their Savior. The rich men denounced in Jam 5:1 may not have belonged to the Church in reality, but this startling denunciation carried in it warning to them and comfort to the poor and persecuted. May there not  be, in a letter to a church, holy invective against those without it, who annoy and oppress its unresisting members? Dean Alford, after Huther, inclines to include in the διασπορά Jews also in Palestine — Judeea being regarded as the center. He refers to the phrase, Act 8:1 (πάντες δὲ διεσπάρησαν κατὰ τὰς χώρας τῆς Ι᾿ουδαίας καὶ Σαμαπείας). But the use of the verb here in its general sense and in an easy narrative cannot modify the popular meaning of διασπορά as the technical or geographic title of Jews beyond Palestine.

On the other hand, it has been maintained by Kister (Studien u. Kritiken, 1831), Kern, Neudecker, and De Wette, that the title in the inscription is a symbolic one, and signifies simply Christians out of Palestine, as the true Israel of God. A modification of this view is held by others, viz., that while the epistle is addressed to believing Jews, believing heathen and unconverted Jews are not excluded. But the phrase in the inscription, as in Act 26:7, is to be taken in its natural sense, and with no spiritualized meaning or reference. The entire tone and aspect also are Jewish. The place of ecclesiastical meeting is συναγωγή; the law, νόμος, is of supreme authority. The divine unity is a primary and distinctive article of faith, the ordinary terms of Jewish obtestation are introduced, as is also the prophetic epithet symbolizing spiritual unfaithfulness, μοιχαλίδες (Jam 4:4).

Anointing with oil is mentioned, and the special regard to be paid (Jam 1:27) to orphans and widows finds its basis in repeated statutes of the Mosaic law. The errors refuted also are such as naturally arose out of Pharisaic pride and formalism, and the acceptance of the promised Christ in a spirit of traditional carnality. The fact that the Dispersion was found principally in the East-that is, in Syria and adjacent countries-countenances the presumption that this epistle is found in the Peshito at so early, period because it had immediate circulation in that region, and there had proved the fitness and usefulness of its counsels and warning. Josephus says of the Dispersion, that the Jews were scattered everywhere, πλεῖστον δὲ τῇ Συρίᾷ ἀναμεμιγμένον (y War, 7:3, 3). The persons addressed were poor; the rich were their persecutors, their own partialities and preferences were worldly and inconsistent; they wanted perfect confidence in God, and stumbled at the divine dispensations; sins of the tongue were common, eagerness to be public teachers was an epidemic among them; they spoke rashly and hardly of one another; and they felt not the connection between a living faith and a holy life. Society was under a process of apparent disintegration, wars and  fightings were frequent, with loss of life and property. Its extremes were the rich and the poor, with no middle class between; for, though tradings and journeyings quite in Jewish style are referred to (Jam 4:13-14), the principal occupation was husbandry, with no social grade between those who owned and those who reaped the fields. SEE DISPERSION.

IV. Time and place of writing the Epistle. — The place most probably was Jerusalem, where James had his residence. Many allusions in the epistle, while they apply to almost any Eastern locality, carry in them a presumption in favor of that country, in the metropolis of which James is known to have lived and labored. These allusions are to such natural phenomena as parching winds, Jam 4:1-11; long drought, Jam 5:17-18; the early and latter rain, Jam 5:7; saline springs, Jam 3:12; proximity to the sea, Jam 1:6; Jam 3:4 (Hug's Einleitung, 2, 439). Naturally from the holy capital of Judaea goes forth from the “servant of the Lord Jesus Christ” a solemn circular to all the believing brethren in the Dispersion-for to them James was a living authority to which they bowed, and Jerusalem a holy center that stirred a thousand loyal associations within them.

It is not so easy to determine the time at which the epistle was written. Many place the date about the year 60-close on the martyrdom of James the Just, not long before the destruction of Jerusalem-as Michaelis, Pearson, Mill, Guericle, Burton, Macknight, Bleek (Einleit. p. 547, 1862), and the older commentators generally. Hug and De Wette place it after the Epistle to the Hebrews to which they imagine it contains some allusions- — Hug holding that it was written (überlegt) on set purpose against Paul and his doctrine of justification by faith. So also Baur (Paulus, p. 677). But these reasons are by no means conclusive. The great argument that the Epistle of James was written to oppose either the doctrine or counteract the abuses of the doctrine of justification by faith has, as we shall see, no foundation. The notion that this epistle is in some sense corrective in its tone and purpose appears plausible to us, as Paul is so usually read by us before James that we gain an earlier acquaintance with him, while James occupies also a later place in the ordinary arrangement of the books of the New Testament.

But it is claimed by many that the state of the Judaeo-Christians addressed in the epistle is not that which we know to have existed at and before the year 60. There is no allusion to the fierce disputations as to the value and  permanence of circumcision, the authority and meaning of the ceremonial law, or the conditions on which Gentile converts should be admitted into the Church-the questions discussed at the Council of Jerusalem. Controversies on these points, it is asserted, saturated the Church during many years before the fall of Jerusalem, and no one could address Jewish converts at any length without some allusion to them. The myriads who believed, as James said, were “all zealous of the law” (Act 21:20); and that zeal assumed so many false shapes, threw up so many barriers in the way of' ecclesiastical relationship, nay, occasionally so infringed on the unconditioned freeness of the Gospel as to rob it of its simplicity and power, that no Jew addressing Jewish believers with the authority and from the position of James could fail to dwell on those disturbing and engrossing peculiarities. The inference, therefore, on the part of many critics, is, that the epistle was written prior to those keen and universal discussions, and to that state of the Church which gave them origin and continuance; prior, therefore, also to the time when the labors of the apostle-Paul among the Gentiles called such attention to their success that “certain from James came down” to Antioch to examine for themselves and carry back a report to the another Church in Jerusalem (Acts 15; Galatians 2). The epistle, on this view, might be written shortly before the Council of Jerusalem- probably about the year 45. Such is the opinion of Neander, Schneckenburger, Theile, Thiersch, Huther, Davidson, and Alford.

On the other hand, Wiesinger and Bleek justly object that the interval supposed is too limited for such a growth of Christianity as this epistle implies. Moreover, although the argument in favor of an early date, drawn from the supposed design of counteracting the misinterpretation of some of Paul's doctrines (comp. 2Pe 3:16), is scarcely tenable. yet the epistle manifestly presupposes such a, general intelligence of Gospel terms and truth as could hardly have obtained, especially abroad, so early as prior to the first council at Jerusalem (Acts 15). Indeed, many of the above arguments in favor of this very early date are self-contradictory; for it was precisely at this period that the disputes and controversies in question raged most fiercely, not having yet been authoritatively determined by any ecclesiastical consultation (comp. Paul's strong contention with Peter and Barnabas); whereas the official edict of that council precluded any further public discussion. In this respect the Epistle of James will fairly compare with that to the Hebrews, written about the same time. The reasoning, however, may be allowed to hold good against so late a date as  immediately preceding Jerusalem's fall (so Macknight infers from Jam 5:1); for at that time the old controversy appears to have been somewhat revived. De Wette adduces the allusion to the name “Christians” in Jam 2:7, as an evidence in favor of the late date; but this would only require a date later than that of Act 11:26. On the whole, the evidence decidedly preponderates in favor of the interval between Paul's two imprisonments at Rome, or about A.D. 62.

V. Object of Writing. — The main design of the epistle is not to teach doctrine, but to improve morality. James is the moral teacher of the N. Test.; not in such sense a moral teacher as not to be at the same time a maintainer and teacher of Christian doctrine, but yet mainly in this epistle a moral teacher. There are two ways of explaining this characteristic of the epistle. Some commentators and writers see in James a man who had not realized the essential principles and peculiarities of Christianity, but was in a transition state, ‘half Jew and half Christian. Schneckenburger thinks that Christianity had not penetrated his spiritual life. Neander is of much the same opinion (Panzung und Leitung, p. 579). The same notion may perhaps be traced in Prof. Stanley and dean Alford. But there is another and much more natural way of accounting for the fact. James was writing for a special class of persons, and knew what that class especially needed; and therefore, under the guidance of God's Spirit, he adapted his instructions to their capacities and wants. Those for whom he wrote were, as we have said, the Jewish Christians, whether in Jerusalem or abroad. James, living in the center of Judaism, saw what were the chief sins and vices of his countrymen, and, fearing that his flock might share in them, he lifted up his voice to warn them against the contagion from which they not only might, but did in part suffer. This was his main object; but there is another closely connected with it. As Christians, his readers were exposed to trials which they did not bear with the patience and faith that would have become them. Here, then, are the two objects of the epistle: 1. To warn against the sins to which, as Jews, they were most liable. 2. To console and exhort them under the sufferings to which, as Christians, they were most exposed. The warnings and consolations are mixed together, for the writer does not seem to have set himself down to compose an essay or a letter of which he had previously arranged the heads; but, like one of the old prophets, to have poured out what was uppermost in his thoughts, or closest to his heart, without waiting to connect his matter, or to throw bridges across from subject to subject. While, in the purity of his Greek and  the vigor of his thoughts, we mark a man of education, in the abruptness of his transitions and the unpolished roughness of his style we may trace one of the family of the Davideans, who disarmed Domitian by the simplicity of their minds, and by exhibiting their hands hard with toil (Hegesippus apud Euseb. 3, 20.

The Jewish vices against which he warns them are formalism, which made the service (θρησκεία) of God consist in washings and outward ceremonies, whereas he reminds them (Jam 1:27) that it consists rather in active love and purity (see Coleridge's Aids to Reflection, Aph. 23; note also active love Bp. Butler's “benevolence,” and purity = Bp. Butler's “temperance”); fanaticism, which, under the cloak of religious zeal, was tearing Jerusalem to pieces (Jam 1:20); fatalism, which threw its sins on God (Jam 1:13); meanness, which crouched before the rich (Jam 2:2); falsehood, which had made words and oaths playthings (Jam 3:2-12); partisanship (Jam 3:14); evil speaking (Jam 4:11); boasting (Jam 4:16); oppression (Jam 5:4). The great lesson which he teaches them, as Christians, is patience-patience in trial (Jam 1:2); patience in good works (Jam 1:22-25); patience under provocations (Jam 3:17);' patience under oppression (Jam 5:7); patience, under persecution (Jam 5:10); and the ground of their patience is, that the coming of the Lord draweth nigh, which is to right all wrongs (Jam 5:8).

VI. There are two points in the epistle which demand a somewhat more lengthened notice. These are,

(a) Jam 2:14-26, which has been represented as a formal opposition to Paul's doctrine of justification by faith; and

(b) Jam 5:14-15, which is quoted as the authority for the sacrament of extreme unction.

(a) Justification being an act, not of man, but of God, both the phrases “justification by faith” and “justification by works” are inexact. Justification must either be by grace or of reward. Therefore our question is, Did or did not James hold justification by grace? If he did, there is no contradiction between the apostles. Now there is not one word in James to the effect that a man can earn his justification by works; and this would be necessary in order to prove that he held justification of reward. Still Paul does use the expression “justified by faith” (Rom 5:1), and James the expression  “justified by works, not by faith only.” Here is an apparent opposition. But, if we consider the meaning of the two apostles, we see at once that there is no contradiction either intended or possible. Paul was opposing the Judaizing party, which claimed to earn acceptance by good works, whether the works of the Mosaic law, or works of piety done by themselves. In opposition to these, Paul lays down the great truth that acceptance cannot be earned by man at all, but is the free gift of God to the Christian man, for the sake of the merits of Jesus Christ, appropriated by each individual, and made his own by the instrumentality of faith. James, on the other hand, was opposing the old Jewish tenet that to be a child of Abraham was all in all; that godliness was not necessary, if but the belief was correct. This presumptuous confidence had transferred itself, with perhaps double force, to the Christianized Jews. They had said, “Lord, Lord,” and that was enough, without doing his Father's will. They had recognized the Messiah: what more was wanted? They had faith: what more was required of them? It is plain that their “faith” was a totally different thing from the “faith” of Paul. Paul tells us again and again that his “faith” is a “faith that worketh by love;” but the very characteristic of the “faith” which James is attacking, and the very reason why he attacked it, was that it did not work by love, but was a bare assent of the head, not influencing the heart; a faith such as devils can have, and tremble. James tells us that “fides informis” is not sufficient on the part of man for justification; Paul tells us that “Jidesformata” is sufficient: and the reason why fides informis will not justify us is, according to James, because it lacks that special quality, the addition of which constitutes itsfidesfo-mata. See, on this subject, Bull's Harmonia Apostolica et Examen Censurae; Taylor's Sermon on “Faith working by Love,” 8, 284 (Lond. 1850); and, as a corrective of Bull's view, Laurence's Bampton Lectures, 4:5, 6. Other discussions may be found in Knapp, Scripta, p. 511; Reuss, Theologie, 2, 524; Hofmann, Schrifibeweis, 1, 639; Wardlaw's Sermons; Wood's Theology, 2. 408; Watson's Institutes, 2, 614; Lechler, Das Apostol. und nachapostolische Zeitalter, p. 163. For monographs, see Walch, Biblische Theologie, 4:941; Danz, Wörterbuch, s.v. Jacobus. SEE JUSTIFICATION; SEE FAITH.

(b) With respect to Jam 5:14-15, it is enough to say that the ceremony of extreme unction and the ceremony described by James differ both in their subject and in their object. The subject of extreme unction is a sick man who is about to die, and its object is not his cure. The subject of the ceremony described by James is a sick man who is not about to die, and  its object is his cure, together With the spiritual benefit of absolution. James is plainly giving directions with respect to the manner of administering one of those extraordinary gifts of the Spirit with which the Church was endowed only in the apostolic age and the age immediately succeeding the apostles.

VII. Contents. — The errors and sins against which James warns his readers are such as arose out of their situation. Perfection-- τελείοτης is a prominent idea, and τέλειος is a frequent epithet-the “perfect work” of patience, the “perfect” gift of God, the “perfect law” of liberty or the new covenant, faith “made perfect,” and the tongue-governing man is a “perfect man.” He' writes from a knowledge of their circumstances, does not set before them an ethical system for their leisurely study, but selects the vices of opinion and life to which their circumstances so markedly and so naturally exposed them. Patience is a primary inculcation, it being essential to that perfection which is his central thought. Trials develop patience, and such evils as produce trials are not to be ascribed in a spirit of fatalism to God. Spiritual life is enjoyed by believers, and is fostered by the reception, and especially by the doing of the word; and true religious service is unworldly and disinterested beneficence. Partial preferences are forbidden by the royal law-faith without works is dead-tongue and temper are to be under special guard, and under the control of wisdom-the deceits of casuistry are to be eschewed contentious covetousness is to be avoided as one of the works of the devil, along with censorious pride. Rich oppressors are denounced, and patience is enjoined on all; the fitting exercises in times of gladness and of sickness are prescribed; the efficacy of prayer is extolled and exemplified; while the conclusion animates his readers to do for others what he has been doing for them-to convert them “from the error of their way” (see Stanley's Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age, p. 297).

The epistle contains no allusion to the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, though they are implied. It was not the writer's object either to discuss or defend them. It would be unwarranted, on that account, to say that Christianity had not penetrated his own spiritual life, or that he was only in a transition state between Judaism and Christianity. He might not, indeed, have the free and unnational views of Paul in presenting the Gospel. But a true Christianity is implied, and his immediate work lay in enforcing certain Christian duties, which he does in the style of the Master himself  VIII. Style and Language. — The similarity of this epistle in tone and form to the Sermon on the Mount has often been remarked. In the spirit of the Great Teacher, he sharply reprobates all externalism, all selfishness, inconsistency, worldliness, ostentation, self-deception, and hypocrisy. Thus in the first chapter as a sample. comp. Jam 1:2, Mat 5:10-12; Jam 1:4, Mat 5:48; Jam 1:5, Mat 7:7; Jam 1:9, Mat 5:3; Jam 1:20, Mat 5:22, etc. The epistle, in short, is a long and earnest illustration of the final warning given by our Lord in the figures of building on the rock and building on the sand. — The composition is the abrupt and stern utterance of an earnest, practical soul-- a rapid series of censures and counsels-not entirely disconnected, but generally suggested by some inner link of association. Often a general law is epigrammatically laid down, while a peculiar sin is reprobated or a peculiar virtue enforced-or a principle is announced in the application of it. The style is vigorous-full of imperatives so solemn and categorical as to dispel all idea of resistance or compromise, and of interrogations so pointed that they carry their answer with them. It is also marked by epithets so bold and forcible that they give freshness and color to the diction. The clauses have a rhetorical beauty and power, and as in men of fervent oratorical temperament, the words often fall into rhythmical order, while the thoughts occasionally blossom into poetry. An accidental hexameter is found in Jam 1:17 [provided it be lawful to make the last syllable of δόσις long].

The Greek is remarkably pure, and, it is difficult to account for this comparative purity. Hegesippus, as quoted by Eusebius, says that James's believing brethren desired him to address the crowds assembled at the Passover; for there were brought together “all the ribres, with also the Gentiles” — πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαι μετὰ καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν; and Greek must have been the language employed. It is therefore quite preposterous on the part of Bolten, Betholdt, and Schott to suspect that the Greek of this epistle is a translation from an Aramean original.

Resemblances have sometimes been traced between this epistle and the first Epistle of Peter, and these may be accounted for by the fact that both authors were somewhat similarly circumstanced in relation to their readers. But Hug's and Bleek's inference is a rash one that Peter must have read the epistle of James.  In a word, the Epistle of James is a noble protest against laxity of morals- against supine and easy acquiescence in the truths of the Gospel without feeling their power or acting under their influence, while it presents such ethical lessons as the Church, placed in multiple relations to a world of sense and trial, has ever need of to animate and sustain it in its progress towards perfection.

IX. Commentaries. — The following are the exegetical treatises expressly on the whole epistle; to a few of the most important we prefix an asterisk (\*): Didemus Alexandrinus, In Ep. Jacobi (in Bibl. Max. Pair. 5, 320); Althamer. Auslegung (Arg. 1527, 8vo); Zuingle, Adnotationes (Tigur. 1533. 8vo; also in Opp. 4:534); Foleng, Commentarius (Lugdun. 1555, 8vo); Logenhagen, Adnotationes (Antw. 1571, 8vo; 1572,12mo); Heminge, Commentary (London, 1577, 4to); Feuardent, Commentarius (Paris, 1599, 8vo); Rung, Commentarius (Wittenb. 1600, 8vo); Bracche, Commentarius (Paris, 1605, 4to); Turnbull, Lectures (Lond. 1606, 4to); Winckelmann, Explicatio (Giess. 1608, 8vo).; Steuart, Commentarius (Ingolst. 1610, 4to); Paez, Commentaria (Antwerp, 1617, 1623; Lugd. 1620, 4to); Lorin, Commentarius [includ. Jude] (Mogunt. 1622; Colon. 1633, fol.); Wolzogen, Annotationes (in Opp.); Laurent, Commentarius (Amst. 1635,1662, 4to); Kerner, Predigten (Ulm, 1639, 8vo); Mayer, Exposition (London, 1639; 4to); Price, Commentarii (Lond. 1646, fol.; also in the Crit. Sacri); \*Manton, Commentary (London, 1653, 4to; 1840,1842, 1844, 8vo); Brochmand, Commentarius (Hafn. 1641, 1706, 4to; Frankfurt, 1658, fol.); Schmidt, Disputationes [includ. Ephes. etc.] (Argent. 1685, 1699, 4to); Creid, Predigten (Frankf. 1694, 8vo); Smith, Vitbreiding (Amst. 1698, 4to); Creyghton, Verklaaring [includ. John's ep.] (Franck. 1704, 4to); Griebner, Predigten (Lpz. 1720, 8vo); Grammlich, Anmerk. (Stuttgart, 1721, 8vo); Michaelis, Introductio (Hal. 1722, 4to); Benson, Paraphrase (Lond. 1738, 4to; with the other Cath. ep. ib. 1749,1756, 4to; in Latin, Hal. 1747, 4to); Heisen, Dissertationes (Brem. 1739, 4to); Janson, Verklaar. (Gron. 1742,4to); Damm, Anmerk. (Berl. 1747, 8vo); Baumgarten, Auslegung (Hal. 1750, 4to); Semler, Paraphrasis (Hal. 1781; in Germ. Potsdam. 1789); Storr, Dissertationes (Tüb. 1784, 4to; also in his Opusc. Acad. 2, 1-74); E. F. K. Rosenmüller, Anmerk. (Leipzig, 1787, 8vo); Morus, Praelectiones [including Pet.] (Lips. 1794, 8vo); Goltz, Verklaaring (Amster. 1798, 4to); Scherer, Erklar. (vol. 1, Marb. 1799, 8vo); Antonio, Ferklaaringe (Leyd. 1799, 4to); Hensler, Erldut. (Hamb. 1801, 8vo); Clarisse, Bearbeid. (Amst. 1802, 8vo); Stuart,  Verklaar. (Amst. 1806, 8vo); Van Kosten, Verklaaring (Amst. 1821, 8vo); \*Schulthess, Commentar. (Turici, 1824, 8vo); Gebser, Erklar. (Berl. 1828, 8vo); \*Schneckenburger, A nnot. (Stuttg. 1832, 8vo); \*Theile, Comm7entar. (Lipsie, 1833, 8vo); Jacobi, Predigten (Berl. 1835, 8vo; tr. by Rvland, I.ondon, 1838, 8vo); Kern, Erklarung (Tilb. 1838, 8vo); Scharling, Commentarius [including Jude] (Havn. 1840. 8vo); \*Stier, Auslegung (Barmen, 1845, 8vo); Cellerier, Commentaire (Par. 1850, 8vo); Stanley, Sermons (in Sermons and Essays, p. 291); \*Neander, Erlauter. (Berlin, 1850, 8vo, being vol. 6 of his edu of the Heilige Schrift.; tro by Mrs. Conant, N.Y. 1852, 12mo); Draseke, Predigten (Lpz. 1851, 8vo); Patterson, Commentary (in the Jour. of Sac. Lit. Oct. 1851, p. 250 sql); \*Wiesinger, Commentar (Konigs. 1854, 8vo; being vol. 6 of Olshausen's Commentary); Viedebrandt, Bibelstunden (Berl. 1859, 8vo); Porubszky, Predirlten (Vienna, 1861,8vo); Wardlaw, Lecturen (London, 1862, 12mo); Hermann [edit. Bouman], Commentarius (Tr. ad Rh. 1865, 8vo); \*Adam, Discourses (Edinb. 1867, 8vo); Ewald, Erklarung [includ. Heb.] (Gbtt. 1870, 8vo). SEE EPISTLE.

James, Spurious Writings Of.

— The following pseudepigraphal works have been attributed-to the apostle James:

1. The Protevangelium.

2. Historia de Nativitate Avarice.

3. De miraculis infantice Domini nostri,',etc.

Of these, the Protevangelium. is worth a passing notice, not for its contents, which are a mere parody on the early chapters of Luke, transferring the events which occurred at our Lord's birth to the birth of Mary his mother, but because it appears to have been early known in the Church. It is possible that Justin Martyr (Dial. cum Tryph. c. 70, 8) and Clement of Alexandria (Stomata, uib. 8) refer to it. Origen speaks of it (in Mat 13:55); Gregory Nyssen (Opp. p. 346, edit. Paris), Epiphanius (Haer. 79), John Damascene (Orat. 1, 2, in Nativ. Marice), Photius (Orat. in Nativ. Marice), and others, allude to it. It was first published in Latin in 1552, in Greek in 1564. The oldest MS. of it now existing is of the 10th century. (See Thilo's Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti, 1, 45, 108, 159, 337, Lips. 1852.) SEE APOCRYPHA.

## James, John[[@Headword:James, John]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Buckingham County, Va., August 1, 1782. He entered the Kentucky Conference in 1820, and successively “filled some of the most important and responsible appointments acceptably and successfully.” He was an ardent worker in the vineyard of the Lord, and espoused the cause of his Master amid persecutions and heavy loss of property: his father-in-law, a wealthy man, disinherited his daughter (the wife of John James) because her husband was a Methodist preacher. Mr. James died, after a service of half a century in the Church, in 1860. As a preacher, his ability was superior, but his sermons were more of a hortatory nature than severe  logical doctrinal discussions. “During his ministerial life he won many souls to Christ, and was regarded in his old age as a father in Israel. He loved his work to the last, and may be said to have descended from his horse to the grave.”- Min. Asn. Confi l. E. Ch. S. 2, 193 sq.

## James, John Angell[[@Headword:James, John Angell]]

             an eminent Congregational minister, born at Blandford, Dorsetshire, June 6, 1785, was educated at the college at Gosport, and entered the ministry when only seventeen years old. He was a very popular preacher, and, before twenty, was settled as pastor of the “Church Meeting in Carr's Lane,” Birmingham, where he remained till his death, October 1, 1859. “In the course of years Angell James came to be considered the most important and influential public man in connection with his own denomination, and on account of his evangelical views of religion, he was also much esteemed both by the Low-Church party in the English Establishment, and by Dissenters generally in Scotland and America.” Mr. James published, besides a multitude of sermons, tracts, addresses, a number of small religious volumes, the best known being the Anxious Inquirer, Christian Fellowship, and Christian Professor, which had, and still have, a vast circulation both in England and in this country. See Dale's Life and Letters of John Agell James (London, 1862); Pen-Pictures of popular English Preachers (London, 1853, p. 274 sq.); New York Literary and Theological Review, 1, 595. (J. H.W.)

## James, John Thomas[[@Headword:James, John Thomas]]

             an English prelate, born in 1786, was educated at Christ Church , Oxford. He was appointed bishop of Calcutta in 1727, and died in 1829. He published several works of travels in the northern and eastern portions of Europe. — Allibone, Dict. of Authors, p. 952.

## James, John Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:James, John Thomas, D.D]]

             an Anglican colonial bishop, was born in England in 1786. He was educated at the Charter House and at Christ Church, Oxford, became vicar of Flitton, Bedfordshire, and was elevated to the see of Calcutta. He arrived in that city, January 15, 1828; on June 23 he set out on a visitation to the Upper Provinces of Bengal, and died while on his way to the island of Penang, August 22 of the same year. Bishop James had acquired some celebrity as an author and traveller. He wrote Journal of Travels in Germany, Sweden, Russia, Poland, etc. (Lond. 1816, 4to): — Views in Russia, Poland, etc., prepared in colors: — The Flemish, Dutch, and German Schools of Painting (Lond. 1822, 8vo). See (N.Y.) Christ. Journal, 1829, page 191; Asiatic Journal, April 1829; Penang Register, September 10, 1828; Lowndes, Bibl. Manual, s.v.; Brief Memoirs of Bp. J.T. James (Lond. 1830, 8vo); Darling, Cyclop. Bib. s.v.

## James, Peter[[@Headword:James, Peter]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Pennsylvania in 1789, and removed to Virginia in 1799, and from thence, a year later, to Mississippi. In 1812 he joined the Mississippi Conference. He filled several prominent positions within the limits of his Conference, and was for a time presiding elder. The Memphis Conference being formed out of a part of the Mississippi, he was invited to join the latter, which he did; but his health declining, he became a superannuate. He died March  18,1869. “Peter James possessed but limited literary attainments; but, by gift of application, he became an able minister of the Gospel. In all the relations of life he maintained his integrity as a Christian, and exemplified the virtues and graces of our holy religion.”-- Min. Ann. Cof M.E. Ch. S. 3:340.

## James, St[[@Headword:James, St]]

             (OF COMPOSTELLA), CHURCH OF, a very famous church in Spain, dedicated to St. James Major, the patron saint of the kingdom. A wooden bust of the saint, with tapers ever burning before it, has stood on the high altar for nine hundred years, and the church is the resort of numerous pilgrims, who hiss ‘the image. Miracles are ascribed to St. James, such as appearing on a white horse defeating the Moors. SEE COMPOSTELLA.

## James, St. (the Less), Festival of[[@Headword:James, St. (the Less), Festival of]]

             SEE ST. PHILIP.

## James, St., Liturgy of[[@Headword:James, St., Liturgy of]]

             a form of service which was very early used in the patriarchate of Antioch; the ‘Monophysites using it in Syriac and the orthodox in Greek, this last having in it many interpolations from the liturgies of other places. ‘Palmer, in his Origines Liturgiae, with which Neale (Introd. Edst. Ch. p. 318) agrees, says, “There are satisfactory means of ascertaining the order, substance, and generally the expressions of the solemn liturgy used all through the patriarchate of Antioch and Jerusalem before the year 451; that the liturgy thus ascertained coincides with the notices which the fathers of that country give concerning their liturgy during the 5th and 4th centuries; that this liturgy was used in the whole patriarchate of Antioch in the 4th century with little variety; that it prevailed there in the 3rd century, and even in the 2nd. The liturgy of St. James may- therefore be considered to have originated near the time of the birth of Christianity; at least in the first  century of our tera” (comp. Neale, Introd. East. Ch. bk. 3:ch. 1, especially p. 819).

## James, Thomas (2)[[@Headword:James, Thomas (2)]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Madison County, Tenn., October 19, 1832. He joined the Church at thirteen years of age, was admitted to the St. Louis Conference in 1852, and appointed to Carthage Circuit. He then removed first to Mount Vernon Circuit, next to Osceola Circuit, then to Fredericktown, and finally to Ozark Circuit. He died in the midst of the work in the fall of 1857. — Min. Ann. Conf. Methodist Episcopal Church South. 2, 14.

## James, Thomas, D.D. (1)[[@Headword:James, Thomas, D.D. (1)]]

             a learned divine and an able critic, was born at Newport, Isle of Wight, in 1571. He studied at Winchester School and New College, Oxford, of which he became fellow in 1593. He was appointed keeper of the Bodleian Library at its foundation in 1602, and afterwards subdean of Wells, and rector of Mongeham, Kent. He died in 1629. Dr. James, it is said, was one of the most learned critics of his day. — His principal works are, Belluen Papale, sine concordia discors Sixti V ad Clementis VIII, circa Hieronymianeam editionemn, etc. (Lond. 1600, 4to; 1841,12mo): — A Treatise of the Corruption of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, by the Prelates, Pastors, and Pillars of the Church of Rome for Maintenance of Popery and Irreligion (Lond. 1612, 4to; reprinted 1688, 1843). — Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 952.

## James, William, D.D[[@Headword:James, William, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Albany, N.Y., in June 1797. He received an academic and collegiate education, and was ordained about the 25th year of his age. He was pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church in Rochester, N.Y., from 1825 until 1830 or 1831, and the for a time of the Third Presbyterian Church in Montgomery Street, Albany. He died in 1868. See Munsell, History of Albany, 4:10. (J.C.S.)

## Jameson, George[[@Headword:Jameson, George]]

             an eminent Scotch portrait painter, was born at Aberdeen in 1586, and studied under Rubens and Vandyck. He died at Edinburgh, in 1644. The largest collection of his works are at Taymouth.

## Jameson, Mrs. Anna[[@Headword:Jameson, Mrs. Anna]]

             an English authoress, deserves our notice as the writer of a series of works on Christian art and archaeology of most superior order. She was born in Dublin May 19, 1797, and was married in 1827 to Mr. Jameson, a barrister, but soon after separated from her husband, and devoted herself to literature. She died March 17, 1860. Her works of interest to us are, Sacred and Legendary Art (Lond. 1848, 8vo): — Legends of the Alonsastic Orders (1850): — Legends of the Madonna (1852): —  Scriptural and Legendary History of our Lord, etc., as represented in Christian Arts (1860).

## Jamess, St., Day[[@Headword:Jamess, St., Day]]

             is a festival in some churches, falling in the Western churches on the 25th of July, and in the Eastern on the 23rd of October, and commemorating St. James the Elder, son of Zebedee, and brother of St. John. No trace of this festival at an early period can be found in any country but Spain. James was the first of the apostles that suffered martyrdom. This particular day was chosen for the commemoration, not with reference to the date of the apostle's death, which took place probably a little before Easter, but in connection with the legend of a miraculous translation of the relic of the apostle from Palestine to Compostella, in Spain.

## Jami[[@Headword:Jami]]

             is a Turkish name for the temples in which worship is performed on Fridays (the worship itself bearing the name of Jema-namazi). it being unlawful to use the lesser temples (mosques) on that day. The first. Jami, called Selalyn (i.e. royal), being founded by a sultan, was built by Orkhan the Second, sultan of the Turks, who began his reign in 1326. — Broughton, Eio. Hist. Sac. 1, 501.

## Jamieson, John, D.D[[@Headword:Jamieson, John, D.D]]

             a divine and philologist, was born at Glasgow March 3, 1759. He became minister of the Anti-Burgher Secession Church in Scotland, was stationed first at Forfar (in 1781), and afterwards (1797) for forty-three years at Edinburgh. He died July 12, 1838. His principal works are, A Vindication of the Doctrines of Scripture and of the Primitive Faith concerning the Deity of Christ (Edinb. 1794, 2 vols. 8vo): “a very able and learned reply to Priestly's history of early opinions:”-An Alarm to Britain, or an Inquiry into the Causes of the rapid Progress of Infidelity (Perth, 1795, 12mo): — Sermons on the Heart (Edinb. 1789-90, 2 vols. 8vo): — The Use of Sacred History, confirming the Doctrine of Revelation (Edinb. 1802, 2 vols. 8vo): — An Historical Account of the ancient Culdees of Iona, and of their Settlement in England, Scotland, and Ireland (Edinb. 1811, 4to), etc. His reputation, however, rests chiefly on his Etymological Dictionary of the Scottish Language (1808-1809), of which he published an abridgment in 1818, and to which he added a supplement in 1825. See Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v. Allibone, Dict. of Authos, s.v.

## Jamin[[@Headword:Jamin]]

             (Hebrew Yamin', יָמַין, lit. the right hand, hence luck, as often; i. q. Felix; Sept. Ι᾿αμείν, and Ι᾿αμίν, but v.r. Ι᾿αβείν in 1 Chronicles 2, 27, and omits in Neh 8:7), the name of three men. SEE BENJAMIN.

1. The second named of the sons of Simeon (Gen 46:11; Exo 6:15; Num 26:12; 1Ch 4:24). B.C. 1856. His descendants were called JAMINITES (Heb. Yanmini', יָמַינַי, Sept. Ι᾿αμινί, Num 26:12).  2. The second named of the three sons of Ram, the fourth in descent from Judah (1Ch 2:26). B.C. cir. 1658.

3. One of the priests that interpreted the law to the people after the return from Babylon (Neh 8:7). B. C. cir. 410.

## Jaminite[[@Headword:Jaminite]]

             (Num 26:12). SEE JAXIN, 1. Jam'lech (Heb. Yamlek', יָמְלֵךְ, kingly; Sept. Α᾿μαλήχ v. r. Α᾿μαλήκ, Ι᾿εμολόχ; Vulg. Jealech), a chieftain (נָשַׂיא) of the tribe of Simeon, apparently one of those whose family increased so greatly that they invaded the valley of Gedor in the time of Hezekiah, and dispossessed the Hamites (1Ch 4:34). B.C. cir. 711.

## Jammabos[[@Headword:Jammabos]]

             a Shinto order of mountain priests of Japan, are a kind of wandering monks, dependent on the benevolence of the people for subsistence; and from the circumstance that they go armed with swords or scimitars, they are sometimes called mountain soldiers. Their founder lived about the 6th century. He wandered about in deserts, and climbed the steepest mountains, subjecting himself to the severest privations. His followers, on entering the order, made a solemn vow to renounce all temporal advantages for the prospect of eternal happiness. In course of time they  became divided into two orders, called Tojunfa and Fonsaufa. The former are obliged to go on a pilgrimage once a year to the mountain of Fikoosan (q.v.). The other order of Jammabos are obliged annually to pay a visit to the sepulchre of their founder, which is also situated on the top of a high and almost inaccessible mountain. In preparation for this hazardous undertaking, they practice frequent ablutions and severe mortifications. During their pilgrimage they eat only herbs and roots. On their return they go to Miaco, and present a gift to the general of the religious order to which they belong, who, in turn, bestows some honorable title on the pilgrim. At their original institution the Jammabos were Shintoists, but they have blended that form of religion with the worship of strange gods. SEE SHINTO.

## Jammy, Pierre[[@Headword:Jammy, Pierre]]

             a Dominican of Languedoc, who died in 1665 at Grenoble, doctor of divinity, is best known as the editor of the works of Albertus Magnus (21 vols. fol. Lyons, 1651). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:914; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s. (B.P.)

## Jamnite[[@Headword:Jamnite]]

             (ὁ ἐν Ι᾿αμνεία, οΙ῾αμνίτης), an inhabitant of JAMNIA (2Ma 12:8-9; 2Ma 12:40) or JABNEEL SEE JABNEEL (q.v.).

## Jamrnia[[@Headword:Jamrnia]]

             (Ι᾿αμνία v. r. Ι᾿αμνεία), a Grecized or later form of the name of the city JABNEEL SEE JABNEEL (q.v.), used in the Apocrypha (1Ma 4:15; 1Ma 5:58; 1Ma 10:69; 1Ma 15:40), and Josephus (Ant. 5, 1, 22; 14:4, 4; War, 1, 7, 7).

## Jan, Johann Wilhelm[[@Headword:Jan, Johann Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born November 9, 1681. He studied at Wittenberg, was in 1713 professor of elocution, in 1714 of history, in 1719 doctor and professor of theology, and died August 27, 1725. He wrote, Judicia Eruditorum de Origine Electorum: — Historica Erae Christianae: — De Censu Romanorum Primo: — De Articulis Suobacensibus Augustance Confessionis Fundamento: — De Liturgiis Orientalibus in Doctrina de S. Eucharistia, etc. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:611. (B.P.)

## Janduno[[@Headword:Janduno]]

             SEE JOHN OF JANDUNO.

## Janes, Edmund Storer, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Janes, Edmund Storer, D.D., LL.D]]

             a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born of highly respectable but not wealthy parents, at Sheffield, Massachusetts, April 27, 1807. He was converted in 1820, and united with the Methodist Episcopal Church. From 1824 to 1830 he was engaged in teaching, during which time he studied law with the intention of making it the profession of his life; but in 1830 joined the Philadelphia Conference, and during the first few years of his ministry, in addition to his work as a minister and his theological studies, which were thorough if not broad, studied medicine. He was ordained deacon in 1832, an elder in 1834, and after filling various important charges was, in 1838, appointed agent for Dickinson College. In 1840 he was elected financial secretary of the American Bible Society; and in 1844 was elected to the bishopric in conjunction with bishop Hamline, they being the last of the bishops who received the vote of the undivided Church.

For more than thirty-one years he discharged his duties in the episcopal office, travelling in all the states except Florida, and in most of the territories, besides being president of the Missionary Society, of the Board of Church Extension, and of the Sunday school Union and Tract Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, as well as being one of the managers of the American Bible Society, of the directors of the American Colonization Society, of the trustees of the Wesleyan University at Middletown, Connecticut, of the Drew Theological Seminary, and  president of the Minard Home, Morristown, N.J. Bishop Janes was in many respects one of the most remarkable men in the history of American Methodism. He inherited the sterling mental and moral qualities of his Puritan ancestors; possessed a mind of a high order, enriched by generous culture, and disciplined by the severest training. He was a model platform speaker, ready, earnest, and impressive; a preacher of rare power, grasp, and eloquence; and an administrator of peerless activity, clearness, decision, patience, and comprehensiveness. He was a man of inflexible principle, thorough, conscientious, and untiring in labor and devotion; and a Christian of the purest humility. He died September 18, 1876. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1876, page 365; Simpson, jyclop. of Methodism, s.v.; Life, by Dr. Ridgaway (N.Y. 1882).

## Janes, Edwin L[[@Headword:Janes, Edwin L]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, twin brother of bishop E.S. Janes, was born at Sheffield, Massachusetts, April (his biographers say May) 27, 1807. He spent his boyhood near Salisbury, Conn., receiving the rudiments of an English education; was converted while teaching school in Columbia, N.Y.; and in 1832 entered the Philadelphia Conference. His appointments were, Asbury Church, West Philadelphia; Elizabeth, Plainfield, and Irvington, N.J.; Asbury Church, West Philadelphia; then to Haddington, Middletown, and Odessa Circuits, Delaware; then Elkton and St. George's  Church, Philadelphia; then was transferred to the New York Conference, and sent in turn to Mulberry Street Church; South Second Street, Williamsburgh; South Fifth Street (which was organized by him); Bridgeport and Middletown, Connecticut, in 1854 and 1855, presiding elder of New Haven District; South Fifth Street, Williamsburgh, three years; John Street and Forsyth Street, New York city; Flushing and Whitestone, L.I.; Summerfield Church, Brooklyn, in 1866; Central Church in 1867, and John Street, New York city, in 1868 and 1869, where he closed his pastoral life. In 1870 he was appointed district secretary or agent of the National Temperance Society and Publishing House, which office he held until his death, January 10, 1875. Mr. Janes was among the foremost of saintly, inien;. an unrivalled pastor; a man of extraordinary power in prayer; of rare eloquence in exhortation; an ingenious, instructive, effectual preacher; a sound theologian, and a devoted temperance worker. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1875, page 51; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Janeway, Jacob J., D.D[[@Headword:Janeway, Jacob J., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister of some note, was born in the city of New-York in 1774, and graduated at Columbia College in 1794. He joined the Presbyterians, but also served the (Dutch) Reformed Church for some time with great distinction. The infirmities of age obliged him to retire from the pastorate, and he resided the last years of his life at New Brunswick, N.J., where he died in 1858. Mr. Janeway wrote quite extensively. His most important contributions are commentaries on Romans, Hebrews, and Acts (Philadel. 3 vols. 18mo): — Internal Evidence of the Holy Bible: — Review of Dr. Schaff on Protestantism, etc. See (Pha.) Presb. Mag. May, 1853.

## Janeway, James[[@Headword:Janeway, James]]

             an English divine, was born in Hertfordshire, and educated at Christ Church, Oxford. In 1652 he left the State Church and set up a dissenting congregation (Presbyterian) at Rotherhithe. He died in 1674. Besides a life of his brother John (q.v.) and his sermons, he published The Saint's Encouragement (1675, 8vo): — Token for Children (1676, 8vo, and often): — Heaven upon Earth (1677, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 954; Hook, Eccles. Biog. 6:276.

## Janeway, John[[@Headword:Janeway, John]]

             a very pious and promising young man, was born at Lilly, Hertfordshire, in 1633, of religious parents, entered Cambridge at seventeen, and at eighteen was converted, in part by means of Baxter's Saint's Rest. He now glowed for the salvation of souls, especially of those nearly related to him; secret prayer became his element. On leaving college, his father being dead. he went to live in the family of Dr. Cox, where his health sank under his studies and labors, and he finished his short course suddenly in June; 1657. His dying bed was a scene of triumph. — Middleton, Works 3:362.

## Jangamas[[@Headword:Jangamas]]

             a Hindu sect, the essential characteristic of which is wearing the Lingam (q.v.), or symbol of creative production on some part of the dress or person. The type is of small size, made of copper or silver, and is commonly worn suspended in a case round the neck, or sometimes tied in the turban. In common with the worshippers of Siva generally, the Jangamas smear their foreheads with ashes, wear necklaces, and carry rosaries made of the Rudraksha seed. The clerical members of the sect usually stain their garments with red ochre. They are not numerous in Upper India; but in the south of India the Jangamas, or Lingayets, as they are often called, are very numerous, and the officiating priests of Siva are commonly of this sect. They are also represented as being very numerous in the Deccan. Besides the Jangama priests of Kedarnath, a wealthy establishment of them exists at Benares.

## Jangling, Vain[[@Headword:Jangling, Vain]]

             (ματαιολογία, frivolous: or empty talk).

## Janisch, Rudolph[[@Headword:Janisch, Rudolph]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Hamburg, May 22, 1750. He studied at Gottingen, was catechist in his native city, and in 1789 pastor of the Lutheran Church at Amsterdam. In 1796 he was recalled to Hamburg, and died April 7, 1826, pastor primarius of St. Catharine's. He wrote, Cogitationes de Animi Humani Libertate (Hamburg, 1770): — Predigtentwurfe fur die sonn- und festtaglichen Evangelien (1797-1804, 8 parts). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:149. (B.P.)

## Janitores[[@Headword:Janitores]]

             persons appointed to take care of the doors of the churches in time of divine service, and to make a distinction between the faithful and the catechumens, and excommunicated persons, and others not entitled to admission. SEE DOOR-KEEPERS.

## Janizaries[[@Headword:Janizaries]]

             (Jeni-tsheri, “new soldiers”), a Turkish military force which was for some time recruited from Christian prisoners taken by the Turks, more especially during the Crusades. They were originated by the Osmanli Emir Orchan, about 1330, of young Christian prisoners, which, after having been distributed among the Turkish husbandmen in Asia, there to learn the Turkish language, religion, and manners, were compelled to embrace Mohammedanism. This treatment of Christian prisoners sprang from the Mohammedan doctrine that “all children at their birth are naturally  disposed to Islamism,” and they reasoned that, by enforcing the conversion of the young captives to the true faith, and enrolling them in the ranks of the army of the faithful, they were serving both their temporal and eternal interests. But after a time the recruiting of the Janizaries was also undertaken among the Christian subjects of the Mohammedans, and the execution of this terrible scheme inspired terror and consternation among the vanquished Christian populations of Asia Minor, Thrace, and Anatolia, where the new tax of flesh and blood on families severed the nearest and dearest ties. For a period of 300 years it was the custom to raise annually for this branch of the Turkish army no less than 1000 Christian youths; and it is estimated by Von Hammer that no less than 500,000 young Christians were thus converted into Mohammedan Turkish soldiers (compare Creasy, Hist. Ottoman Turks, 1, 21 sq.).

In the second half of the 17th century the old system of filling the ranks of the Janizaries exclusively with compulsory conscripts from the Christian subjects of the Turk was finally abandoned, as the many privileges which these soldiers enjoyed as body-guard of the sultan, etc., induced many young Turks to seek admission to their body. There were two classes of Janizaries, one regularly organized, dwelling in barracks in Constantinople and a few other towns, and whose number at one time amounted to no less than 60.000, afterwards, however, reduced to 25,000; and the other composed of irregular troops, called Jamaks, scattered throughout all the towns of the empire, and amounting in number to 300,000 or 400,000. At the head of the whole Janizary force was the Aga, who held his appointment for life, and whose power was almost without limit. In times of peace they acted as a police force; in war they generally formed the reserve of the Turkish army, and were noted for the wild impetuosity of their attack.

But the many privileges which were bestowed on them soon began to make them very unruly; and their history abounds in conspiracies, assassinations of sultans, viziers, agas, etc., and atrocities of every kind; so that, by degrees, they became more dangerous to the country- than any foreign enemies. Attempts to, reform or dissolve them were always unsuccessful, till sultan Mahmoud II, in 1826, being opposed in some of his measures by them in Constantinople, displayed the flag of the Prophet, and succeeded in arousing on his own behalf the fanatical zeal of other portions of his troops. Their own aga deserted them, they were defeated, and their barracks burned, when 8000 of them perished in the flames. June 17,1826, a proclamation announced the Janizaries forever abolished. Everywhere in the empire they were persecuted until “upwards of 40,000 of these troops were annihilated, and an equal number  driven into exile.” See Frazer (the Rev. R. W.), Turkey, Ancient and Modern (London, 1854, 8vo), p. 406; Creasy, Hist. of Ottoman Turks, chiefly founded on Von Hammer (London, 1858, 2 vols. 8vo), Vol. 2; Knolles, Turkish History, 1, 132 sq.; Madden (R. R.), Turkish Empire (Lond. 1862, 8vo), ch. 13; Macfarland, Constantinople in 1828.

## Janna[[@Headword:Janna]]

             (Ι᾿αννά, prob. for Heb. יִנָּה, yannah', flourishing, although no corresponding name occurs in the O.T.), the father of Melchi and son of Joseph, named as the sixth in ascent from Christ on his mother's side (Luk 3:24). B.C. cir. 200. SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

## Jannaeus[[@Headword:Jannaeus]]

             SEE ALEXANDER JANNJEUS.

## Jannes[[@Headword:Jannes]]

             (Ι᾿αννῆς, probably of Egyptian etymology [see below]). Jannes and Jambres are thought to have been two of the Egyptiani magicians who attempted by their enchantments (לָטַים, Exo 7:22, etc.; or לְהָטַים, Exo 7:11, secret arts) to counteract the influence on Pharaoh's mind of the miracles wrought by Moses (see Exodus 7, 8). Their names occur nowhere in the Hebrew Scriptures, and only once in the New Testament (2Ti 3:8), where Paul says no more than that they “withstood Moses,” and that their folly in doing so became manifest (2Ti 3:8-9). He became acquainted with them, most probably, from an ancient Jewish tradition, or, as Theodoret expresses it, “from the unwritten teaching of the Jews.” They are found frequently in the Talmudical and Rabbinical writings but with some variations. Thus, for Jannes we meet with יניס יונוס יואני יוחני יוחנא. Of these, the last three are forms of the Hebrew יוחנן, which has led to the supposition that Ι᾿αννῆς is a contracted form of the Greek Ι᾿ωάννης. Some critics (Pfeiffer, Dub. vex. 1, 253) consider these names to be of Egyptian origin, and in that case the Jewish writers must have been misled by a similarity of sound to adopt the forms above mentioned, as the Mishna (Sanhedr. 98, b; Chol. 19, a) has done in the case of other unknown proper names (Majus, Observat. sacr. 2, 42). For Jambres we find ממרי ממרא יומברוס ימבריס, and in the Shalsheleth Hakkabala (13, 2) the two names are given ואמברוטיאו  יואני, i.e. Johannes and Ambrosius!

The Targum of Jonathan inserts them in Exo 2:11. The same writer also gives as a reason for Pharaoh's edict for the destruction of the Israelitish male children that “this monarch had a dream in. which the land of Egypt appeared in one scale and a lamb in- another; that on awakening he sought for its interpretation from his wise men; whereupon Jannes and Jambres (וימבריס יניס) said, “A son is to be born in the congregation of Israel who will desolate the whole land of Egypt.” Several of the Jewish writers speak of Jannes and Jambres as the two sons of Balaam (Talmud, Jalkut Ruben, 81, 3), and assert that they were the youths (נְעָטָרַים, Auth. Version servants) who went with him to the king of Moab (Num 22:22). Arabian tradition assigns them a place in Egyptian history (see the Asiatic Journal, 1843, No.. 7, p. 73). Their graves were located in Egypt (Pallad. Lausiac. 20). The Pythagorean philosopher Numenius mentions these persons in a passage preserved by Eusebius (Praeparatio Evang. 9:8), and by Origen (c. Cels. 4:p. 198, ed. Spencer); also Pliny (Hist. Nat. 30:1), and apparently Apuleius Apol. p. 94). The Arabs mention the names of several magicians who opposed Moses;. among them is none resembling Jannes and Jambres (D'Herbelot, s.v. Moussa Ben Amran). There was an ancient apocryphal writing entitled Jannes and Mambres, which is referred to by Origen (in Matthew Comment. § 117; Opera, 5, 29), and by Ambrosiaster, or Hilary the Deacon:. it was condemned by pope Gelasius.

Jannes appears to be a transcription of the Egyptian name Annu, probably pronounced Ian. It was the nomen of two kings': one of the eleventh dynasty, the father or ancestor of Sesertesen I of the twelfth; the other, according to our arrangement, fourth or fifth king of the fifteenth dynasty, called by Manetho Ι᾿άννας or Ι᾿ανίας (Josephus), or Σταάν (Africanus). See Poole; Horce Egyptiacae, p. 174 sq. There is also a king bearing the name Annu, whom we assign to the second dynasty (Hor. ‘g. p. 101). The significations of Adan is doubtful: the cognate word Aant means a valley or plain. The earlier king Aan may be assigned to the 21st century B.C.; the later one is thought to have been the second predecessor of Joseph's Pharaoh. This shows that a name which may be reasonably supposed to be the original of Jannes was in use at or near the period of the sojourn in Egypt. The names of the ancient Egyptians were extremely. numerous, and very fluctuating in use; generally, the most prevalent at any time were those of kings then reigning or not long dead.  See Wetstenii Nov. Test. Graec. 2, 362; Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. Rabb. col. 945; Lightfoot's Sermon on James and Jambres (in Works, 7:89); Erubhin, or Miscellanies, ch. 24 (in Works, 4, 33); Lardner's Credibility, pt. 2, ch. 35 (in Works, 7, 381); Fabric. Pseudepigr. V. T. 1, 813; Thilo, Cod. Apocryph. 1, 553; the dissertations De Janne et Jambre of Zentgrav (Argent. 1699); Grotius (Hafn. 1707); Michaelis (Hal. 1747); and Hermann, De pseudothaumaturgio Pharaonis (Jen. 1745).

## Janning, Conrad[[@Headword:Janning, Conrad]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born at Groningen Nov. 16, 1650. He received his early education from his uncle, J. Tinga, a pastor at Groningen. As his parents were devoted Romanists, they were unwilling to have him educated ‘at the Protestant university of his native city. He was therefore sent to a Jesuit College in Westphalia, and afterwards to Antwerp. In 1679 he was associated with the Bollandists in the gigantic labor of preparing the Acta Sanctorum. In 1661 he visited Rome, where he completed his theological studies, and was consecrated to the priesthood. In Rome and throughout Italy, and on his whole route, he collected materials for the above-named work. He returned to Antwerp in 1686, but soon made another tour, visiting different parts of Germany and Bohemia in quest of further materials. In 1697 he again went to Rome, ‘and rendered important service in the work to which his life was devoted. To his indefatigable labors this stupendous task. is under very great obligations, as thirteen volumes are ascribed to his pen. Different judgments ‘may be formed of this work. Prof. H. De Groot, of the Groningen University, a man of eminent attainments in Church History, and distinguished by his writings in this department, thus speaks of the work of the Bollandists: “With many fables and worthless legends, they communicate a great number of important biographies, elucidated generally with great learning and in the earlier portions, for the most part, also with impartiality. For a knowledge of Church History in the primitive times, and, above all, in the Middle Ages, both the lives and the elucidations are often of inestimable value.” Janning died August 13, 1723. See B. Glasius, Godgeleerde Nederland, 2, 159 sq.; Geschiedenis der Christelijke Kerk, door Profs. De Groot, Ter Haar, Kist, Moll, etc., 5, 34. (J. P.W.)

## Janoah[[@Headword:Janoah]]

             (Heb. Yano'ach, יָנוֹח, rest; 2Ki 15:29; Sept. Α᾿νώχ v.r. Ι᾿ανώχ; but in Joshua cvi, 6,7 with הlocal, Yano'chah, יָנוֹחָה, to Janoah; Sept. Ι᾿ανωχά v. r. Ι᾿ανωκά and Ι᾿ανώ, or even ᾿Μαχώ; Vulg. Janzoe; A.V. “Janohah”), the name probably of two places.

1. A town on the N.E. border of Ephraim (see Keil and Delitzsch, Comment. on Joshua, etc., p. 177, Clarke's ed.), and consequently in or near the Jordan valley (Jos 16:6-7). Euseb. and Jerome state that in their time it was still a village in the district of Acrabatine, twelve miles east of Neapolis, the ancient Sichem (Onomasticon s. v Ι᾿ανώ, Janon). About three and a half hours (12 miles) east by south of Nablus stands the little village of Yanon, situated in a vale which descends the eastern slope of the mountains of Ephraim to the Jordan. The village is' now mostly in ruins, but it has a few houses inhabited, and its ancient remains “are extensive and interesting. Entire houses and walls are still existing, but covered with immense heaps of earth and rubbish. The- dwellings of the present inhabitants are built upon and between the dwellings of the ancient Janohah” (Van de Velde, Travels, 2, 303). Janohah being situated on the side of the mountain range, the border “went down” to Ataroth, which lay in the valley of the Jordan. About a mile up the vale of Janohahis a little fountain, and upon a hill above it the prostrate ruins of another ancient town which is now called Khirbet Yanun (“ruined: Yaniun”) (Robinson, B. R. 3:297):

2. A town of Northern Palestine, situated apparently between Abel-beth- Maachah and Kedesh, and within the boundaries of Naphtali. It was taken, with several other cities; on the first invasion of Palestine by TiglathPileser, king of Assyria (2Ki 15:29). It is mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome, but they strangely confound it with Janohah, a town of Ephraim (Onomasticon, s.v.; Janon), and in this they are followed by Reland: (Palestina, p. 826), Gesenius (Thesaurus, s.v.), Schwarz Palest. p. 147), and others. The modern village of Hunin, which stands on the brow of a mountain between Abel and Kedesh, and which contains the massive ruins of a large and strong castle, would answer to the situation, and the names have some slight radical affinity. For a description of Hunin, see Porter, Handbook for Syria and Palestine, p. 444. — Kitto, s.v. ‘A ruin called Yanuh, on a hill S.W. of Haddata (Robinson, Later Researches, p.58), seems' by its name to have more correspondence to Jalnoah than Huinnin;  but it lies in the center of Gentile Galilee, and Tiglath-Pileser's march seems rather to have followed the hills along the Huleh plain, Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 324.

## Janoah (2)[[@Headword:Janoah (2)]]

             (1) OF EPHRAIM Of Khurbet Yanun, the modern representative of this place, the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (2:395) give only this notice: "Traces of ruins above a spring."

(2) OF NAPHTALI. The Yauih, thought by some to represent this place, is a double village, nine and three quarter miles south-east from es-Zib (Ecdippa, or Achzib), which would fall on the border between Asher and Naphtali, and is thus described (from Guerin) in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (1:193): "Cisterns cut in the rock, and many cut stones scattered over the soil, surrounding platforms or employed as building material, show that we are here on the site of a small ancient city, the name of which is faithfully preserved in its modern name." Lieut. Conder, how ever, distinguishes this locality from the Janoah of 2Ki 15:29 (see the Memoirs as above, 1:96; but no description of the place is given), which he regards as the Januh lying four miles south of the Leontes (Nahr Kasimiyeh), and six and a quarter miles east of Tyre; but this would fall within the tribe of Asher.

## Janohah[[@Headword:Janohah]]

             (Jos 16:6-7). SEE JANOAH, 1.

## Janow, Matthias Von[[@Headword:Janow, Matthias Von]]

             one of the most celebrated reformers before the Reformation, and one of the three distinguished forerunners of Huss, SEE WALDHAUSER and Milicz, on whose teachings in their day, more than on all the territorial aggrandizements of the German empire, the most important results ‘of the latter half of the 14th century were staked (Gillett, Huss, 1, 37), was the son of a Bohemian knight. Of the early history of Matthias we know but very little. He was educated at the University of Prague, where he was a zealous disciple of Milicz (q.v.), and he is often called Magister Parisiesis. because he spent six years at the University of Paris and obtained his master's degree there. He traveled extensively, and no doubt had attained great popularity as a scholar and divine when quite young.' He was ambitious to secure some prominent position, and succeeded, on a visit to- Rome in 1380, in obtaining the appointment of prebendary at Prague; and confessor of Charles IV. He entered upon the duties of this office Oct. 12, 1381, and continued therein until his death, Nov. 30, 1394. Matthias of Janow does ‘not seem to have been a very eloquent preacher, but he was certainly a man of very earnest and deep piety, zealous for his Master's cause, anxious to purify the Church' from the evils and corruptions which then threatened the extirpation of all religious feeling; and however small may have been his influence in the pulpit, “it was more than compensated by the influence which he exerted through his writings, and by his scientific exposition of principles. In his works we may find not only the reformatory ideas which passed over from him to Huss, but also the incipient germ of those Christian principles Which at a later period were unfolded in Germany- by Luther, although the latter never came under the influence of Matthias ‘of Janow” (Neander, CA. Hist. 5, 192). In his earlier period of life, disgusted with that spiritual pride and contempt of the laity which characterized the priests 2 the 14th and 15th centuries, he was impressed by Milicz's ideas of the universal priesthood of all Christians, more especially after he had been placed in the confessional, where he had great  opportunity to inform himself more minutely of the good or bad in all classes of society, and of the religious ants of the people. This may be clearly seen not only from his own narration of the change which he experienced (see Neander, Ch. Hist. 5, 194 sq.; Gillett, Huss, 1, 28 sq.), but also from his writings, collected under the title of De regulis Veteris et Novii Testamenti, of which, unfortunately, the greater part still remains in MS. form (for extracts, see Jordan, Virldauferi d. Husitenthumas in Bohmen [Lpz. 1846]). Pressel, in Herzog (s.v.), says that the work might more appropriately have been entitled Inquiries concerning true and false Christianity. “It is chiefly taken up with reflections on the history of the times, and hints concerning the future, based on the rules of the Old and New Testaments, on the prophetical elements which they contain. Although there is a great deal in the details which is arbitrary, particularly in the apocalyptic calculations, yet grand prophetic glances into the future are also to be found. He portrays the utter corruption of the Church in all its parts, and explains the causes of it (Neander). The main object of the work, however, was the rejection of the authority of human traditions and popish decretals, and the substitution in their stead of the supreme authority of the divine Word. He tries everything by this test.

The conduct of the bishops and the priests is severely arraigned. The antichrist he asserts, has already come. ‘He is neither Jew, Pagan, Saracen, nor worldly tyrant persecuting Christendom, but the man who opposes Christian truth and the Christian life in the way of deception; he is and will be the most wicked Christian, falsely styling himself by that name, assuming the highest station in the Church, and possessing the highest consideration, arrogating dominion over all ecclesiastics and laymen; one who, by the working of Satan, knows how to make subservient to his own ends and to his own will the corporations of the rich and wise in the entire Church; one who has the preponderance in honors and in riches, but who especially misappropriates the goods of Christ, the Holy Scriptures, the sacraments, and all that belongs to the hopes of religion, to his own aggrandizement and to the gratification of his own passions; deceitfully perverting spiritual things to carnal ends, and in a crafty and subtle' manner employing what was designed for the salvation of a Christian people, as means to lead them astray from the truth and power of Christ (Neander, 5,.196 sq.; Gillett, p. 30 sq.). It is apparent, from the tenor of Janow's writings, that he took higher ground than the other Hussite forerunners, Waldhausen and Milicz the earliest Bohemian reformers and that he was, in truth, the Wickliffe of the Bohemian Church. The efforts of his predecessors were simply toward  a reform in morals and in doctrine, but the efforts of Janow were directed to a reformation of the corrupt Latin system, with a view to remove wholly the yoke of that system. He strove not simply to elevate the moral and religious condition of the priest and the layman, but demanded alike privileges for both. Not to the priesthood only, but to the laity also belonged the communion of both kinds; not to the popes only, who had haughtily exalted themselves, belonged the right to govern, but all bishops should share the same privileges; in short, his idea was that the organism of the Church is one in which all the members should be connected according to their several ranks, and co-operate together like the lead and members in the human body (comp. Reichel, See of Rome in the Middle Ages, p. 600). We need not wonder that Janow, although he did not suffer the punishment of a heretic, was not long permitted to cast abroad seeds which must result in the overthrow of the papal hierarchy, and the removal of many strong barriers which protected the priesthood in these days of darkness and of sin. Having urged upon the emperor the need of a council, the pope declared Janow guilty of disseminating heretical opinions, and he was obliged to leave Prague. It is said that he recanted in 1389 before the Synod of Prague, which had arraigned him, but it is evident from his writings that he never changed his opinions, for one of his last declarations was “All that remains for us is to desire a reformation by the overthrow of the antichrist himself to lift up our heads and see our redemption near.” Sixteen years after his death (1410), his writings, it is generally admitted, were committed to the flames, together with those of Wickliffe. See Palacky, Geschichte ron Bohmen, III. 1, 173 sq.; Neander, Church History, v. 192 sq.; Gillett, Huss and his Times, 1, 26 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Jansen (Lat. Jansenius), Jacques[[@Headword:Jansen (Lat. Jansenius), Jacques]]

             a Belgian theologian, was born at Amsterdam in 1547. He studied at Losuvain, was in 1575 first president of the newly-founded Augustinian college, in 1580 professor of theology, in 1614 dean, and died July 30, 1625. He wrote, Instructio Catholici Ecclesiastae: — Enarratio in Exodi 15 et Deuteron. 32: — Commentar. in Jobum: — In Nahum et Habacua Prophetas: — In Cantica Canticorum: — In Psalmos Davidis: — In Evangelium Johannis. See Andrea, Bibliotheca Belgica; Mirteus, Elogia Illustrium Belgii Scriptorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Jansen or Jansenius, Cornelius (1)[[@Headword:Jansen or Jansenius, Cornelius (1)]]

             a distinguished Belgian theologian, was born at Hulst in 1510. He studied theology at the University of Louvain, and acquired at the same time a thorough knowledge of Greek and Hebrew. In 1538 he went to Tongerloo as professor of theology, and became successively curate of St. Martin at Courtray in 1550, dean of the theological faculty of Louvain in 1562, and was soon after sent by Philip II to the Council of Trent. On his return to the Netherlands he was made bishop of Ghent in 1568. He died April 10, 1576. His works on Scripture enjoyed great reputation. He wrote Concordia Evaengelica et ejusdemn Concordice ratio (Louvain, 1549, 8vo): — Para phrasis in omnes Psalmos Davidicos (Louv. 1849, 4to) Commentarii in Concordiam ac totam historiame Evan, gelicame  (Louvain, 1572, 1577, and 1617, fol.; Lyon, 1597 and 1606, folio; often reprinted at Antwerp and Venice [this is his chief work]): Annotationes in librum Sapientice Salomonis (Antwerp, 1589, 4to): — Commentarii in Proverbia Salomonis et Ecclesiasticam, etc. See Simonis, Oratio infunere Jansenii; Gallia Christiana (vol. 6); Sander, De illustribus Gandis; Genebrardus, Chronicon; Foppens, Bibl. Belgica; Miraeus, De Scriptoribus Saeculi xvi; Pope-Blount, Censura Autorum; Fabricius, Hist. Biblioth. — Hoefer, Nouvelle Biog. Géneralé, 16, 344. (J. N. P.)

## Jansen(ius) Cornelius (2)[[@Headword:Jansen(ius) Cornelius (2)]]

             a celebrated Dutch divine and founder of the JANSENISTS, born at Accoy, near Leerdam, in Northern Holland, Oct. 28, 1585, was a nephew of the above Cornelius Jansen, the Bp. of Ghent. He received his early education at Utrecht, and in 1602 entered the university at Louvain as a student of philosophy and theology. While at this high school he seems to have formed an acquaintance with the Frenchman, Jean Baptiste Duvergier (q.v.) de Hauranne, generally known by the name-of St. Cyran. “Both he (i.e. Cyran) and Jansenius were there brought into contact with some who in secret cherished the doctrines of grace although in the communion of Rome, and thus they received many principles of truth utterly opposed to those ordinarily held in the Church. There also they both saw and felt the evil workings of the Jesuits; they marked the inroads which that system was making on all doctrinal truth and practical morality.” But Jansenius's severe industry brought on sickness, and he was obliged to quit the university, and for a time the two ‘bosom-friends were separated. Advised to seek a change of air, he undertook a journey through France, and finally stopped at Paris to prosecute his studies anew. Again the two friends met, and together they removed to Bayonne, and spent another series of years in earnest study and meditation, particularly on the writings of the Church fathers, of whom Augustine became their special favorite. So interested became Jansenius in the writings of Augustine, that from henceforth he determined to make it his life-business to arrange and methodize everything in the productions of this Church father treating on the subjects of the grace of God, the condition' of man as fallen, free-will and human impotence, original sin, election, efficacious grace, faith, and other points of like importance, with a view to a reformatory movement in the Church to which he belonged, by combating the increasing Pelagianism of the Jesuits. In 1617 the two friends again parted, Jansenius returning to Louvain to obtain the doctorate and to assume the duties of an  extraordinary professorship in the university. In a controversy which ensued between this high school and the Jesuits Jansenius greatly distinguished himself, and was twice sent to Spain (1624 and 1625) in the interest of the university, Holland being, at that time, dependent on Spain. In 1621, Jansenius and Cyran, who had become convinced of the necessity of a reform within the, pale of the Roman Catholic communion, met again at Louvain with a view to bringing about such a change. They divided the work among themselves, Jansenius taking the field of doctrine, Duvergier that of organization and life. At the same time, they entered into intimate connections with distinguished priests in Ireland and with some of the leaders of the Congregation of the Oratory (q.v.). The Spanish Inquisition seems to have had wind of this great and daring undertaking of the two noble spirits, and when, in 1630, Jansenius was nominated for the regular professorship of sacred literature at Louvain, a great effort was made to prevent the appointment. But Jansenius was made the recipient of this honorable distinction in spite of the Jesuits and the “Holy Office.” He further secured the favor of the Spanish court by his opposition to France and its alliances with Protestant powers,-to which course he seems to have been mainly incited by the tardiness of Richelieu to enter into an alliance with Jansenius and Duvergier in the intended reformatory movement. He severely attacked the pretensions of France, which at this time, by her attitude, was threatening the Spanish provinces of the Netherlands, in a work entitled Marms Gallicus, the publication of which occasioned the imprisonment of Duvergier, who was known to have been in constant epistolary intercourse with Jansenius, while to the latter it secured the see of Ypres (1636). In this city he died of the plague May 6, 1638, just as he had finished his Augustinus, a work embodying the result of 22 years' study of the writings of St. Augustine, and which, according to his own statement, he had read, pen in hand, at least ten times, and the portions relating to sin and grace no less than thirty times, determined to exhibit, expound, and illustrate, not his own views, but the exact views of the celebrated Church father (compare Augustinus, 2, Procem. 29:65).

Jansenius was a learned theologian, but a plain, retiring man, who spent most of his life in his study, and was hardly known in his day beyond the immediate circle surrounding him. It is thought likely that the impulse communicated by Baius (q.v.) to the school of Louvain may have influenced Jansenius in giving this direction to his studies, as Cornelius Jansen, the bishop of Ghent, who was one of the instructors of our Jansen  at Loluvain, was himself a pupil of Baius, and that through him he had imbibed a strong dislike to the lax views of theology and morality advocated by the Jesuits. Jansenius took the ground, in opposing the Jesuits, that life stands in the closest relation to practical doctrinal precepts. He thought it impossible to attain true spiritual and Christian life without the fullest faith in this doctrine, which alone inculcates true humility. On the ground that pride was the cause of the fall, he sought to destroy all feeling of individual power, giving up human free agency to divine grace, and declaring human nature to be thoroughly corrupt, and unable by itself to do any good. While he believed these to have been the doctrines of Augustine himself, yet, as an obedient son of the Church of Rome, which, while he was anxious to purge her from the Pelagianism of the Jesuits, he dearly loved, he in his will, written, half an hour before his death, said of his yet unpublished Augustinus, ‘I feel that it would be difficult to make any changes in it; yet, should the Holy See require such, remember that. I am an obedient son, and willing to submit to the Church in which I have lived till death.” He willed the MS. to Lame, Fromond, and Calenus, who published it under the title Augustinus… sea doctrina sancti Augusti de humanae nature sanctitate, egritudine, nedicin, aieersus Pelagianos et Massilienses (Louvain, 1640, folio).

The Augustinus is divided into three parts. In the first Jansenius gives a historical account of Pelagianism, which heresy exalted the power of free agency, aid denied the original depravity of human nature, and, consequently, original sin. In the second part the Writer sets forth the views of St. Augustine on human nature, both in its state of primitive purity and in its state of degradation after the fall. In the third part, finally, he presents the ideas of St. Augustine touching grace, by which Christ redeems us from our fallen state, also the predestination of men and angels. The fundamental proposition of the work is that, “since the fall of Adam, free agency exists no longer in man, pure works are a mere gratuitous gift of God, and the predestination of the elect is not an effect of his prescience of our works; but of his free volition.” This, it will be perceived, is a close reproduction of the views presented by Calvin in the preceding century. Such principles were, of course, in direct opposition with those advocated in Spain and Holland by the Jesuits Molina and Lessius, who wished, to conciliate the doctrine of salvation by grace with a certain amount of human free agency. Jansenius, besides, had personally incurred the hatred of the “Order of Jesus” by causing the Jesuits to be excluded as professors  from the University of Louvain; and, though the work had failed to excite much attention, the Jesuits were determined now to be revenged on their enemy.

The Augustinus thus became the occasion of a theological controversy by far the most important in its doctrinal social, and even political results which has agitated the Roman Catholic Church since the great Reformation of the 16th century… The whole weight of the order of the Jesuits having been brought into play to cause the condemnation of the work at Rome, it was accordingly and speedily; done by pope Urban VIII, in his bull neminenti, March 6,1642. “So decisive a point would not have been gained by the Jesuits had they not succeeded in directing the attention of the papal court to a passage in which Jansenius brought forward a statement of St. Augustine as authoritative, although the same point (without reference, of course, to that father) had been condemned at Rome. This was an inroad on papal infallibility, and this caused the rejection of the work.” But if the book of Jansenius had failed to excite much attention, the issuing of a bull against its use, and all this at the instigation of the Jesuits, provoked no little interest. Especially strong was the opposition against the bull in Belgium and in France, and many were the partisans thus secured for the Augustinus, a number of whom-perhaps even the most--were animated, in all likelihood, less by doctrinal predilection than by an antipathy to the laxity of the moral teachings of the Jesuits, with which the opposition to the Augustinus was, of course, always identified. The very strongest of the partisans of the Augustinus were the recluses of Port Royal (q.v.), a celebrated association of scholars and divines, among whom figured some of the brightest names in the Church of France of the 17th century. One of these, Antoine Arnauld (q.v.), in 1643 published his De la frèquente Communion, based on the predestination doctrine of Augustine and Jansenius, and thereby heaped more live coals on the heads of the now already much distracted Jesuits. Even the Dominicans in different countries divided in opinion, those of Spain and Italy enlisting on the side of the Jansenists (as the advocates of the Augustinus came by this time to be called), those of France siding with the Jesuits. Even the Sorbonne, of whom Arnauld was a member, was divided; and, after an earnest strife between the contending parties had waged in France for some time, both decided in 1651 to carry it to Rome, and plead their cause before the infallible (!) judge. In 1649, Cornet Syndic, of the theological faculty at Paris, at the instigations of the Jesuits, had drawn up in connection with some of them, five propositions, and had submitted them to the Sorbonne as forming the substance of Jansenius's work. These  the Jesuits now presented at Rome, satisfied that if they could only once obtain the condemnation of these as heretical, the fall of Jansenism was of course secured. On May 31, 1653, the Jesuits finally secured their end, — and Innocent X, in his bull Cue occasione, at the instigation of his cardinal Chigi, condemned the five propositions, which had been “mostly couched in somewhat ambiguous language, so as to admit of very different explanations,” the object of the Jesuits being “to procure their condemnation in any sense or in any form.” They are as follows:

(1.) That there are divine commands which virtuous and pious persons; though they would gladly perform the same, cannot possibly obey, because God has not given them that measure of grace which is absolutely necessary to enable them to render such obedience.

(2.) That no one in this depraved state of nature can resist the influence of divine grace when it operates on the heart.

(3.) That, in order to make the actions of men meritorious, it is not necessary that they be free from necessity, but only from restraint.

(4.) That the semi-Pelagians greatly err when they affirm that the will of man has power to receive or to resist the influence of prevenient grace.

(5.) That they are semi-Pelagians who assert that Jesus Christ, by his passion and death, made an atonement for the sins of all men. The pope pronounced the first and the last proposition presumptuous, impious, and blasphemous, but the other three simply heretical. The friends and adherents of Jansenius admitted the propriety and justice of condemning these propositions, but maintained that they were not found in the work of Jansenius.

France was at this time at enmity with Rome, and cardinal Mazarin, though but little interested in these theological questions, believed this a favorable opportunity to re-establish amicable relations with Rome, offended with him on account of his arrest of cardinal Retz (q.v.). He held an assembly at the Louvre, March 26, 1654, in which thirty-eight bishops took part, and which declared that the pope's decision should be considered as applying positively to Jansenius's doctrine, and that all who held in any way the five condemned propositions should be dealt with as heretics. This decision was communicated to the heads of all the dioceses throughout France, and approved by the pope September 29. In January, 1656, the Sorbonne also  took direct action against the Jansenists by condemning two letters of Arnauld, in which the latter declared that he could not find the five condemned proposition's in Jansenius's writings. He also hit upon an expedient which not only rendered the bull for a time harmless, but which initiated a new movement against the doctrine of papal infallibility. “True,” he said, “the see of Rome has authority to decide with respect to doctrine, and every good Catholic must submit to its decree; but the Holy See may misapprehend fact (as in the papal condemnation of Galileo's theory of planetary movement), whether a book contains certain statements or no: the meaning also of a writer may be misunderstood. Let the five propositions be heretical, yet, with the exception of the first, they are to be found neither in letter nor in spirit in the writings of Jansen.” Thus arose the celebrated distinction of defacto and de jure.

The Sorbonne now demanded of Arnauld that he should discontinue his opposition and submit to her decisions. He, and sixty others with him, still refusing to submit, they were expelled from the theological faculty. A general assembly of the clergy was also convened in September of this year, and the following formula was adopted on the motion of De Marca, archbishop of Toulouse: “I condemn with heart and lips the doctrine of the five propositions of Cornelius Jansenius, contained in his book entitled Augustinus, and which the pope and bishops have condemned, said doctrine not being that of St. Augustine, whom Jansenius has explained wrongly, against the real meaning of that holy doctor.” A bull of Alexander VII, October 16, indorsed the decisions of the assembly, and affirmed that-the condemned propositions were a part of the doctrines of Jansenius. The signing of the above formula, which was required of all- French priests and members of religious orders, was everywhere opposed. Louis XIV, confounding the Jansenists with the Fronde, gave the Church the help of the civil authorities. But the members of Port Royal continued in their opposition, thinking it perjury for them to sign it. Another royal edict of April 29, 1664, was now issued, which was more moderate in its demands. It merely required the signing as a matter of form, but at the same time threatened such as refused with seizure of their income, and even with excommunication. The opposition still continuing, headed by Port Royal, persecution now commenced in earnest.. The dungeons of the Bastile were crowded with those who refused to violate their consciences by subscribing a formula which they did not believe to set forth their views The very passages of the fortress were occupied by prisoners. Among those who were thus treated was Lemaltre de Saey, spiritual director of the nuns of  Port Royal, who, accused of inciting them to resist, was imprisoned in the Bastile in 1666. As for Duvergier de Hauranne, he had already been sent to Vincennes thirty years before.

The government and the Jesuits, determined to suppress the rebellious spirit of Port Royal (q.v.), now used every effort that could be devised to gain their end. Two months had elapsed since the expulsion of Arnauld from the Sorbonne, when the civil authorities ordered that every novice and scholar should be removed from Port Royal. This sharpened the pen of Pascal, and forth came the eighteen famous Provincial Letters (Lettres a unprovincial). “In these remarkable letters the author showed with extraordinary force how narrow the question really was-whether five propositions are in the Augustinus or not, when no one had there pointed them out; he showed by what unworthy compromises the condemnation of Dr. Arnauld had been obtained; and, besides touching on doctrinal points which were involved, he firmly and manfully attacked the shameless casuistry of the Jesuits. These letters had a wonderful efficiency, for their power was felt even by those who had no apprehension of the present subject of controversy.” Voltaire has said that in wit the earlier of them were not excelled by the comedies of Moliere, while the latter rivaled the productions of Bossuet in eloquence; in fact, that they constituted an epoch in French literature. Says Hallam (Introd. Literature of Europe' Harper's edition, 2, 335): “These letters did more to ruin the name of Jesuit than all the controversies of Protestantism, or all the fulminations of the Parliament of Paris.” “All Europe,” says Macaulay (History of England, 2, 46), “read, admired, and laughed.” But not only the Jesuits felt this heavy blow; even the incumbent of St. Peter's chair staggered and reeled under the sudden attack, and, as a set-off for it, cardinal Chigi, now Alexander VII, not only confirmed the position of his predecessor, and again declared that the five propositions were contained de facto in Augustinus, but, imitating the French authorities, accompanied it by the requisition that every one holding a spiritual office in the Church of Rome should abjure these errors by subscribing a formula prescribed for that purpose. This injudicious and oppressive act subjected the Janseilists to still severer persecutions, and continued the heated controversy, in which the ablest pens on both sides were enlisted. A great point was made by the Jesuits of the infallibility question. SEE INFALLIBILITY.

But, as the controversy continued, it took a wider range, and came to embrace such topics as the rights of the bishops as contradistinguished from those of the pope; the Jesuitical views of  theology and morality, so ably censured by Pascal, as we have already seen; the vast and alarming power of the Jesuits, and even many usages of the Church of Rome. The opposition, which thus far had seemed to come mainly from Port-Royal recluses, was found to have spread even among high dignitaries of the Church: four bishops refused to sign the formulary which Rome dictated, and many others of this high position in France took the ground of “respectful silence.” In 1668 king Louis succeeded in obtaining the sanction of Rome for a compromise, substantially on the basis of Arnauld's distinction of defacto and de jure, and of respectful silence.

“Jansenistic” principles now became far more widely diffused. The authorities of the Church of Rome thought a Jansenist was not necessarily a heretic; the schools of Port-Royal flourished even more than before the persecution and imprisonment;” the learned Tillemont became one of her recluses, and Racine one of her students. The incumbents of the papal chair even became the friends of Port Royal, and obtained no little aid from it in their opposition to the Jesuits, which Innocent XI more especially manifested. This, of course, exasperated the Jesuits more than ever, and the great friend and protector of Jansenism at court, the duchess of Longueville, having died, they succeeded in gaining over Louis XIV, who, it is said, “abhorring Jansenism quite as much as he abhorred Protestantism, and very much more than he abhorred atheism,” had abstained from open violence only at the instance of the duchess of Longueville. An edict was issued forbidding the admission of new members to Port Royal, and the recluses were ordered to “quit the valley of Port- Royal at once and forever;” while Dr. Arnauld, the principal support of Jansenism, was obliged to flee from France, and to seek a refuge in the Low Counties, where he died in 1694.

Another and last personal disciple of Cyran died in 1695. In the same and the following year passed away also the other great supports of Jansenism, and it was already whispered among the Jesuits and at the French court that the heretical movement had been: successfully eradicated, when suddenly the crippled Jansenism received a fresh start. A priest of the Oratory of Paris, P. Quesnel, a man of learning, zeal, and spirituality of mind, had published the New Testament with annotations which were of a practical and edifying character, but strongly tinged with Jansenistic doctrines. It had been published in successive portions from 1671 to 1687. It had met at first with a most favorable reception. The Sorbonne had approved it; pope Clement. XI had  commended it; Francois Harle, archbishop of Paris, an avowed enemy of the Jansenists, had expressed his approbation of it; Louis Antoine de Noailles, bishop of Chalons, subsequently archbishop of Paris and finally a cardinal, who was then a zealous advocate of the Jansenistic doctrines, had even taken the work under his special protection, and enjoined its perusal; in his diocese. It had been and still was eagerly read, and had already passed through many editions. Another edition had just. (1702) become necessary, which was published under the title of Le nouveau Testament en Francois, avec des reflexions morales sur chaque ver, se, pour eze rendre la lecture plus utile, et la meditation plus aisee. The author had never signed the five propositions, and his confessor now put the question to the Sorbonne “whether he might admit to communion a spiritual person who had done no more than maintain, the “reverential silence,” as some of the. bishops had done,” and the reply from the Sorbonne came that, with regard to points of fact, respectful obedience was sufficient obedience. But hardly had the cas de conscience as it is technically termed, become known at Rome, when pope Clement XI condemned it in the most' severe terms (Feb. 12, 1703), and complained to the king of those who so thoughtlessly stirred up the old controversy. Finally, the bull Vineam Domini (July 15, 1705), confirmed and renewed all preceding condemnations of the five propositions. This bull was accepted by the assembly of the clergy, and registered in Parliament. But with it the Jesuits were by no means quieted. They desired complete victory. Another edition of Quesnel's Reflexions morales having become necessary, and it being the production of a decided Jansenist, popularizing the Port-Royalists, who made it one of their duties to distribute it freely among the- people, they determined that it also should be suppressed. They persisted in their efforts to secure the condemnation of the work by the papal see until at last success crowned their undertaking.

In 1708 Clement XI pronounced against it, and in 1712 it was prohibited by a papal edict as “a text-book of undisguised Jansenism.” By this time the king of France (Louis XIV) and the Jesuits were in league together, and we need not wonder that the Jansenists, as opponents of the Jesuits, were severely dealt with. Indeed, it is asserted that this bull, as well as many others that were issued about this time in Rome, and aiming at the French Church, were one and all dictated in Paris. Says Tregelles (Jansenists, p. 38), “The king and the Jesuits procured whatever bulls they wanted from the pope, and when they did not sufficiently set forth the Jansenist heresy, they were returned from Paris to Rome with corrections and alterations, to which the pope acceded.” No wonder, then, that the bull  of 1712 was in 1713 followed by another still severer, famous as the bull Unigenzitus, by which were condemned all of the writings of Quesnel, and all that had ever been or might ever be written in their defense. It also singled out all propositions from the works of Quesnel as false, captious, evil sounding, offensive to pious (!) ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, and injurious to the Church and its customs; contumelious, not against the Church merely, but also against the secular authorities; seditious, “impious, blasphemous, suspected of heresy, and also savoring of heresy itself; also favoring heretics; heresies, and schism, erroneous, nearly allied to heresy, often condemned; and, furthermore, also heretical.; and sundry heresies, especially those contained in the well-known propositions of Jansenius, and that, too, in the sense in which those were condemned.” The bull did not specify which of the propositions belonged severally to each of these heads of condemnation. “This was the triumph of doctrinal Jesuitism: Le Tellier, the king's Jesuit confessor, arranged the terms of the bull. It seemed as if every feeling of piety towards God, and every apprehension of his grace, was to be extinguished throughout the Papal.Church — as if all who adhered at all to many doctrines that had been regarded as orthodox were to have their feelings and their consciences outraged.” But the Gallican clergy was by no means agreed as to the acceptance of the bull, although the Jesuits earnestly pressed it. Some were in favor of its unconditional acceptance, others desired to make a qualifying declaration, and still others wished the qualification to be made by the pope himself. After much disputation, the king himself decided the matter by making submission to the bull binding in Church and State. From three to four thousand volumes, including pamphlets, relating. to the controversy which this famous bull provoked, are found in the great Parisian library.

The death of Louis XIV left the fate of Jansenism still unsettled, while it also caused a relaxation of the repressive measures. The regent, duke of Orleans, was urged to refer the whole controversy to a national council, and the leaders of the Jansenist party appealed to a general council. The Jansenist party thus formed, which numbered four bishops and many inferior ecclesiastics, were called, from this circumstance, the Appellants (q.v.). The firmness of the pope, and a change in the policy of the regent, brought the Appellants into disfavor. Even the Parliament of Paris was forced to submit, and registered the papal bull in a lit de justice (June 4, 1720), although with a reservation in favor of the liberties of the Gallican Church. The Appellants for the most part submitted, the recusants being  visited with severe penalties; and, on the accession of the new king, Louis XV, the unconditional acceptance of the bull was at length formally accomplished, so far as the general public were concerned. From this time forward the Jansenists were rigorously repressed, and their great stronghold, Port-Royal, having been already, in 170 911, destroyed by connivances of the king and the Jesuits, a large number emigrated to the Netherlands, where they formed a community, with Utrecht as a center. (See below, Jansenists in Holland.)

“During the 18th century Jansenism degenerated in France. In 1727 Francois de Paris died, and was buried in the cemetery of St. Medard. in Paris. He was of an honorable family, and had early shown a religious turn of mind.: His patrimony he bestowed upon the poor, and earned his livelihood by weaving hose. In 1720, at the age of thirty, he was made deacon of St. Medard. Cardinal de Noailles would gladly have invested- him with a higher office, but he declined. In 1722 he resigned his deaconship, and retired to a wilderness. He soon returned' to Paris, where he lived in seclusion and poverty, denying himself the ordinary comforts of life, and shortening his days by self-inflicted torments. A magnificent monument was erected to his memory by his brother, a member of the French Parliament, who subsequently renounced his worldly position and property, and lived a life of seclusion and asceticism. To the grave of Francis de Paris multitudes flocked. There, in various ways, they testified their superstitious regard and veneration, and there marvelous cures were claimed to be wrought and miracles said to be performed. — Strong religious emotions were manifested, and some were seized with convulsions. Some were favored with the spirit of prophecy, and predicted the overthrow of Church and State. Such predictions were heard until within a short time previous to, and even during the revolution of 1789. As late as 1840 multitudes of religious pilgrims still resorted to the spot, on the anniversary of his death and crowned with garlands the grave of De Paris.

The superstition and fanaticism which prevailed at his grave soon after his death were not wholly confined to the common people, but were shared by a considerable number of men of learning and rank. Those of the latter class who made themselves most conspicuous were Hieronymus N. de Paris, the parliamentary member just alluded to; C. Folard, widely and favorably known by his observations on the history of Polybius; and Louis Basilius Carre de Iontgerou, a member of Parliament, who experienced a wonderful conversion at the grave of this venerated saint, and who  subsequently narrated the marvelous phenomena there witnessed, and vindicated their supernatural and divine character. These superstitious and fanatical excesses, combined with the austerities and even inhuman mortifications practiced by many of the more zealous Jansenists, tended to prejudice the more enlightened against their cause, and greatly weakened its moral power. Petitpied, Asveld, Rollin, and others, attempted in vain to stem the tide of superstition and fanaticism. These excesses ruined the cause of the Jansenists — at least in France, or, in the words of Voltaire, ‘the grave of St. Francis of Paris became the grave of Jansenism,' for thenceforth the whole ecclesiastical authority lost its importance” (Hurst's Hagemebah, 2, 426). Yet men were slow to give it up: they clung to it even in its death-hours. Such as were desirous of a reformation of the Roman Catholic Church secretly or openly espoused the cause of the Jansenists. Those who desired to see the arrogance of the pope checked and his power restrained favored the Jansenistic cause. All who were opposed to the Jesuits were regarded as Jansenists. Enlightened men everywhere ‘sympathized with the Jansenists in their efforts to restrict papal encroachments and the demoralizing influence of Jesuitism; and, when its sun went down in France, the friends of reform in the Roman Catholic Church turned towards Holland and hoped that from it would go out a great power for good. The most distinguished theologians of Italy, such as Zola, Tamburini, and others, held a regular epistolary correspondence with the Jansenists at Utrecht. (See below.)

Had the Roman Catholic Church been susceptible of a thorough reformation, it is reasonable to think that it would have been effected by the enlightened, zealous, self-sacrificing, and persevering efforts of the Jansenists. They were true sons of the Church-they sincerely desired its inward and outward prosperity-they cherished an almost servile devotion to it. Though their system of faith and morals was essentially Augustinian, and thus in substantial agreement with that of the Reformers, yet they had no sympathy with the Reformers, and their minds were filled with prejudice against them. But they made common cause with these in their appreciation of the New-Testament Scriptures, in their efforts to promote their use among the people, and in their inculcation of holiness of heart and life. To their praise it should be mentioned that a Bible Society was established by the Jansenists of France as early as 1726, which flourished for thirty years. Though the Jansenistic movement was unsuccessful in reforming the Romish Church, yet it did good service to the cause of Christ by  counteracting the prevalent spirit of corruption, and by promoting a spirit of sincere piety. The piety which it fostered was never, it is true, as enlightened as that which prevailed in the Protestant Church: the piety of even its most enlightened advocates was not wholly free from certain admixtures of superstition, fanaticism, mysticism, and asceticism. We add, in conclusion, that Gallicanism, as revived and formulated in the four famous propositions adopted by the Council of French Clergy in 1682, was also under great obligations to the Jansenists.

Jansenists in Holland. — Although the fanatical excesses to which Jansenism had gone in France for a time darkened its prospects of ultimate success, it must be conceded, even by Roman Catholics of the most ultramontane class, that Jansenists in the 18th and 19th centuries “preserved a close association with greater purity of morals and a deeper faith” than their opponents the Jesuits, who for the last 200 years have appeared in behalf of the infallibility of the pope only to strengthen and to preserve their own existence as an order. It was this characteristic feature of the Jansenists that “everywhere smoothed the way for them.” When persecution had driven them from France, “we find traces of them in Vienna and in Brussels, in Spain and in Portugal, and in every part of Italy” (Ranke, Hist. Papacy, London, 1851, 2, 293). Everywhere they now disseminated their doctrines, but it is especially in Protestant Holland that the sect has been most successful, and has maintained itself to our own day. In the days of Philip II of Spain, Utrecht had been raised to the dignity of an archiepiscopal see (A.D. 1557). The other. United Provinces, on throwing off the Spanish shackles, became Calvinists, but Utrecht and Haarlem continued faithful to the Roman hierarchy.

To this part of a country, where the evangelical life had taught even the Roman Catholic communist a spirit of toleration, the Jansenists directed their steps, and it is here alone that they still appear as a definite, tangible body. — Their organization in Holland dates partly from the forced emigration of the French Jansenists under king Louis XIV, and partly from the controversy about Quesnel at the opening of the last century; but their success as an independent sect (if we may thus style adherents of the Roman Catholic communion, but defenders of the evangelical doctrine) dates from. the day when the vicar apostolic, Peter Codde, an intimate friend of Arnauld, was suspended, by Clement XI in 1702 from his position on account of his firm adherence to Jansenistic principles, was allured to Rome, treacherously detained there for three years in defiance of all canonical regulations, and a  certain Theodore de Cock, a friend of the Jesuits (so a Jesuit sometimes designates himself), appointed in his stead. The chapter of Utrecht, thus deprived of the man of their choice, refused to acknowledge the new vicar named in Codde's place, and angrily joined themselves to the Appellant party in France, many of whom had come thither. The government of Holland also interfered' in 1703, suspended the operation of the papal bull, and deprived De Cock of the archbishopric. Codde, on his return, did all that he could to repair the injuries sustained by the Jansenists during the incumbency of De Cock, who had made many changes, had deprived many priests, some even of thirty years standing, of their livings, and had appointed his Jesuitical friends instead. At length, in' 1723, they elected an archbishop, Cornelius Steenhoven, for whom the form of episcopal consecration was obtained from the French bishop Vorlet (titular of Babylon), who had been suspended for Jansenistic opinions. A later Jansenist archbishop of Utrecht, Meindarts, established in 1742 Haarlem and in 1758. Deventer as his suffragan sees; and in 1763 a synod was held, which sent its acts to Rome, in recognition of the primacy of that see, which the Church of Utrecht professes to acknowledge. Since that time the formal succession has been maintained, each bishop, on being appointed, notifying the pope of his election, and craving confirmation. The popes, however, have uniformly rejected all advances, except on the condition of the acceptance of the bull Unigenitus. But the Jansenists have steadfastly refused to comply with this demand, and have even refused to be bought over to the Church of Rome, as was attempted in 1823. The recent act of the Roman see in defining as of catholic faith the dogma of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin Mary has been the occasion of a new protest.

Their language is firm and explicit: “We owe it to ourselves, to the Catholic faith,” say they, “and to the defense of the truth, to reject boldly the new and false, dogma of the immaculate conception. We should therefore fail in our duty if we kept silence any longer.... Our Church (the Jansenist sect) has often appealed to an ecumenical council to be law fully appointed. We renew this appeal… We make our appeal at this time and place because of the violation done to the faith, and the injury which the bishops have suffered, since they were not consulted when the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin Mary, mother of our Savior, was set up as of divine authority. May the Father of lights enlighten us, and work his will in us. We sign ourselves, with veneration, very holy father, the humble servants of your holiness.” Then follow the signatures of the metropolitan archbishop and the two bishops. This letter, dated Sept. 6,  1856, is accompanied by a pastoral exhortation addressed to the faithful. The Romish court replied by a formal anathema dated Dec. 4, of which the following is an extract: “The sacred congregation of the most eminent and most reverend cardinals of the holy Romish Church, inquisitors general throughout the Christian republic against heretical perversity, having heard the report of the committee acting in the name of our holy father, pope Pius IX, do now condemn the views published by the three false, schismatical bishops of the province of Utrecht…The sacred congregation forbid all persons, of every state and condition, in any way, and under any pretext, to print the said document containing these views, to keep it in their house, or read it; every one must instantly give it up to the bishops or to the inquisitors.” The Jansenists are genuine Roman Catholics, but they refuse a servile obedience to Rome. They have also come to deny the infallibility of the pope altogether, and recognize him only as the “head of the bishops,” placing the highest authority of the Church in a general council. They circulate the Scriptures, and insist on inward piety. They denominate themselves Roman Catholics of the episcopal clergy. They still number about 5000 souls, and are divided over twenty-five parishes in the dioceses of Utrecht and Haarlem. Their clergy are about thirty in number, with a seminary at Amersfoort, which was founded in 1726. The name of their present archbishop is Van Santen, whom Rome has again and again vainly endeavored to induce, by the basest of means, to sign the prescribed formulary (comp. Tregelles, Jansenists, p. 80 sq.) so far as they can be said to possess a theological system, it may be described as a compound of Jansenist and ultra-Gallicane principles.

Other Works of Jansenius. — Besides the work which gave rise to the schismatical movement in the Roman Catholic Church, he wrote also Oratio de interiioris hominis Reformatione (1627; translated into French by Arnauld d'Andilly): — Alexipharmacuem pro pervious ‘Silae Ducemsibus, adversus ministrorum suorm fascinum, sive Responsio brevis ad libellunm eorum, provocatorium (Louvain, 1630): — Spongia notarum, quibus Alexipharmacum aspersit Gisbertus Vcetius (Louvain, 1631, 8vo): — Tetrateuchus, sire commentarius in quatuor Evangelia ,(Louvain, 1639, 4to): — Pentateuchus, sive commentarius in quinque libros Miroysis (Louvain, 1641, 4to): — Analecta in Proverbia, Ecclesiasten, Sapientiam, Habacum et Sophoniam (Louvain, 1644, 4to): — Mars Gallicus, seu de justitia arnorum et faederum regis Gallioe, Libri II (1633). See Foppens, Bibl. Belgica; Bayle, Dict. Cri. tique; Dumas, Hist.  des cinq Propositions; Leydecker, Historia Janzsenismi (Utrecht, 1695, 8vo); Frick, Uebersetzung der Bulla Uniyenitus, etc. (Ulm, 1717, 4to); Geschiedenis van ‘de Christelijke Kerk in Deuteronomy 18 de eeuwo, door A. Ijpeij, 12:335-387; Harenberg, Geschichte der Jesuiten; Fontaine, Mem. p. servir a l'Histoire du Port-Royal (1738); Divers ecrits touchant la signature dujbr. nu-laire (1706); Hulsemannus, De auxiliis gratice; Nieuwlands, Vermaaklijkheden uit de Kerkgeschiedenis; La Constitution Unigqenitus avec des Remarquies (Utrecht); Walchii Bibl. Theolog.; Henke's Kirchengeschichte des 18'en Jahrhunuderts; La Verite des Miracles. operns vai ‘intercession de Mr. de Paris' (1737,'1745; written by Montgerou); Reuchlin, Gesch. von Port-Royal (Hamb. 1839,1844); Traite dogmatique sur les miracles du tenmps (1737); Geschiedenis der Christelike Kerk, door Profs. De Groot, Ter Haar, Kist, Moll, Nieuwenhuis, etc., voi. 5 (Amsterdam, 1859); Colonia, Dict. des livres Jansenistes, etc.; Ste. Beuve, Port Royal, vol. 1 and 2; Tregelles, in Kitto's Journ. Sac. Lit. Jan. 1851, and since in separate and enlarged form, The Jansenists (London, 1851, 12mo); Mrs. Schimmelpenninck, Select Memoirs of Port-Royal; Declaration des Eveques de Hollande, etc. (Paris, 1827); Gerberon, Hist. de Jansenism; Voltaire. Siecle de Louis XIV, 2, 264; Rapin (Jesuit), Histoire de Jansenismne, edit. by Domenech (Paris, 1861, 8vo); Am. Bib. Rep. 3rd ser. 3, 689 sq.; Am. Theol. Rev. 1860, Aug. vol. 2, SEE JESUITS; SEE PORT-ROYAL.

## Jansen, Ellert[[@Headword:Jansen, Ellert]]

             an Anabaptist martyr, suffered during the persecutions of the Anabaptists near the middle of the 16th century in the Low Countries, then under the- government of Charles V. In the year 1549 he was imprisoned at Amsterdam, with nineteen other Anabaptists. ‘He was a tailor by trade, but his mental capacity and force of character designated him as a man well qualified even for one of the learned professions. While his other friends escaped from prison, he remained behind; determined to profess openly his peculiar Christian views, or die in defense of them. March 20, 1549, he finally suffered the so much coveted martyrdom by burning. See Brown, Baptist Mart. p. 67.

## Jansenism[[@Headword:Jansenism]]

             SEE JANSENIUS, 2.

## Jansens, Elinga Franciscus[[@Headword:Jansens, Elinga Franciscus]]

             a Dutch Dominican, who died in 1715, was one of the most famous canonists of his time. He wrote, Autoritas D. Thoma Aquinatis (1604): — Certissimum quid Certissimae Veritatis pro Doctrina Doctoris Angelici: — Controversies in Haereticos Opusculum (Antwerp, 1673): — Suprema Romani Pontificis Autoritas (1689): — De Romani Pontificis Autoritate et Iufallibilitate (1690): — Forma et Esse Ecclesiae Christi (1702): — Dissertationes de Principalioribus Quaestionibus hoc Tempore in Scolis  Disputatis (1707). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Jansse, Lucas[[@Headword:Jansse, Lucas]]

             a distinguished French Protestant theologian and writer, was born at Rouen about 1605. He studied theology at the Huguenot seminary situated at the lately celebrated Sedan, and was pastor at Rouen from 1632 to 1682, when age and infirmities obliged him to resign. At the revocation of the Edict of Nantes he retired to Rotterdam, where he died April 24th, 1686. Jansse was a man of solid learning and lively imagination. He made himself especially conspicuous by a pamphlet — La Messe trouvee dans l'Ecriture (Villefranche [Rouen], 1647, 12mo) —in which he ridiculed Veron for ‘having, in an edition of the Louvain Bible published at Paris in 1646, translated the beginning of Act 13:2 by “As they said mass unto the Lord.” In order to avoid persecution, Jansse destroyed a large number of copies; but it was often reprinted, as in Recueil de plusieuy's pieces curieuses (Villefranche [Holland], 1678, 12mo), and alone under the title Le Miracle du P. Veron sur la Messe (Lond. 1699, 12mo). He wrote, also, Traite de la Fin du Monde (Rouen and Quevilly, 1656, 8vo): Le Chretienne au Pied de la Croix (Rouen, 1683, 8vo), etc. See Chauffepie, Dict. Hist.; Haag, La France Protest.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26:354. (J. N. P.)

## Janssenboy[[@Headword:Janssenboy]]

             the family name of several Dutch theologians quite distinguished in the Roman Catholic Church, mostly as missionaries of the Dominican order.

1. CORNELIUS, born near the beginning of the present century, was educated at Louvain, then went to Italy, and, after preaching and teaching for some time, the Congregation of the Propaganda sent him in 1623 to the northern provinces on mission work, and, as his especial field, Saxony was designated. Failing, however, to make many converts in this country, the very cradle of Protestantism, he was ordered to remove to Flanders. On his return to Italy in 1637, he was lost at sea (Oct. 11). He wrote several works of some note, mostly of a polemical nature, amongst which, of especial interest to us, his Defense de la Foi Catholique.

2. DOMINICUS, brother of the former, born at Amsterdam March 14, 1647, was also dispatched to the northern provinces at the same time as his brother Cornelius. He resided at Hamburg, but the opposition he here encountered by imprudent conduct finally resulted in his expulsion from the city; and although the order was afterwards revoked, by reason of his  pledges to be more considerate and fair in his representations of the Reformers, he quitted Hamburg in 1634 ad retired to a Dominican convent at Cologne. In 1643 his superiors sent him to Amsterdam, where he died March 14,1647. While at Cologne, Dominicus published several works in defence of the doctrines and usages of the Roman Catholic Church, but they are rather of an inferior order.

3. NICHOLAS was born at Zierickzee, on the island of Schouwen, Zealand, in the second half of the 16th century. After having taken the Dominican garb at Anivers, he was appointed regent and then superior of the college at Lire, in Brabant, and afterwards professor of theology at Louvain. His superior ability pointed him out as one of the ablest men for missionary labor among the Lutherans of Denmark, and he was intrusted with this work. After a stay of several years in Holstein, Norway, and other northern provinces, he went to Rome to give an account of his labors, and to propose the measures necessary to re-establish Romanism in those countries. In 1623 he was again dispatched to the same countries, this time reinforced by his brothers above mentioned. He failed, however, in making much of an impression on the Protestants, who had heard and seen enough of Romanism and its workings to be satisfied that salvation did not flow through that channel. While he was treated with the utmost liberality by both the government and the people among whom he came to proclaim the doctrines of the Roman Catholic religion, the. converts for his religion were few, if any. But it must be conceded that Rome had well chosen the man who was likely to make converts for popery, if such a thing had been possible. Nicholas was certainly a man of great erudition, and well qualified to gain even the admiration of his opponents. He died November 21, 1634. His works are, Panegyrique de St. Thomizas d ‘Aquin (Louvain, 1621, 8vo): — Vie de St. Dominique (Anvers, 1622, 8vo): — Defensio Fidei Ca'thol. (Anvers, 1631,8vo), etc. See Touron, Hommes illustres de l'ordre de St. Dominique; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 26, 355 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Janssens, Abraham[[@Headword:Janssens, Abraham]]

             an eminent Flemish painter was born at Antwerp in 1569, and at an early age executed a number of works for the churches of Flanders, which rank him among the ablest artists of the Flemish school. His paintings in the Church of the Carmelites at Antwerp, representing The Virgin and the Infant, and The Entombment, are highly commended. In the cathedral at Ghent is an Ecce Homo, and a Descent from the Cross worthy of Rubens himself. His masterpiece is the Resurrection of Lazarus, in the collection of the elector-palatine. He probably died in 1631. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. cf the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Janssens, Erasmus (Lat. Erasmus Johannes)[[@Headword:Janssens, Erasmus (Lat. Erasmus Johannes)]]

             a Dutch Unitarian theologian, was born about 1540. He was rector of the College of Antwerp, but his advocacy of Socinianism obliged him to resign that office in 1576. He was next rector of the College of Embden (Oost Frize), but, in consequence of new persecutions, he went in 1579 to Frankfort, and thence to Poland, where he settled at Cracovia in 1584.  Here he asked to be permitted publicly to defend his opinions. The demand was granted, and the renowned Faustus Socinius was his opponent. Their conference lasted two days (29th and 30th of November, 1584), and passed off calmly; but, both having subsequently published an account of the proceedings, they accused each other of incorrectness. Janssens however, on being offered the pastorship of a Unitarian congregation at Clausemburg, in Transylvania, retracted his former principles, and adopted those of Socinius (q.v.), who, as is well known, by his great ability not only silenced all the anti-Trinitarians that' differed from his views, but finally even gained them all over to his side (comp. Krasinski, Reformation in Poland [Lond. 1840, 2 vols. 8vo], 2, 366). Janssens is supposed to have died near the close of the 16th century. His principal works were, Clara Demonstratio Antichristum immediate post morten apostolorum caepisse regnare in Ecclesia Christi (1584, 12mo) [this work gave rise to the persecutions which obliged Janssens to retire to Poland]: — Antithesis doctrine Christi et Anti-Christi de uno verao Deo (anon. 1585, 12mo; with a refutation by Jerome Zanchio, Neustadt, 1586, 4to): — Scriptum quo causas propter quas vita ceterna contingat complectitur, etc. (1589): — Epistola ad Faustum Socinum, with an answer of the latter dated April the 20th, 1590: — De Unigeniti: Filii Dei existentia, sire disputatio inter Eribsmum Johannem et Faustuns Socinum, etc. (Cracov. 1595,12mo): — De Quatuor Monarchiis: — Commentarius in Apocalyps in. ‘He published, also, the Bibliorum Pars IV, id est Libri Prophetici, Latina recensio ex Hebraea facta, brevibusque scholiis illustrata ab-Immanuele Tremellio et Franc. Junio (Francf. 1579). See Diercksen's Antuepia Christo nascens, etc., p. 678; Vriemoet, Athen. Fris. p. 182; Fauste Socin, Epist. III ad Matth. Radecium, p. 386, 437); Sanditts, Bibl. Antitrinit. p. 72, 84, 87, 88, 105; Paquot, Mem. pour servir a hist. des Pays-Bas,7, 328333. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 26, 357. (J. N. P.)

## Janssens, Hans Herman[[@Headword:Janssens, Hans Herman]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born in 1783, and died at Leyden in 1855, professor of exegesis and dogmatics. He published Hermeneutica Sacra (Liege, 1818, 2 volumes; Paris, 1851; Turin, 1858), a work which is held in high repute among Catholics, and has also been translated into French (Paris, 1827, 1833). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Jansson, Hans Hendrick[[@Headword:Jansson, Hans Hendrick]]

             a Dutch theologian, born at Siddeburen Sept. 3, 1701, was educated at the University of Groningen. His theological instructors there were Otto Verbrugge and Antonius Driessen. Attracted by the spirit and fame of Vitringa, he resorted to the Franeker University, and imbibed the spirit of that celebrated divine. After becoming a candidate for the ministry, he repaired to Utrecht to enjoy the instructions of the distinguished Lampe. He was settled successively at Dirksland (1723-31), Embden (1731-45), Finsterwolde (1745-48), Veendam (1748-52), and Groningen (1752-80).  His first work, by which he made himself known as a worthy disciple of Vitrilga, was an exposition of the Epistle of James. It was commended by competent theologians of his day as being of sterling merit. He occupies in this work high evangelical ground, insisting not on a heathenish morality, but on practical piety. In 1750 he gave to the public an exposition of the Epistle of Jude. In this work he opposes the enthusiasm and mysticism which prevailed around him, and which tended to subvert vital godliness. His next work was on the third chapter of the Prophecy of Zechariah. These were all quarto volumes. Several smaller volumes of an experimental and practical character were also published by him. He enjoyed in a very high degree the love and esteem of the congregations which he successively served. He died March 1, 1780, universally- lamented. See B. Glasius, Godgeleerd Nederland, 2, 169 sq. (J. P.W.)

## Jansson, Hillebrand[[@Headword:Jansson, Hillebrand]]

             a Dutch theologian, was born at Zandeweer April 20, 1718. He was fitted for the university by his father, who was also named Hillebrand, and who was successively settled at Sebaldeburen, Noordhorn, and Zandeweer. The younger Hillebrand first settled at Noordhorn, where he remained from 1741-50; then removed to Kropswolde, where he labored till 1753, when he accepted a call to Veendam. This was at the time one of the largest and most populous parishes of Holland. Here he labored for nearly half a century with zeal and fidelity. He died Oct. 12, 1789. His name is famous in the history of the Reformed Church of Holland by reason of the conspicuous part he took in the controversy on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Francis Gomar, noted as the opponent of Arminius, was one of the first to give a latitudinarian interpretation to what is said on this point in the Confession of Faith (Article 35), and in the Heidelberg Catechism (81st Q. and A.). According to him, every one who openly acknowledged the Christian religion might come to the table of the Lord irrespective of personal piety. This view was adopted by many, and from time to time found public advocates. In 1764 E. Van Eerde defended it against J. K. Appelius. He appealed to the standards, and he is said to have maintained his views with decided ability. Jansson entered the lists on the side of Van Eerde, and henceforth became the principal combatant.

The position he took was this: “Every one who has a historical faith confesses the same, and deports himself inoffensively and exemplarily, and in accordance with his confession not only may, but also must come to the Supper; and in so far as he does it in obedience to Christ's command, in expectation of his  blessing, promised in connection with the administration of the Word and the seals of the covenant, he does not sin in the thing itself, although he always does it ill as to the manner so long as he does not do it spiritually.” He seems to have placed the observance of this ordinance on the same footing with that of hearing the Word preached and other acts of divine worship, such as singing and prayer. Appelius, on the contrary, maintained “that the Supper was, according to the teaching of the Scriptures and that of the Reformed Church, instituted for the regenerate, who possess spiritual life and its attributes.” This controversy greatly agitated the Church, and its effect was hi some places to restrain men from a public profession of their faith, and to deter those who had already made a profession from coming to the communion. A somewhat intermediate view, presented and advocated by the accomplished P. Bosveld, served to allay the agitation, and finally prevailed in the Church. His view is substantially this: All who have made a public profession of their faith, whether they possess the internal evidence of having been truly converted or not, must be regarded as believers, and, as such, entitled to and bound to observe this ordinance; and the minister must invite all such to come to the communion, as being their privilege and duty. This view is substantially in harmony with the theory and practice of most evangelical denominations in this country. See Geschiedenis van de Christelijke Kerk in Deuteronomy 18 de eeuw, door A. Ijpeij, 7:401 sq.; Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervornade Kerk, door A. Ijpeij en J. Dermout, 3:612 sq.; Glasius, Godgeleerd Nederland, 2, 175 sq. (J. P. W.)

## Januarius[[@Headword:Januarius]]

             is a name under which some fourteen martyrs are honored in the Roman Catholic Church. A yens Januaria, or family of that name, is found among the old inscriptions. There is a monument in Turin to the memory of a certain Januarius Vintius. The name seems to have belonged especially to Africa and Southern Italy. Its popularity is proved by the large number of martyrs bearing it, which is surpassed by few others (perhaps Alexander, Felix, John, etc.). The best known. among them is St. Januarius, bishop of Bene vento, who was beheaded in the early part of the 4th century (according to the Neapolitan tradition, at Pozzuoli, where many Christians suffered a like fate, in 305). The saint's day is Sept. 19. Januarius is the patron saint of Naples. His head and blood, preserved in vials and looked upon as holy relics, are kept in the chapel El Tesoro, in the cathedral of Naples, where they were placed Jan. 13, 1497. According to tradition, a  pious woman gathered at the place of his execution two bottles of his blood, and presented them to bishop Severus of Naples. On three festivals each year, the chief of which is the day of the martyrdom, Sept. 19, and on occasions of public danger or calamity, as earthquakes or eruptions, the head and the phials of the blood are carried in solemn procession to the high altar of the cathedral, or of the church of St. Clare, where, after prayer of greater. or less duration, the blood, on the phials being brought into contact with the head, is believed to liquefy, and in this condition is presented for the veneration of the people, or for the conviction of the doubter.

It occasionally happens that a considerable time elapses before the liquefaction takes place, and sometimes it altogether fails. The latter is regarded as an omen of the worst import; and on those occasions when the miracle is delayed beyond the ordinary time, the alarm and excitement of the congregation rise to the highest pitch, as it is represented in such a case to be an evil sign for the city and the people. The blood is exposed three times every year, particularly on the first Sunday in May, and in cases of especial public affliction. The process of the performance of this so-called miracle is kept secret by the clergy of Naples. Of late years the liquefaction of the blood was interpreted as a sign of the saint's goodwill towards the government; but it has done so for Ferdinand II, for Garibaldi, and for Victor Emanuel with equal ease, which would seem to indicate that the saint is indifferent to the political fate at least of his devout worshippers. Addison, in his Travels, speaks of the performance (in his notices of Naples) thus: “I had twice an opportunity of seeing the operation of this pretended miracle, and must confess that, so far from thinking it a real miracle, I look upon it as one of the most bungling tricks I ever saw.”

Another Januarius, said to have suffered under Felix, has Jan. 7 assigned to him in the Martyrologium of the Romish Church. Still another, said to have suffered martyrdom in Africa with Paul and Gerontius, has Jan. 19. Veda names April 8 for a Januarius of Africa, along with Macaria and Maxima. July 10 is kept in honor of two saints of like name, one of which belonged to the seven sons of Felicitas, who are said to have been put to death towards the end of the 2nd century at Rome; the other suffered martyrdom in Africa with Felix and Nabor. Their remains were transferred to Milan. ‘July 11 is sacred to a Januarius who died at Nicopolis. Another suffered martyrdom at Carthage, together with Philippus, Catulinus, etc., July 15. A Januarius, together with Felicissimus and Agapetus, fell a martyr under Decius at Rome, and the Church observes Aug. 6 in his memory. October  13 is the anniversary of the Spanish martyrs Faustus and Januarius, who suffered at Cordova. On Oct. 24 there is mention made of a Januarius who after being long persecuted, was, together with Felix, Audactus, etc., put to death and buried near Carthage. The island of Sardinia has also a Januarius, in whose honor they keep Oct. 25. On Dec. 2 we find a Januarius, with Severus, etc.; and another in Africa Dec. 15. See Herzog, Real-Encylopaidie, 6, 433 sq.; Pierer, Univ. Lex. s.v.; Wetzer.und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 500; Zell, Rinmische Epigraphik, 2, 88; Monumenta Taurinzensia, 2, 119; J. G. Keysler, Neueste Reisen (Hanov. 1751); Acta Sancta, vo1. 6; Chambers, Cyclopied. s.v.; Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. 1, 502.

## Janum[[@Headword:Janum]]

             (Heb. Yazunm', יָנוּם, slumber, otherwise for יָנוּן, propagation; Septuag. Ι᾿ανούμ v. r. Ι᾿εμαϊvν, Vulg. Janun), a town in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Eshean and Beth-tappuah (Jos 15:53). The Heb. text has יָניּם(das s if anim', יָנַים) by a manifest error, which is corrected in the Masoretic marg.; many copies have Yanus', יָנוּס, flight, as in the Eng. margin ‘Janus.” The Syriac version has Yalum. Eusebius (Onomast. s.v. Ι᾿ανουά) mentions a place, Janua, three miles south of Legio, but admits that it cannot be the locality in question. M. de Saulcy (Nar. 1, 437) thinks the site may possibly be marked by the ruins of Jenheh, at the foot of a hill nearly south of Hebron; but, according to Dr. Robinson, the remains are little more than those of caves (Bib. Res. 2, 472). The associated names appear to indicate a district immediately northwest of Hebron (Keil. Comment on Joshua ad loc). The position corresponds with that of a ruined site, Ras Jabreh, marked on the first edition of Van de Velde's map immediately on' the west of the road directly north from Hebron to Jerusalem, and adjoining Khurbet enl-Nasara; but the second edition of the map omits both these sites, though the latter is explicitly mentioned in the Memoir (p. 247) as “a ruined village” visited by him as well as by Dr. Robinson (Researches, 1, 317).

## Janum (2)[[@Headword:Janum (2)]]

             For this locality Conder suggests (Tent Work, 2:337) the present Beni Naim, which lies three miles east of Hebron (a position possible, perhaps, for the group of towns with which it is associated in the sacred text), with cisterns in the vicinity, and thus described (from Guerin) in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (3:325):

"Here I saw in many places ancient materials employed in Arabic buildings. Several fragments of wall still upright in good cut stones attracted my attention. I visited a mosque which covers, according to the tradition of the people, the tomb of Lot. The coffin shown to me consists of a great wooden coffer, covered with a carpet, and probably contains the body of some modern santon revered under the name of Abraham's nephew. Around this sanctuary extends a court surrounded by a square gallery, which is itself enclosed by a wall built of stones belonging to different periods. On one of them distinguished the trace of a mutilated cross, and one of the people  told me that the mosque is supposed to have succeeded a Christian Church. It is at once a sacred edifice and a fortress, for the terraces which cover the gallery are provided with a parapet pierced with loopholes. . . . I was told by the sheik that the place used to be called Kefr Bereik, which confirms Robinson's identification of the place with Jerome's Caphar Barnebo."'

## Janus[[@Headword:Janus]]

             SEE JANUM.

## Janus (2)[[@Headword:Janus (2)]]

             a very old Roman divinity, whose name is merely a different form of Dianus (probably the sun). The worship of this divinity held a high place in the regards of the Romans. “In every undertaking his name was first invoked, even before that of Jupiter, which is the more singular, as Jupiter was unquestionably the greatest of the Roman gods. Perhaps it may be taken as a verification of the tradition that Janus was the oldest of them, and ruled in Italy before any of the others came thither. (See below, our reference to Romulus.) He presided not only over the beginning of the year: but over the beginning of each month, each day, and the commencement of all enterprises. On New Year's day people made each other presents of figs, dates, honey-cakes, sweetmeats, etc.; wore a holiday-dress, saluted each other kindly, etc. The pious Romans prayed to him every morning, whence his name of Matutinus Pitter (Father of the Morning).” Janus is represented with a scepter in his right hand and a key in his left, sitting on a beaming throne (probably a relic of the original, or at least very old worship of Janus as the sun). He has also two (and sometimes even three) faces (whence the expression, applied to a deceitful person, “Janus faced” [compare Ovid, Fasti, 1, 135]), one youthful and the other aged; the one looking forward, and the other backward, in which some have professed to see a symbol of the wisdom of the god, who beholds both the past and the future, and others simply of the return of the year. Although it is related that Romulus himself erected a temple to Janus in Rome, it seems that a special impulse to the cultus of this god was first acquired by the action in his favor of Numa, who dedicated to him the passage, close by the Forum, on the road connecting the Quirinal with the Palatine. This passage (erroneously called a temple, but which was merely a sacred gateway containing a statue of Janus) was open in times of war, and closed in times of peace. The speculations as to the origin of this Latin deity has been very extended and varied: thus some have even supposed Janus of the Romans the parallel of Noah of the Hebrews, deriving his name from. יִיַן, wine, because Noah was the first planter of vines, and because of his two faces, the one representing his sight of the world before, the other his sight of the world after the Deluge! See Chambers; Cyclopaedia, s.v.; Vollmer, Wörterbuch der Mythol. p. 913 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Class. Biog.

## Janus (3)[[@Headword:Janus (3)]]

             in Roman mythology, was a god, concerning whose original signification the most contrary views were held. The most commonly accepted view is that he was a deified king of ancient Italy. About his worship in Rome the following is related: Numa dedicated a sanctuary to his honor, which was opened in time of war and closed in time of peace. This goes to show that he was a god of war, as also his by-name "Quirinus." He is represented with a double face, sometimes with four heads. In his right hand he carried a staff (the symbol of augury), in his left a key (god of doors, for Janua signifies door). On his fingers the number three hundred was written on one hand, the number sixty-five on the other, designating him the god of the year.

## Janvier, George Washington, D.D[[@Headword:Janvier, George Washington, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born of Huguenot descent at Cantwell's Bridge (now Odessa), Delaware, January 22, 1784. In his twentieth year he joined the Presbyterian Church, and began his preparatory studies with his pastor, Reverend Dr. Read, and continued them at Princeton, but did not graduate. He was licensed by the Presbytery of New Castle, September 26, 1810; spent one year in itinerant preaching; became pastor at Pittsgrove, N.J., May 13, 1812; and died there June 9, 1865. He was moderator of the Synod of New Jersey, and was a member of the Board of Foreign Missions. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, page 115.

## Janvier, Levi, D.D[[@Headword:Janvier, Levi, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, born at Pittsgrove, N. J. April 25, 1816, graduated at Princeton College with the highest honors of his class in 1835, and then pursued a theological course of study at Princeton Seminary, teaching at the same time in Lafayette College, where he so ably discharged his duties that he was urged to accept a professorship. But Janvier preferred the missionary work, and he was licensed and ordained by the West Jersey Presbytery, his father, also a minister, preaching on the occasion. He went to India; and there was for several years superintendent of the mission press; he also prepared a translation of the Pentateuch and Psalms into Punjabi, and aided in the preparation of a Punjabi dictionary and other works in this department. Impaired health obliged him to seek recreation. and he came on a visit to his native country in 1859. In 1860 he returned again to the missionary work, but he continued only a short time to serve his Master here on earth: March 25, 1864, he was murdered by a Sikh at Anandpore, India. “He was a missionary of a high order; learned, wise, gentle, humble, winning; whose loving, benevolent life preached most touchingly the Gospel of his Master,” was the testimony of one of the papers of India after the assassination of Mr. Janvier. Another colaborer (the Rev. J. T. Gracey) wrote to the Methodist, New York, in April, 1864, that “great excitement prevailed among the people,” and that Janvier's funeral “was attended, with marked respect, by thousands of natives.” See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Alie. 1866, p. 117 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Janvier, Rene-Ambroise[[@Headword:Janvier, Rene-Ambroise]]

             a French Benedictine monk, was born at Sainte-Osmane, on the Main, in 1613. He was one of the most distinguished Hebraists of the 17th century, and is celebrated for his Latin translations of several Jewish commentaries, among which are a translation of Kimchi's commentary on the Psalms entitled R. Dav. Kinechi Commnentarii in Psalmos (Paris. 1666, 4to). He died at Paris April 25,1682. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 26:363; Haureau, Hist. Litteraire du Main, 2, 115; Hist. littie. de la Congreg. de St. Maur, p. 101.

## Jao[[@Headword:Jao]]

             SEE JEHOVAH; SEE VALENTINIANISM.

## Japan[[@Headword:Japan]]

             a country in Eastern Asia; consisting of a great number (about 3850) of large and small islands, which are situated between 300 10' and 540.24' N. lat., and between 1470 34' and 1640 30' E. long. It is divided into Japan proper, which embraces the large islands Japan or Nipon (with Sado, Oki, and Awadsi), Sitkokf, and Kiusiu (with a number of adjacent islands), and the dependencies, to which belong Jeso, with adjacent islands, the 174 Kuriles, the less known (89) Bomie, and the Lieu Kieu Islands. The population is generally estimated at from 35 to 40 millions; its area at about 150,000 square miles.

The history of Japan; according to the traditions of the country, begins with the dynasty of the heavenly gods, consisting of seven generations, and reigning from four to five million years. It was followed by the dynasty of the earthly gods, consisting of five generations, and reigning 2,342,167 years. The native population (the Ainos) was at a very early period (according to some as early as B.C. 1240) pushed back by the immigrants from China. Probably Simnu (the divine warrior), the, founder of the Japanese empire, with whom the authenticated history of the country begins, was also a Chinese. He first conquered Kiusiu (about B.C. 667), subsequently Nipon, where he erected a palacious temple (Dairi) to the sun goddess (Miako), and constituted himself ruler, under the honorary title of Mikado. When he died he was regarded as a national hero. His successors were called Mikado or Kin Rey (emperor); also Ten Oo (Heavenly Prince) or Ten Zin (Heavenly Child). In the century before Christ the dignity of the four commanders-in-chief (Djogoon) was created in the war against the Ainos. As chiefs of the army, they concentrated the executive power in their hands,' steadily ‘enlarged it, and, under the reign of a weak Mikado, succeeded in making it hereditary in their families. This was, in particular, the case with the Kubo (crown general) Yoritimo, who had rescued the country from a perilous situation during the administration of the Mikado Koeyei (1141-55); he added to his title Kubo the word Sama (lord). Henceforth he and his successors resided in Yeddo, while Miako remained the residence of the Mikados; his dynasty was in 1334 supplanted by another, but the separation of the ecclesiastical and secular authority remained unchanged.

In the middle of the 16th century the first Europeans visited Japan, which, up to this time, had been only known to them from Arabian geographers,  and from the accounts given in the 13th century by the traveler Marco Polo, after his return from China. Through the efforts of three runaway Portuguese sailors, who in 1545 had found a refuge on board a Chinese merchantman, and who, having by storms been driven to the Japanese island Yanega, had found a kind reception at the residence of the prince of Bungo, in Kiusiu, a lively commercial intercourse arose with Portugal, which soon proved to be of immense value to the latter country. In 1549, the celebrated Jesuit missionary Francis Xavier, who had converted a Japanese at Goa, arrived in Japan. During a stay of two years he visited the territories of several princes and founded missions, which he confided to zealous priests of his order. The Roman Catholic faith spread rapidly, and soon the Catholic Church numbered about 250 churches and 13 seminaries. The Buddhist priests made a desperate resistance to the progress of Christianity, but a number of the Daimios favored it, as they expected from the success of Christianity great commercial advantages.

In 1562 the prince of Omura, and soon after the princes of Bungo and Arima, embraced Christianity, and sent a splendid embassy (embracing also three princes), with rich presents, to pope Gregory XIII and to king ‘Philip II of Spain. But when the suspicion arose that the Daimios who had embraced Christianity intended, with the aid of foreign Christian governments and of the native Christian population, to establish their entire independence, the Kubo Sama Fide Yose, an upstart who, being of low birth, had in 1585 usurped the dignity of Kubo Sama, curtailed the rights of the subordinate princes, took from the Mikado everything except the administration of the ecclesiastical affairs, and issued a stringent edict against Christianity, which had been favored by his predecessor Nabunanga. The edict provided for the exile of all the missionaries and the destruction of the churches. It was not executed at once, but in 1596 a real persecution of the Christians began, the beginning of a religious and civil war which lasted for forty years. Fide Yose died in 1598, while preparing for the invasion and conquest of China; and he was succeeded by the guardian of his minor son, Yie Yazoo, prince of Mlikava, whose descendants have reigned at Yeddo until the present day. Yie Yazoo made the dignity of Kubo hereditary in the three houses founded by his sons, shut the Mikado up in his palace at Miaco, and gave to the country a legislation and constitution under which it remained at peace for more than two hundred years.

In the mean while the Dutch had gained a footing in Japan, and, from commercial jealousy against the Portuguese, aided and encouraged the  Kubo Sama in his proceedings against the Christians. With their aid, at the close of the 16th century, 70,000 Christians who had entrenched themselves on the peninsula Simabara were crushed. ‘Since then the Roman Catholic faith became gradually extinct. The number of Christians put to death has been estimated at nearly two millions, and the annals of the Jesuits, Franciscans, and Dominicans are filled with narratives of the deaths of members of their orders in Japan. Besides Xavier, the greatest. missionaries were Valignani, father John Baptist, a Spanish Franciscan, Philip of Jesus, a Mexican Franciscan, both crucified at Nagasaki, father Charles Spinola, etc. The last Catholic priest who entered Japan was Sedotti, who in 1709 found means to land, but was never again heard of.

The hatred of Christianity, the religion of the detested foreigners, induced the rilers of Japan to break off all intercourse with Christian nations. Even the allied Dutch had soon to suffer from this isolation. They had to give up in 1641 the island of Firando (north of Nagasaki), which in 1609 had been assigned to them as a trading station, and to remove to the island of Desima where their officers were subjected to a very rigorous superintendence. They were only allowed to export annually goods to the value of 750,000 florins (the Chinese 1,000,000) in two ships (the Chinese in ten); moreover, they had to send for a long time annually, and since 1790 every fourth year, tribute to Yeddo. All the efforts made by the governments of Christian nations (the English from 1613 to 1623, and in 1803, the Russians in 1792 and 1804, and the North Americans in 1837) to re-establish commercial relations were unsuccessful. When China was partly opened to the Christian nations in virtue of the treaty of Nanking (1842), king William II of the Netherlands (by a letter dated Feb. 15, 1844) made another attempt to prevail upon the Japanese government to open several ports and to allow commercial intercourse, but again his request was declined, as was also that of the American commodore Biddle, who in 1846 appeared in the bay of Yeddo, and proposed the conclusion of a commercial treaty. More successful, however, was the American commodore Perry, who, towards the close of 1852, was sent with a flotilla to Yeddo. After long-protracted and most difficult negotiations, he concluded on March 31,1853, at Kanagava, a treaty. of peace and friendship, by which the American vessels received access to the ports of Simoda and Hakodade, to the former immediately, to the latter from March 31, 1855, in order to take in fuel, water, provisions, and other necessaries. The long isolation of Japan from the Christian world having thus come to  an end, treaties with other Christian nations soon followed. Thus England obtained the conclusion of a treaty similar to the American on Oct. 14,1854; Russia on Feb. 7, 1855; the Netherlands on Nov. 9,1855. The last-named treaty abrogated the disgraceful stipulations concerning Christianity to which the Dutch had formerly been compelled to submit, and an additional stipulation of Jan. 30, 1856, allowed them to celebrate divine worship in the opened ports. In 1857 and 1858 new treaties made further concessions' to the four treaty powers, and the same rights were, by a treaty of Oct. 9, 1858, extended to France. From Jan, 1, 1859, the ports of Nagasaki, Hakodade, and Kanagava; from Jan. 1, 1860, the port of Negato, and another port on the western coast of Nipon; and on Jan. 1, 1863, Hiogo, the port of Osaca, were opened. Foreigners were allowed to reside in these places, to purchase landed property, to build houses and churches, and to celebrate their divine worship; from Jan. 1, 1862, they were also permitted to reside in Yeddo. Gradually other Christian nations, as Portugal, Prussia, Spain, and Austria, likewise sent expeditions to Japan, which requested and obtained the conclusion of similar treaties.

The first step towards opening intercourse with foreign nations was soon followed by others. In 1860 a Japanese embassy was sent to the United States; an-other visited in 1862 the London Exhibition, as well' as courts of Europe. At the Paris Exhibition of 1867 even the brother of the Tycoon appeared with a numerous retinue. A number of young Japanese, including many sons of princes, were sent to the schools of foreign countries, in particular those of the United States; several distinguished foreigners were called to high offices in Japan, and a Japanese consul general was appointed for San Francisco in 1869.

The great change which, during the period from 1854 to 1870, took place in the relation of Japan to the world abroad, was not completed without producing many violent commotions, and effecting important transformations at home. The policy pursued by the Tycoon at Yeddo was bitterly opposed and resisted by many of the most influential Daimios, and a large portion of the Japanese people at large. On this occasion it was found out that the European governments which had concluded treaties with the Tycoon had been greatly mistaken concerning the true nature of the office of Tycoon. They had regarded him as being the absolute ruler of Japan; whereas, in fact, the Mikado, although actually confined to the exercise of his religious functions, was still universally looked upon as the head of the state, and the highest arbiter in all quarrels between the Tycoon  and the Daimios. In union with the Dainmios, the Mikado now asserted his sovereignty with considerable success. When some of the Daimios committed outrages against the foreigners, the Tycoon confessed his inability to bring them to punishment, and the European powers had themselves to enforce their claims against the princes of Satsuma and Negato. Ultimately a fierce civil war broke out between the Tycoon and a number of the northern Daimios on the one hand, and the Mikado and the majority of the Daimios on the other, which resulted in the abolition of the office of the Tycoon (1868), and the restoration of the Mikado to the full power of actual ruler. The successful Mikado, however, did not, as many expected, change the foreign policy, but showed himself eager to cultivate the most friendly relations with foreigners, and to elevate the country to a level with the most civilized nations of Europe and America. In May, 1869, a large congress of Daimios was held at Yeddo, and from that time to the middle of the year 1871 many important reforms in the administration have partly been carried through, partly begun.

The authorization given by the Japanese government to foreign residents of a free exercise of the Christian religion in the open ports was, of course, eagerly embraced by both the Protestant and the Roman Catholic churches. Missionaries of both established themselves in several of the ports, attending both to the religious wants of the foreign residents, and preparing for missionary operations among the natives. The appearance of Roman Catholic missionaries at Nagasaki brought to light the fact that a number of the descendants of former Christians in Japan still secretly adhered to the Roman Catholic faith, and now hoped for permission to exercise it publicly. The Japanese government, however, did not give the expected permission, but in 1867 arrested and imprisoned some twenty of the native Christians. After an imprisonment of six months, the French charged affaires obtained in December their liberation. In the following year, however, the persecution was renewed-with great cruelty. The following is one of the official decrees published by the government:. “As the abominable religion of the Christians is strictly prohibited, every one shall be bound to denounce to the proper authorities such persons as appear suspicious to him, and a reward shall be given to him for so doing. Although the sect of the Christians has been many centuries ago persecuted most rigorously by the Rankfu government, its entire extermination. had not been arrived at. As, however, the number of the followers of the Christian doctrine has lately considerably augmented in the village of  Urakami, near Nagasaki; whose peasants secretly adhere to it, after mature consideration it has been ordered by the highest authority that Christians shall be taken into custody, according to the rules laid down in the annexed document; As the Christian doctrine has been prohibited in this country since the oldest times, this matter ought not to be lightly treated. Those to whose custody Christians shall be confided shall therefore instruct them of what is right, with leniency and humanity, and shall do their best to again make good men of them. But-if some should not repent and acknowledge their errors; they shall be most severely punished without any mercy. Those whom it concerns shall keep this well in mind, and denounce to the proper authorities every one who shall prove incorrigible. Those men (Christians), until they have repented, shall not be allowed to have any intercourse with the inhabitants of the places where they are consigned. They shall be used to clear land, or to work in the lime-pits, or the gold and coal mines, or for any work their officers may think fit to employ them on. They shall live in the mountains and forests. One portion of rice shall be allowed per head to the respective Daimios for the space of three years, to commence from a day to be determined hereafter. They shall be brought in small detachments to the places mentioned below. The Daimios shall, as soon as they receive the information of the arrival of the persons allotted to them, send soldiers to take them over. The above imperial orders are hereby published far observance. The following Daimios shall take over the Christians allotted to them at their respective palaces at Osaca.' This decree was followed by a list of thirty-four Daimios who had Christian prisoners allotted to them, in numbers varying from 30 to 250 each. The following decree was posted at the gates of Yokohama: “The Christian religion being still forbidden in the same manner as formerly, is strictly interdicted. The devilish sect is strictly prohibited.”

On the 7th of July 114 native Christians, chiefly men and heads of families, were put on board the Japanese steamer Sir H. Parkes at Nagasaki, and carried away to the mines of the north for penal servitude. The protest of the consuls at Nagasaki and the ministers at Yeddo were of no avail. The Congress of Daimios which met in 1869 showed itself likewise very hostile to Christianity. Only one member dared to defend it, while 210 voted for a resolution declaring Christianity to be opposed to the state. Another resolution to inflict severe penalties for bringing back the apostates to one of the religions of the country was negatived by 176 against 44 votes.  Japan has long had many religious sects which have lived peaceably together. The three principal sects are the Sinto religion, Buddhism, and the sect of Siu. The original and most ancient is the Sinto or Sinsyoo sect, which is founded on the worship of spirits, called in the Japanese language. Kami, in the Chinese Sin, who control the actions of men, and all visible and invisible things. The chief of these spirits is Yen, Zio Dai Sin, which means Great Spirit of the Heavenly Light, who receives the highest honors from all religious parties. Besides this sun-goddess, thousands of inferior Kamis receive divine honors. Most of these are the spirits of distinguished men, who were canonized on account of their merits. Their number is not limited but the Mikado still possesses the right to canonize prominent men, and thus to elevate them to the dignity of a Kami. The Sinto religion has five commandments:

1. Preservation of the pure fire as an emblem of purity and a means of purification;

2. Purity of the soul, of the heart, and the body;

3. Observation of festivals;

4. Pilgrimages;

5. Worship of the Kami in the temples and at home.

The numerous temples (Mya) contain no idols, but large metal mirrors and packets of white paper scraps, as symbols of purity. The priests are called Kaminusi, or keepers of the gods. They live near the temples, and derive their income chiefly from the money offerings made on feast-days. Among the twenty-two places of pilgrimage, the temple Nykoo, in the province of Jsyay, which is sacred to the sun-goddess, is the most prominent, and every one is bound to visit it at least once in the course of his life. The second religion is Buddhism, which was introduced about 532 from Corea, but received many modifications in Japan, and gradually became the religion of the vast majority of Japanese. The sect known as Siuto, or the school of philosophers, comprises the followers of Confucius, and includes the people of the best education.

The great political revolution through which Japan passed in 1868, by the abolition of the office of the Tycoon and the re-establishment of the supreme power of the Mikado, was accompanied by an effort to effect-a complete change in the state religion of the country. An American missionary writes on this subject, under date of Dec. 26, 1868, as follows: “Here the Buddhist religion is, or was, the established religion, and the  priests have a monopoly of burying people, and praying for them afterwards. The aboriginal Sinto religion has fallen into disuse, poverty, and consequent disfavor and disgrace. This state of things commenced about three hundred years ago under Yie Yazoo, the founder of the Tycoon dynasty. In the wars which he waged he was often beaten, and in his flight, and in other times of calamity, he and his adherents found shelter and sympathy in many a Buddhist monastery. At last, when he reached the throne, he liberally rewarded all those priests who had befriended him in his adversity, paying them a fixed sum out of the public treasury, and bestowing grants of land to be held as temple grounds, the revenue from which was devoted to the support of the temple. From that time Buddhism flourished in Japan, and Sintoism decayed. The nation followed the example of the victorious Tycoon, and thus Buddhism became established and popular. Still, as the Tycoon did not ignore the Mikado, but allowed him to be the nominal head of Japan, and even paid some outward respect to him, in the same way Buddhism did not ignore or displace Sintoism, of which the Mikado is pontifex maximus.

Where the aboriginal Sinto gods were worshipped before, the Buddhist divinities did not replace or supersede them, but were added to them, and thus, in many places, a singular union was effected. Buddhism and Sinto divinities are worshipped together, and the priests of both divisions often reside in the same temple. When this is the case such temples are called Ryoby, i.e. ‘union temples.' Thus there are pure Buddhist, pure Sinto, and the mixed or union temples. During the recent revolution a great effort has been made by the adherents of the Mikado to revive the ancient faith, and cast off whatever is of foreign origin, whether derived from China or India. Efforts are made to eliminate the whole mass of Chinese characters from the language and literature of the land, and to return to the ancient, simple, and alphabetical manner of writing. The same principle is at work in the reaction against the established religion, which is of foreign origin, introduced from China and India 500 years ago. Since the Mikado's government has been established, it has decreed that, where Buddhist and Sinto divinities are worshipped in the same temple, the former are to be set aside, and the latter alone reverenced. The priests of the former religion are urged to embrace the ancestral and national faith, in which case they may continue to hold their places. — At various points over the empire there are deserted Sinto temples.

The ancient god holds his place, but, not being a popular god, his shrine is forsaken by officiating priests and worshippers. The present government has made inspection, and found that in many cases these  shrines, so sadly neglected, are the shrines of the true and ancient gods. These are to be re-erected, and endowed with government support. What has been taken from the disendowed Buddhists will, no doubt, most of it be given to the Sintos. Now, when one of these old temples is re-erected and endowed, the office of priest in it becomes desirable. Not only has it a revenue from government, but the people suddenly wake up to a knowledge of the fact that this same forgotten god, in the olden time, worked wonders. The early history of the divinity is involved in obscurity, and on the principle ‘Omne ignotum pro magnifico,' it is magnified; worshippers bring their offerings, new votive tablets are set up, and the revenue hence accruing, added to' what is bestowed by government, makes a priest's office a desirable one, especially as he is exempt from all military service. Many, therefore, now- seek to obtain this position; but, on presenting their petitions at the seat of government, it is generally decided that it is desirable to have these places filled by adherents of the Mikado from the south.” In 1870 the Buddhist priests were compelled to pay to the Mikado the sum of 8,000,000 rios, or $10,000,000, for the privilege of remaining in possession of their temples and monuments, and of observing their religious rites and customs without restriction. ,

The reports on the number of natives who desire to reconnect themselves with the Roman Catholic Church greatly vary. According to a recent (1870) report of the Japanese government their number amounts to 3600, of whom 2000 were at Urakami, near Nagasaki, 100 at Omura, and 1500 at Fubahori. Besides, there were Christians in Shimabara, Amakusa, Hirado, and other places, but their number could not be accurately stated. There is a strong force of French Jesuits at Kanagawa. They have lately opened a school for young men, for the purpose of teaching the French language and literature, and the sciences. The pope has erected Japan into a vicariate apostolic. The Roman Catholic missionaries assert that at least 100,000 Japanese would openly join their Church if religious toleration should be established.

Protestant missions were in 1870 supported in Japan by three American denominations: the Presbyterian Church, the Dutch Reformed Church, and the Protestant Episcopal Church. Several missionaries teach secular branches in the government schools. Progress has been made with the translation of the Bible into Japanese, and Bible-classes have been formed, but up to 1871 but few of the natives had made a profession of Christianity. The Presbyterian missionaries, who had stations at Yokohama  (begun in 1859) and Yeddo (begun in 1869), had, according to their report of 1870, baptized three natives. The Protestant Episcopal Church supported one missionary bishop and one missionary. See Charleroix et Crasset, Histoire de Japan (Paris, 1754);: Sir Rutherford Alcock, The Capital of the Tycoon (Lond. 1863); Siebold, Nipon; Archiv zur Beschreibung von Japan (Leyd. 1832-51); American Annual Cyclopedia, 1868,1870. (A. J.S.) See our Sulpplemeent, s.v.

## Japan (2)[[@Headword:Japan (2)]]

             This archipelago in eastern Asia consists of one large island, Hondo (mainland or continent), not called Nippon by the natives, but formerly so named by foreigners, three other large islands, Shikoku (four provinces), Kiushiu (nine provinces), and Yezo (unexplored land), a number of  outlying islands, Sado, Oki, Iki, Tsushima, Awaji, Goto, etc., and the more distant groups, the Kuriles (smokers), Bonin (no man's), and Riu Kiu (hanging fringe-tassels or sleeping dragon), with nearly four thousand islets. The area of this empire, called by the natives Nihon or Nippon (sunrise), or Dai Nihon Koku (great land of the sun's root, or oeigin), is, by survey of 1874, 146,571 square miles, and the population, by census of 1874,33,623,373 souls. Hondo contains nearly 15,000,000 people, and, with the islands immediately south and next to it, may be called Old Japan (native Oyashima, eight great islands), because historically conquered and colonized in early times. New Japan comprises later acquisitions and colonies, such as Ydzo and Riu Kiu.

The origin of the dominant race in Japan is not yet entirely clear to scholars, but traditions all point to Corea and northern Asia as the ancestral seats of that conquering race which, near the Christian sera, descended upon the. land over which they saw the sun rise. They found other races on the soil whom they subdued. Many of the subjugated were doubtless of near Asian origin, like their conquerors, but there were also the straight- eyed, black-haired Ainos, who now occupy only Yezo and the Kuriles, whither they were in early: times (from the 4th to the 13th century of our sera) driven. The conquerors, by the superior force both of their fetiches and dogmas, as well as of their valor, arms, and agriculture, made conquest only after long struggles. The farmers and warriors finally pacified the fishers and hunters, and established both their political rule and imported religion, Shinto, over "all within the four seas." The first mikado or emperor, deified as Jimmu Tenrmno (heavenly king), is said to have begun to reign B.C. 667, in his miya or palace-temple, near the miyako (city) of Kioto — but of Japanese dates, until the introduction of almanacs and writing, with methods for keeping record of time, from China, in the 3d century and later, no one can speak with certainty, and Japanese traditions that antedate the Christian aera are chronologically worthless.

The first form of government was a rude species of feudalism, in which the mikado was suzerain, and his relatives or captains were rulers of the conquered land, which had been duly parcelled out into districts. This order of things continued until the 7th century, when the centralized system of pure monarchy, introduced from China, was carried out, and the mikado, as sole ruler, was assisted by six boards or ministries of government, and all provincial officers were appointed in and sent out from Kioto. Several centuries were necessary to bring this method to perfection, and in the  distant provinces military families who had kept the peace and put down insurrections at first made themselves necessary to the central government, and later, at the capital, transferred their energies to ambitious schemes in the palace itself. The introduction of Buddhism led the mikados to neglect the sceptre, and to become Buddhist monks, or live in gross licentiousness under cover of a professedly holy life. This paved the way for the rise of the shoguns (known later as kubo sama, "Tycoon," etc.), who gradually concentrated the powers of the executive in their own hands, while nominally the mikado was the fountain of honors. Exaggerating the mikado's "spiritual" importance for his own ends, the shogun usurped the functions of military and civil administration, and held the army, the treasury, and the appointing power. Yoritomo, at Kamakura, in 1192, began the dual system of government, which, with slight intermissions, lasted until 1868, though Iyeyasu, at Yedo, in 1604, established the order of things in Japan with which, until 1868, foreigners have been most familiar. Side by side with this spectacle of two rulers and two capitals grew up the elaborate feudalism of Japan, which has so attracted the attention of students, and which in its perfected development was unique in Asia.

The story of the introduction of Portuguese Christianity into Dai Nippon, as given by professor Schem in volume 4 is in the main an admirable one. We note only the following needed corrections: Tanega (seed island) for Yanega, Hideyoshi for Fide Yose, Iyeyasu for Yie Yazoo, Hirado for Firando, Yedo for Yeddo, Bakafu for Rankfu, Ise for Isyay, Riobu for Ryoby, etc. We may add that, in 1877, most interesting relics — documents, books, tapestry — of the Japanese embassy to the pope were discovered, and that while in Japan, in 1873, the writer identified the place of imprisonment and burial of "Sedotti" (Jean Baptiste Sidotti), "the last Catholic priest" who, in 1709, landed in Japan, and “was never again heard of" until the Reverend S.R. Brown, D.D., unearthed the account of his inquisition and trial, written by a Japanese scholar. Further, the recently found correspondence of the Dutch superintendents of Deshima requires us to relieve the Hollanders of much of the odium resting on their names for assisting with cannon to crush the "Christian" insurrection at Shimabara, in 1627 (not "at the close of the 16th century"), in which very much fewer than seventy thousand "Christians" were either concerned or injured.

For two centuries and a half after the expulsion of the Romish priests, the supposed extirpation of Christianity, and sealing of all the doors of the  empire against foreign influences, Japan rested in peace in the calm of despotism. But while the successors of lyyasu, in Yedo, supposed that the duarchy feudalism and national isolation were permanently established, great currents of thought began to move under the surface. These were finally to break out in floods that should sweep away the old and bring in a new sera never dreamed of by ancient or modern man in Japan. These movements were intended to effect the overthrow of the shogun and his abasement as the emperor's vassal, the replacement of the mikado on his throne as sole ruler, the abolition of the feudal system, the disestablishment of Buddhism, and the restoration of Shinto as the state cultus.

All was ready, or nearly so, for upheaval, when the squadron of American steamers, under commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry, swept into the bay of Yedo, July 8, 1853. After his treaty, and those made later by Townsend Harris, our consul-general, and European envoys, and the opening of the ports to foreign residence and commerce, the men who had wrought to undermine the shogunate bent their energies to the expulsion of the foreigners and the dictatorial isolation of "the holy country " from the rest of the world. The advent of foreigners precipitated a crisis long preparing, and in the chaos of conflicting elements that kept the country in commotion from 1859 to 1870 foreigners resident on the soil could see little but the occasional outbursts of incendiarism, assassination, riots, and blood. shed, culminating in the civil war of 1868-70. In this the progressive party was successful. The mikado was reinstated to supreme power in the capital, which had been removed from Kioto to Yedo (bay-door) — which received the new and more appropriate name, Tokio (eastern capital) — the office of shogun was abolished, and its last incumbent retired to Shidzuoka (where he died in 1884), feudalism was abolished, and the three hundred or less petty territorial rulers or daimios were retired to private life in Tokia, the hereditary pensions of the military-literati, or idle privileged classes, were capitalized and extinguished, society was reconstructed on the simplified basis of "the three classes," nobles, gentry, and common people.

From the centralized government in Tokio now proceeded the most radical measures of reform, political, social, and moral, which, in their rapidity and frequency, served to show that the mikado's advisers were making all haste to be "civilized." The goal of their agonizing race was the equality of Japan among the nations of Christendom, and the abolition of the odious extra-territoriality clause from the treaties. Dependence was not placed alone upon development of industrial and military resources, although these were carefully attended to, and wisely, for new Japan was  not yet purged of the old spirit of feudalism. Several insurrections had to be quelled, one of them, the Satsuma rebellion in 1877, being on a scale which threatened for a time the very existence of the government, and cost the country twenty thousand lives and a hundred million dollars. By means of telegraphs, steamers, improved rifles, ships, and cannon, backed by the valor of peasant conscripts, led by officers of modern education, peace was won after seven months' war. Political education by means of newspapers (now two thousand in number in Japan, or more than in both Spain and Russia) and debating-clubs proceeded apace, resulting finally in the establishment of local assemblies, a franchise based on property qualification, and the solemn oath-bound promise of the mikado that, in 1890, a national parliament should be formed, and the government (changed from absolute despotism) become a limited monarchy. And this in Asia! Such is the political outlook in Japan. Let us now glance at her religious condition.

When the treaties lifted the seals from the closed doors of the empire, and missionaries from the three great divisions of the Christian Church entered Japan, the Roman Catholics searched at once for, and soon found, remnants of the 17th century converts, numbering in all probably five thousand. Preserving a few Latin words of sacred import, and some of the characteristic forms of the Roman ritual, with here and there an image or picture of the Virgin or of Jesus, these descendants of the martyrs were, despite their debased and half heathenish condition, Kiristans. With this advantage of historic continuity the Roman Catholics began their work simultaneously with the Russo-Greeks and American Protestants. Persecutions soon broke out, and were carried on both by the old shogun's and the new mikado's government. The writer has a vivid recollection of seeing, on a bitter cold winter's day, in the mountains of Echizen, a gang of these wretched prisoners roped together and led by jailers while tramping in the snow to their place of duress in the volcano craters of Kaga. The intercession of diplomatists, and especially of the Reverend G.F. Verbeck, then the trusted servant of the government, and president of the Imperial University of Tokio, finally stopped these inhuman proceedings. Fear of the censure of Christian nations, and their threatened final refusal to expunge the extra-territoriality clause from the treaties, have compelled the Japanese to cease from persecution in every form. In 1872 the anti- Christian edicts, which, since 1600, had denounced "the corrupt sect," and promised rewards to informers, were removed. Later, both Buddhism and  Shinto were disestablished, the department of religion was abolished, and the vexatious burial laws repealed, "and thus it has been brought to pass that Christianity has been, by the action of the Japanese government itself, placed upon a footing of perfect equality with the old-established and recognized religions of Japan. In other words, within twenty-five years from the first Protestant mission in the empire, Christianity secures a position before the law which it gained in ancient Rome only after the delays and persecutions of over three centuries."

About thirty Protestant missionary societies now have representatives in Japan, most of them from America. In addition to the usual methods of missionary, work by the foreign teachers, the Japanese themselves carry on matters pretty much in their own way. Almost every form of Christian effort in vogue among us is quickly adopted by the Japanese brethren. Preaching services held in public halls and theatres by a number of speakers during several days in succession are very popular and effective. Social meetings for the promotion of harmony and Christian fellowship are frequently held in individual churches or unitedly by different churches or denominations. The Japanese are good public speakers, enjoying the privilege of a participation in social worship, and being emotional and sympathetic. There are few of those pauses of dead silence which so afflict our own meetings for prayer. The telegraph, now ramifying throughout Japan, often bears such messages as these, "Konnichi Mitami Kudari, Kitokwai furuu" (today the Holy Spirit has come down, and the meetings are full of fervor).

Prayer-meetings held exclusively for and by women, scripture-reading leagues, young men's Christian associations, popular lecture courses, and religious periodicals, edited by native Christians, supplement the foreign missionary's work, and that of the American, Scotch, and Bible societies, and thus fill the whole land with light and truth. Old missionaries declare that the native Church members, who are very apt at first to join the Church from intellectual conviction, show a most cheering growth in spiritual knowledge. The preaching of the young licentiates or pastors, at first dealing almost exclusively with morality, becomes more spiritual, Christ and his cross being the prominent theme. The complete New Test. has now been in the hands of the Japanese for five years, and the year 1886 will, D.V., see the completed Bible in their homes. The Scriptures are published in three styles of print and diction, so that all classes may read them. Ninety thousand copies and portions of the Scriptures, and one hundred and sixty thousand tracts were distributed by  the tract societies last year. Turning away from China as the mother country of knowledge and inspiration, the Japanese now look to Europe and America. A company of literary men and scholars are endeavoring to do away with the use of Chinese ideographs, and to print books and newspapers in the Roman character. Familiarity with their own phonetics, or syllabary of forty-eight letters, makes the final adoption of the Roman alphabet easy. The Romaji-kai is the newspaper in which they are showing how a native boy may now learn to read better in ten months than he could of old in ten years.

Much of the literary, social, political, as well as moral progress made by the Japanese, results either directly or indirectly from missionary labor, suggestion, or stimulus. In addition to their preaching, teaching, translation, and healing, they have conferred-upon natives and foreigners alike a lasting benefit of incalculable importance by their aids to the mastery of the language, and their other publications. The following statistics of Christianity in Japan are from the paper read before the Osaka Conference in April, 1883:

ProtestantRoman CatholicGreekBishops3Missionaries145435Priests (Japanese)11Ordained Ministers49Unordained Evangelists, Catechists, etc100202106Bible women37Converts498726,1808863Contributions$12,064$4373Schools:3Theological771Students7174Mixed392020Scholars1520Boys9Scholars454Girls15Scholars556

Sunday109Scholars4132Organized churches93148Churches or chapels80Preaching places?281Hospitals5In-patients795Dispensaries8Patients24,898Of the dangers that beset the churches of Christ in Japan we do not here speak, but refer the reader to the following recent works for a more thorough study of the country and people, and the work for Christ in the sunrise kingdom.

Literature. — Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan (1874-85 volume 1-14; Leon Pages, Histoire de la Religion Chretienne au Japon; Griffis, The Mikado's Empire (New York, 1876; 4th ed. 1884); Corea, the Hermit Nation (ibid. 1882); Bird, Unbeaten Tracks in Japan (ibid. 1881); Rein, Japan (ibid. 1884), and the works of baron De Hubner, E. Warren Clark, E.J. Reed, Isabella Carruthers, W. Gray Dixon, Henry Faulds, and others. (W.E.G.)

## Japanese Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Japanese Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The honor of translating the first portion of Scripture into the language of the extensive empire of Japan belongs to the late Dr. Gutzlaff (q.v.). About the year 1835 three shipwrecked Japanese mariners arrived at Macao on their voyage homewards, and during the few months that they remained in that city Dr. Gutzlaff availed himself of their aid in translating the gospel of John into their language. This translation was printed at Singapore about 1838. In this version the word used for God was Gokuraku, the term the Buddhists use for paradise or the state of supreme bliss. For Logos or the Word he used Kashikoi mono, the wise or clever person; for Holy Spirit, Kami. While in England Dr. Gutzlaff proposed, in 1849, to the British and Foreign Bible Society, to have the Scriptures printed in the Japanese tongue. The Acts of the Apostles and the epistles of John were consequently printed according to Gutzlaff's translation.

As the style of his version was found inferior, and little likely to prove acceptable to the better educated in Japan, a new translation was undertaken by Dr. Bettelheim, a medical missionary and convert from Judaism. He was sent to the Loochoo islands in 1846, and while there made a translation of the New Test. While in Hong Kong he published the gospel of Luke, under the care of the bishop of Victoria, and at the expense of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. It was printed on blocks, in royal octavo size, with Giltzlaffs Chinese translation at the top of the page, and Bettelheim's, in the Loochoo dialect, at the bottom, in Katakana, or the character used for scientific works. When Bettelheim left Japan in 1854 he took up his residence in Chicago, and from this place he offered, in 1860, to sell his translation to the United States government. The government, wishing to know its merits, sent a copy of one of the gospels and a grammar he had compiled to its minister resident in Japan, Mr. Harris, to be examined by scholars there and reported on. Mr. Harris not knowing what better to do, sent it to Drs. Brown and Hepburn, two missionaries, but whether from the peculiarities of the dialect, or out of very imperfect knowledge of the Japanese language at that early day of their residence there, they could not make anything out of it. So it was returned to Mr. Harris with an unfavorable report. Dr. Bettelheim, however, revised his work in Chicago, with the assistance of a Japanese, bringing it more into conformity with the pure Japanese. This revision, consisting of the four gospels and Acts, was offered to the British and Foreign Bible Society, and purchased by them. It was printed at Vienna in 1872 for that society, in the Hiragama character, which is more generally understood in Japan than the Kantakana, in which it was written.

This publication was the only direct effort made by that society as a temporary measure until something better could be prepared. The committee appointed by the missionary convention commenced its sittings in June, 1874. There were invited to meet and participate in the work of translation the Reverend R.S. Maclay, of the American Episcopal Mission; Reverend N. Brown, D.D., of the American Baptist Mission; the Reverend John Piper, of the Church Missionary Society; and the Reverend W.B. Wright, of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Mr. Piper and Mr. Wright, owing to their residing at such an inconvenient distance, could not meet the committee. Dr. Nathan Brown sat with the committee about eighteen months, until January 1876, when he resigned, and continued to prosecute the work of translation alone. The other members of the  committee continued at the work of translation and revision with but slight interruption, Dr. Maclay being absent about eighteen months, owing to other duties, and Dr. Brown being compelled through ill-health to cease work in July, 1879. The committee finished their work of translation and revision of the New Test. Nov. 3, 1879, about five years and six months after they had commenced. The work was cut on blocks and published in- the following order: Luke, August 1875; Romans, March 1876; Hebrews and Matthew (revised), January 1877; Mark (revised), April 1877; epistles of John, June 1877; Acts, September 1877; Galatians, January 1878; John, gospel (revised), May 1878; 1 Corinthians, August 1878; 2 Corinthians, Septemnber 1878; Ephesians, Philippians , 1 James , 2 d Thessalonians, June 1879; Philemon, James , 1 James , 2 d Peter, Jude, Colossians, Revelation, April 1880. As to the literary style of the translation — a matter of no small importance — the following statement, made by the Reverend Dr. J.C. Hepburn on the occasion of celebrating the completion of the Japanese version of the New Test., April 19, 1880, at Tokio, will be of interest:

"In this country, where, from the earliest times, the Chinese language and literature has had such a powerful influence upon the cultivation and language of the people, it was, at the very first, a matter of considerable anxiety in what literary style our work should be brought out to make it most acceptable and useful. The conclusion was not difficult to arrive at: that-avoiding on the one hand the quasi-Chinese style, only intelligible to the highly educated, scholarly, and comparatively very snlall portion of the people; and on the other hand, a vulgar colloquial, which, though easily understood, might make the Scriptures contemptible — we should choose that style which, while respected even by the so-called literati, was easy and intelligible to all classes. We thus adhered to the vernacular, or pure Japanese, and to a style which may be called classical, in which many of their best hooks intended for the common reader are written. And our more enlarged experience has given us no reason to regret our first determination, but rather to be more and more satisfied with it, and to believe that in this, as well as in maly other matters, we have been under the guidance of a kind and all-ruling Providence.

The committee had assistance from several Japanese scholars, among whom Mr. Okuno and Mr. Matsuyama are mentioned. Of the latter it is said, "He has been with the committee from the first and throughout its whole work. He has been our chief dependence, assistant, and .arbiter in all cases of difficulty. Whatever virtue there is in our Japanese text, it is  mainly, if not altogether, owing to his scholarly ability, the perfect knowledge he has of his own language, his conscientious care, and identifying himself with the work." At present the New Test. is circulated in Japan in the following editions:

1. The Standard, or Kanamejiri, New Testament. — This is a republication of the New Test. completed in 1880, with such changes as the translation committee finally decided upon.

2. The Romanized New Testament; or, Warera no shu Iyesu Kirisuto no Shin Yaku zen sho. — This is the Japanese of the Standard New Test., in Roman letter. The transliteration was done by Dr. Hepburn. The Daily Gazette of Yokohama, October 16, 1880, has the following notice concerning the editor: "The labors of this modest but excellent philanthropist and Japanese scholar in the causes of learning and Christianity in Japan are well known. His dictionary, Japanese-English and English-Japanese was the first work of its kind published in this country, and notwithstanding the more elaborate and copious contribution of Mr. Satow, it still retains its high rank for accuracy and general usefulness. In the midst of other occupations, Dr. Hepburn has found time to add to his literary reputation a complete Romanized version of the New Test., a piece of work which can be but imperfectly estimated by its extent, which embraces six hundred and fifty-three closely printed royal octavo pages.

"Of the quality of the translation we do not feel competent to form an opinion. Dr. Hepburn's close association with the gentlemen who undertook the work is itself a guarantee of excellence: but we may, at a later time, have occasion to notice it critically.

"The American Bible Society is to be congratulated on this valuable addition to its library, and the thanks of all who desire the promotion of good works are due to those wh'ose labor has yielded this good fruit."

3. The Common Reader's, or Sohirakana, New Testament. In this the common cursive Japanese character is used almost alone, with but very few Chinese characters. It is intended to meet the wants of the most illiterate; The first volume will appear in a few days, and the entire work will be finished, we hope, before the close of the year. It will be a volume slightly thinner than the Standard New Test. The Reverend M. Knox, of the Presbyterian Mission, has kindly superintended the proof-reading.

4. The Shinkatakana New Testament. — In this style the angular Japanese kara are used, with many Chinese characters. It is thought that this will be the favorite edition with the scholarly classes. It is of just about the same size as the Standard, and its cost and selling price will he the same. The proof-reading of this work has been under the supervision of Dr. Hepburn.

5. The Chino-Japanese, or Kunten, New Testament and Psalms. — The New Test. was prepared by the Reverend D.C. Greene, D.D., and the Psalms by the Rt. Reverend W.C. Willias, D.D. This is an adaptation of the Bridgman and Culbertson Chinese translation for the use of Japanese readers. In the words of Dr. Greene, The word kuenten is the name given to the diminutive characters written on the right side of the Chinese ideographs. These, which consist for the most part of the Japanese phonetic characters, serve to supply the terminations of the Japanese verbs and such particles as are not found in the Chinese construction. Besides the kunten, there are certain numerals and arbitrary signs placed on the left of each column, which indicate the Japanese order of thought. By the insertion of these marks, this book becomes substantially a translation into Japanese of the Chinese version above mentioned."

A commencement with the translation of the Old Test. into Japanese has also been made. Delegates of the Protestant missions in Japan met in Tokio, May 10, 1878, to consider principally plans for translating the Old Test. A permanent translation committee was arranged for, to consist of one member from each mission, to be elected by the mission itself, who are to assign the work of translating the different portions of the Old Test. to various sub-committees; and the results of their labors are to be submitted to a general revising committee, to be appointed by the permanent committee. The revision committee is made up of Drs. Hepburn, Brown, Maclay, and the Reverend Messrs. Green and Piper. As to the progress made in the Old Test. translation, we learn from the different reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society that most of the books have been translated, and that some have already been printed. Besides the reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society, compare also the Bible Society Record of the American Bible Society. (B.P.)

## Japha[[@Headword:Japha]]

             SEE JAPHIA, 3.

## Japheth[[@Headword:Japheth]]

             (Heb. Ye'pheth, יֶפֶת, in pause YaIpheth, י פֶת, wide-spreading [comp. Gen 9:27], although some make it signify fair, referring to the light complexion of the Japhethites; Sept. Ι᾿άφεθ; Josephus. Ι᾿αφέθας, Ant. 1:4, 1), one of the three sons of Noah, mentioned last in order (Gen 5:32; Gen 6:10; Gen 7:13; Gen 9:18; Gen 10:1; 1Ch 1:4), although it appears from Gen 10:21 (Gen 9:24) that he was the eldest of Noah's sons, born one hundred years before the flood (Michaelis, Spicil. 2, 66). B.C. 2616. He and his wife were two of the eight persons (1Pe 3:20) preserved in the ark (Gen 7:7). In Gen 10:2 sq. he is called the progenitor of the extensive tribes in the west (of Europe) and north (of Asia)of the Armenians, Medes, Greeks, Thracians, etc. (comp. Syncellus, Chronicles p. 49; Mala, Chronogr. p. 16; see Tuch on Gen 10:27). SEE ETHNOGRAPHY.

De Wette (Kritik, p. 72) justly repudiates the opinion of the Targumim, both Jonathan and Hieros., who make Japheth the progenitor of the African tribes also. The Arabian traditions (D'Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient.) attribute to Japheth wonderful powers (Weil, Biblische Legenden, 8, 46), and enumerate eleven of his sons, the progenitors of as many Asiatic nations, viz. Gin or Dshin (Chinese), Seklah (Slavonians), Manshuge, Gomari, Turk (Turks), Khalage, Khozar, Ros (Russians), Sussan, Gaz, and Torage. In these traditions he is called Aboultierk (Hottinger, Hist. Orient. p. 37). To the seven sons of Japheth mentioned in Gen 10:2 and 1Ch 1:5, the Sept. and Eusebins add an eighth, Elisha, though not found in the text. Some (Buttmann, Mytholog. 1, 222; Bochart, Phal. 3:1; and Hasse, Entdeckung, 2, 131) identify Japheth with the Irenrog of Greek fable, the depository of many ethnographical traditions (see Smith's Dict. of Classic. Biogr. s.v.  Japletus), while others, again, connect him with Hereus, mentioned by the ancient historian Sanchoniathon. His act of filial piety, in conjunction with Shem, as related in Gen 9:20-27 (where some understand the clause, “He shall dwell in the tents of Shem,” to refer to God, and not to Japheth), became the occasion of the prophecy of the extension of his posterity (see Iengstenberg's Christology, i, 42). SEE SHEM.

## Japheth ben-Ali ha-Levi[[@Headword:Japheth ben-Ali ha-Levi]]

             (called in Arabic Abu-Ali Hassan ben-Ali al-Lei al-Bozrii), a very able Karaite grammarian and commentator on the Old Test., flourished at Bassra, in Arabia, during the latter half of the 10th century. He is reputed to have written a history of the Karaites (q.v.), of which traces still remain (see Rule, Karaites, p. 106), and commentaries which cover twenty MS. volumes preserved in. Paris and Leyden. He distinguished himself by his literary labors, and obtained the honorable appellation of הגדול המלמד, the great teacher, and a place among those who are mentioned in the Karaite Prayer-book. The late eminent Orientalist Monk brought, in 1841, from Egypt to the royal library at Paris, eleven volumes of this commentary, five of which are on Genesis and many sections of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers; two volumes are on the Psalms, one is on Proverbs, and one on the Five Megilloth. They are written in Arabic, preceded by the Hebrew text and an Arabic translation. The indefatigable Pinsker has examined the entire twenty volumes, and made extracts from them. This work, of such gigantic magnitude, although it has exercised great influence on the development of Biblical exegesis (as may be concluded from the fact that Aben-Ezra had them constantly before him when writing his expositions of the O.T., and that he quotes them with the greatest respect), has not as yet been published, and we have still only the fragments which Aben-Ezra gives us. Japheth was also an extensive polemical writer, and engaged in controversies with the disciples of Saadia (q.v.); but for polemics he does not seem to have possessed the proper requisites. See Ginsburg in Kitto, s.v.; Jost, Israelitische Annalen (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1841), p. 76: Barges, Rabbi Japhet ben-Heli Bassorensis Karaitis in Psal. Commentarii Prefatio (1846); Pinsker, Likkute Kadmoniot (Vienna, 1863), p. 169; Supplement, p. 181, etc.; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, 5, 342.

## Japheth ben-Said[[@Headword:Japheth ben-Said]]

             a descendant of the above, and another great Karaite, in all probability also born at Bassra, flourished about 1160-1200. Besides the celebrated work in defense of Karaism entitled Ha-Atakat ha-Tora, which he is supposed to have written about 1167, he wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch and other books of the O.T. Pinsker fancies, and not with. out reason, that this is the Japheth whom the Karaites describe as the instructor of Aben-Ezra, and asserts that Ezra's quotations from the commentary on Exo 4:20; Exo 8:13; Exo 9:16; Exo 10:5; Exo 10:21, belong to this Japheth, and not to the former. His commentaries are still in MS., both in the Paris and Leyden libraries. See Pinsker, Likkute Kadmoniot, p. 222 sq. and 185 sq., Supplement; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, 6, 305 sq.; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. s.v. SEE KARAITES.

## Japhia[[@Headword:Japhia]]

             (Heb. Yaphi'a, יָפַיעִ, splendid; Sept. Ι᾿αφιε v.r. Ι᾿αφαγαί and Φαγγαί, but Ι᾿εφιέ. in 2 Samuel 5, 15), the name of two men, and also of a place.

1. The king of Lachish, who joined the confederacy at the instance of Adoni-zedek against Joshua, but was defeated and slain after confinement in the cave of Makkedah (Jos 10:3 sq.). B.C. 1618.

2. ‘One of the sons of David (q.v.) by some one of his full wives whose name is not given, born at Jerusalem (2 Samuel 5, 15; 1Ch 3:7; 1Ch 14:6). B.C. post 1046.

3. A town on the eastern part of the southern boundary of Zebulon, situated on high ground between Daberath and Gath-hepher on the north (Jos 19:12). Reland (Palcest. p. 826) thinks it is the town Sycaninum (ἡ Συκαμίνος or Συκαμίνων, Steph. Byz. Συκάμινον), on the Mediterranean, opposite Carmel, between Ptolemaisa and Caesarea (Pliny, 5, 15, 5), according to the Itin. Ainton. twenty Roman miles from the latter; called Hephat ( ῾Ηφά) in the time of Eusebius (Onoze. s.v. Ι᾿αφέδ), and still extant (Golii Not. ad Alfrag. p. 132) under the name of Haiffa (Robinson's Researches, 3, 194). He also regards it as the Jebba of Pliny (5, 18), which Gesenius, however (Thesaur. p. 613), shows is distinguished from Sycaminum.. This position does not agree with the requirements of the text. The place has been identified by Dr. Robinson (Researches, 3:200) with the modern village Yafa, about a mile and a half  southwest of Nazareth (Schubert, Reise, 3, 203), where the Italian monks fix the residence of the apostle James (Raumer, Palast. p. 127). See Quaresmius, Elucidatio, 2, 843; and Early Travels, p. 186: Maundeville calls it the “Castle of Saffra.” So, too, Von Harff, A.D. 1498 (Pilgerfahrt, p. 195). Although situated in a valley, the tribal line must have crossed (“went up,” text of Joshua) the hills on the south of it (Keil; Comment. ad loc.). It contains about thirty houses, with the remains of a church, and has a few single palm-trees. Eusebius and Jerome doubtless refer to this place, as “Japhet, in the tribe of Zebulon, still called Jophe, or the ascent of Japho” (Onoma. s.v. Japhic). The Japha (Ι᾿αφά) fortified by Josephus (Life, 37, 45) was probably the same, a large and strong village of Galilee, afterwards captured by Trajan and Titus, under the orders of Vespasian. In the storm and sack of the place, according to the same writer, 15,000 of the inhabitants were put to the sword, and 2130 made captives ( lar, 2, 20, 6; 3:7, 31). With this location De Saulcy (Narrat. 1, 73) and Schwarz (Palestine, p. 170) coincide, as also Van de Velde (ilemnzoi, p. 321) and Porter (Handbook, p. 385).

## Japhia (2)[[@Headword:Japhia (2)]]

             Its modern representative, Yafa, lies one and a half miles south-west of Nazareth. It contains no ancient remains, except a few broken columns,  and about thirty cisterns. For a description of the numerous grain-pits cut in the rocks see the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey, 1:353 sq.

## Japhlet[[@Headword:Japhlet]]

             (Heb. Yaphlet', יִפְלֵט, deliverer; Sept. Ι᾿αφαλήτ), a son of Heber and great-grandson of Asher; several of his sons are also named (1Ch 7:32-33). B.C. between 1856 and 1658. It appears to have been a branch of his descendants (Japhaletites, יִפְלֵטַי, Heb. Yaphleti', Sept. Ι᾿αφλητί, Vulg. Jephleti, Auth.Version “Japhleti”) that are mentioned in Jos 16:3 as having settled along the border between Ephraim and Dan, near (north of) the present Jaffa road, apparently east of Beth-horon, possibly at the present Beit Unia. Others, however, regard the name in this locality as a trace of one of the petty tribes of aboriginal Canaanites (compare the Archite, “Archi,” in the verse preceding, and in 2Sa 15:32; the Ophnite, “Ophni,” Jos 18:24).

## Japhleti[[@Headword:Japhleti]]

             (Jos 16:3). SEE JAPHLET.

## Japho[[@Headword:Japho]]

             (Jos 19:46). SEE JOPPA.

## Jaquelot[[@Headword:Jaquelot]]

             SEE JACQUELOT.

## Jarah[[@Headword:Jarah]]

             (1Ch 9:42). SEE JEHOADAI.

## Jarchi[[@Headword:Jarchi]]

             SEE RASHI.

## Jard, Francois[[@Headword:Jard, Francois]]

             a very celebrated French Jansenist preacher, born at Bollene, near Avignon, March 3, 1675, was one of the appellants against the bull Unigenitus. He died April 10, 1768. Besides his sermons, he published La religion Chretienne miditie dans le veritable esprit de ses maximes (Paris, 1743, 1763, 6 vols. 12mo; new ed. Lyons, 1819, 6 vols. 12mo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26, 372.

## Jareb[[@Headword:Jareb]]

             (Heb. Yareb', יָרֵב, i. q. יָרַיב, contentious,. i.e. an adversary) occurs as a proper name in the Auth. Vers. of Hos 5:13; Hos 10:6, where a “king Jareb” (יָרֵב מֶלֶךְ, Sept. βασιλεὺς Ι᾿αρείμ, Vulg. rex ultor) is spoken of as the false refuge and final subjugator of the kingdom of Israel. It probably is a figurative title of the king of Assyria (mentioned in the same connection), who, like the Persian monarchs, affected the title of “the great king” (Michaelis, Supplem., actually derives it from the Syriac ireb, “to be great”); here spoken in irony towards the faithless nation as their greatest scourge (Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 1286). Had Jareb been the proper name of the king of Assyria, as it would be if this rendering were correct, the word preceding (מֶלֶךְ, melek, “king”) would have required the article. That it is rather to be applied to the country than to the king may be inferred from its standing in parallelism with Asshur. Such is the opinion of First (Handw. s.v.), who illustrates the symbolical usage by a comparison with Rahab as applied to Egypt. At the same time he hazards a conjecture that it may have been an old Assyrian word, adopted into the Hebrew language, and so modified as to express an intelligible idea, while retaining something of its original form. The clause in which it occurs is supposed by  many to refer to Judah, in order to make the parallelism complete; and, with this in view, Jarchi interprets it of Ahaz, who sent to Tiglath-Pileser (2Ki 16:8) to aid him against the combined forces of Syria and Israel. But there is no reason to suppose that the two clauses do. not both refer to Ephraim, and the allusion would then be, as explained by Jerome, to Pul, who was subsidized by Menahem (2Ki 15:19), and Judah would be indirectly included. Other interpretations of the most fanciful character have been given (Glass, Phil. Sacr. 4:3, 17, p. 644).

## Jared[[@Headword:Jared]]

             (Heb. Ye'red, יֶרֶד, in pause Ya'red. י רֶד, descender; Sept. Ι᾿άρεδ, N.T. Ι᾿αρέδ, Josephus Ι᾿αρέδης), the name of two men.

1. The fourth antediluvian patriarch in descent from Seth, son of Mahalaleel and father of Enoch; born B.C. 3712, died B.C. 2750, aged 962 years; 162 years old at the birth of his heir (Genesis 5, 15-20; 1 Chronicles 1, 2, “Jered;” Luk 3:37).

2. A son apparently of Ezra, of the tribe of Judah, by his wife Jehudijah, although in the latter part of the same verse' a different parentage is spoken of; he is named as the “father” (i.e. founder) of Gedor (1Ch 4:18, where the name is Anglicized “Jered”). B.C. cir. 1612. The Rabbins, however, give an allegorical interpretation to the passage, and treat this and other names therein as titles of Moses-Jered because he caused the manna to descend.

## Jarenton[[@Headword:Jarenton]]

             a celebrated abbot of St. Benigne, at Dijon, France, born-at Vienna towards the year 1045 was educated in the monastery at Clugny. After leading for some time a life of dissipation, he retired in 1074 to the little monastery of La Chaise-Dieu, of which he soon became the prior, distinguishing himself among his monastic associates by a display of brilliant abilities and great erudition. In 1082 he was, after filling-various other positions of trust, dispatched on a very important mission by the French papal legate. In 1084 he went to Rome to report the success of his mission to pope Gregory VII, at that time confined by the emperor in the castle of Sant-Angelos, and he effected the pope's liberation by encouraging the papal legions to offer resistance to the imperial troops. We need not wonder that such service was well repaid by the papal court, and  that hereafter Jarenton figure prominently in the Roman Catholic Church. In 1097 he retired to his abbey, which he left only to attend, in 1100, the Council of Valencia. ‘He died, apparently, Feb. 10,1113. He is supposed to have written extensively, but only a letter to Thierry, the abbot of St. Hubert, is now known. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26, 375.

## Jaresiah[[@Headword:Jaresiah]]

             (Heb. Yaareshyah', יִעֲרֶשְׁיָה, nourished by Jehovah; Sept. Ι᾿ααρασία), one of the “sons” of Jeroham, a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:27). B.C. apparently ante 588.

## Jarha[[@Headword:Jarha]]

             (Heb. Yarcha', יִרְחָע, etymology unknown, but probably Egyptian; Sept. Ι᾿ωχήλ, Vulg. Jaraa), the Egyptian slave of a Hebrew named Sheshan, who married the daughter of his master, and was, of course, made free. As Sheshan had no sons, his posterity is traced through this connection (1Ch 2:34-41), which is the-only one of the kind mentioned in Scripture. Jarha thus became the founder of a chief house of the Jerahmeelites, which continued at least to the time of king Hezekiah, and from which sprang several illustrious persons, such as Zabad in the reign of David, and Azariah in the reign of Joash (1Ch 2:31 sq), B.C. prob. ante:1658. — Kitto. It is supposed by some that the name of Sheshan's daughter whom Jarha married was Ahlai, from the statement in 1Ch 2:31, compared with that in 1Ch 2:34; but the masculine form of the word, and the use of Ahlai elsewhere (1Ch 11:41) for a man, is adverse to this conclusion. As Sheshan's oldest grandson by this marriage was called Attai, and as the genealogy would run through him, it is supposed by others that Ahlai is a clerical error for Attai; while others think Ahlai (אחלי, disjoiner, from אחל) was a name given to Jarha on his incorporation into the family of Sheshan.

Others conjecture that Ahlai was a son of Sheshan, born after the marriage of his daughter. At what time this marriage occurred we cannot certainly determine, but as Sheshan' was the seventh in descent from Hezron, the grandson of Judah, it could not well have been much later than the settlement in Canaan (B.C. 1612), and on the presumption that there are no lacunae in the pedigree, it would naturally fall much prior to the Exode (B.C. 1658). In 1Sa 30:13, mention is made of an Egyptian who was servant to an Amalekite, and there is no reason why it should seem strange that an Egyptian should also  be found in the family of a Hebrew, especially as, being a Jerahmeelite, he had (supposing the event to have occurred in Palestine) his possessions in the same district as the Amalekites, in the south of Judah, nearest to Egypt (1Sa 27:10; comp. 2Sa 23:20-21; Jos 15:21; 1Ch 15:18). See Burrington's Geneal.; Beeston, Genealogy; Hervey's Geneal. p. 34; Bertheau on 1Ch 2:24, etc.). SEE SHESHSAN.

## Jarib[[@Headword:Jarib]]

             (Heb. Ylarib', יָרַיב, an adversary, as in Psa 35:1, etc.; Sept. Ι᾿αρείβ, Ι᾿αρίβ), the name of three or four men. SEE JAREB.

1. A son of Simeon (1Ch 4:24); elsewhere (Gen 46:10, etc.) called JACHIN SEE JACHIN (q.v.).

2. One of the popular chiefs dispatched by Ezra to ,.procure the company of priests in the return to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:16). B.C. 459.

3. One of the priests of the kindred' of Jeshua that divorced their Gentile wives after the Exile (Ezr 10:18). B.C. 459.

4. A Graecized or corrupt form (1Ma 14:29; compare 2Ma 2:1) of JOARIB SEE JOARIB (q.v.).

## Jarimoth[[@Headword:Jarimoth]]

             (Ι᾿αριμώθ), a Graecized form (1Es 9:28) of the Heb. name (Ezr 10:27) JEREMOTH SEE JEREMOTH (q.v.).

## Jarkon[[@Headword:Jarkon]]

             See ME-JARKON. Jarlath is the name of the second successor of St. Patrick to the see of Armagh, Ireland, near the middle of the 6th century. Scarcely anything is known of his personal history. SEE IRELAND.

## Jarmoch[[@Headword:Jarmoch]]

             (Reland, Palcestina, p. 283) or Jarmuk (Schwarz, Palest. p. 53), a river of Palestine (ירמו)ִ mentioned in the Talmud (Parah, 8, 10; Baba Bathra, 746) as emptying into the Jordan; the Hieronax (q.v.) of the Greek and Roman writers, and the modern Yarmuk.

## Jarmuth[[@Headword:Jarmuth]]

             (Heb. Yarmuth', יִרְמוּת, height; Sept. Ι᾿εριμούθ), the name of two places.

1. A town in the plain of Judah (Jos 15:35), inhabited after the Babylonian captivity (Neh 11:29); originally the seat of one of the Canaanitish kings, SEE PIRAM defeated by Joshua (Jos 10:3; Jos 10:5; Jos 10:23; Jos 12:11; Jos 15:35). Eusebius (Onomast. s.v. Ι᾿εριμοῦς, also Ι᾿ερμοχώς) sets down Jarmucha or Jermus as ten Roman miles from Eleutheropolis towards Jerusalem, but elsewhere Jarmuth (s.v. Ι᾿εριμούθ, doubtless the same place) less correctly at four miles' distance, although in the neighborhood of Eshtaol, which is ten miles from Eleutheropolis. Dr. Robinson (Researches, 2, 344) identified the site as that of Yarmuk, a village about seven miles north-east of Beit-Jibrin (Schwarz, Palest. p. 85). As the name implies; it is situated on a ridge (tell Ermudor Armuth, a different pronunciation for Yarmuth: Van de Velde, Narrative, 2, 193). It is a small and poor place, but contains a few traces, in its hewn stones and ruins, of former strength and greatness (Porter, Handbook. p. 281; Van de Velde, Mienzoir, p. 324; Tobler, Dritte Wanderung, p. 120, 462)..

2. A Levitical city in the tribe of Issachar (Jos 21:29), elsewhere called REMETHῥ(Jos 19:21) and RAMOTH (1Ch 6:73). Schwarz (Palest. p. 157) supposes it was the Ramah of Samuel (1Sa 19:22), which he identifies with the modern village of Rameh, north-west of Shechem; but this place lies within the territory of Manasseh. The associated names seem to indicate a locality on the eastern edge of the plain of Esdraelon. SEE REIRETH.

## Jarmuth Of Judah[[@Headword:Jarmuth Of Judah]]

             The modern representative of this place, Khurbet el-Yarmnuk, lies one and a half miles north-west of Beit-Nettif, of which the Mentoirs to the Ordnance Survey give only this meagre description (3:128): “Heaps of stones, foundations, and cisterns," with a reference to “section A, Jarmuth," which contains no allusion to it.

## Jaroah[[@Headword:Jaroah]]

             (Heb. Yaro'd'ch, יָרוֹח, perhaps born under the new moon; Sept. has Α᾿δαϊv v.r. Ι᾿δαϊv, Vulg. Jara), son of Gilead and father of Huri, of the Gadites-resident in Bashan (1 Chronicles 5, 14). B.C. long ante 782.

## Jarque or Xarque, D. Francisco[[@Headword:Jarque or Xarque, D. Francisco]]

             a South American Jesuit; flourished in the 17th century. He is distinguished as the author of Estado presente de las Missiones en el Tucuman, Paraguay e Rio de la Plata (1687, 4to), for which his intimate knowledge of the native element eminently fitted him. It is remarkable how the Jesuits have succeeded in acquiring foreign languages, and how thorough and  accurate is their knowledge of the nations with whom they are brought in contact. (J. H.W.)

## Jarratt, Devereux[[@Headword:Jarratt, Devereux]]

             an early Protestant Episcopal minister, was born in the county of New Kent, Va., Jan. 6 (O. S.), 1732-33. His early education was neglected, and he had few opportunities of receiving instruction in youth; but he so far improved himself as to be able, at the age of nineteen, to take charge of a neighboring school. Soon after, he entered a family, in which one part of his duties was to read a sermon of Flavel's every night — a task which he performed at first with reluctance. The effect of these discourses was to convince him of sin. He now perused Russell's Sermons and Burkett's Exposition of the N.T.; but, being subjected to many temptations, he relapsed into his former state. He was finally relieved by a passage in Isa 66:12, and resolved to enter the ministry, for which purpose he went to England in 1762. On his return he served at Bath, Va., where he was eminently successful after some time, although at first his labors appear to have been disregarded. He died January 29,1801. He was the author of three volumes of Sermons, and A Series of Letters to a Friend, republished in 1806 in connection with his Autobiography. — Sprague, Ann. 5, 214; Methodist Quarterly Review, 1855, p. 502.

## Jarrige, Pierre[[@Headword:Jarrige, Pierre]]

             a French Jesuit, who was born at Tulle in 1605, is celebrated in history by his desertion from and severe attacks upon the Jesuitical order. He was a very popular teacher and preacher at the time, when he joined the Calvinists in 1647; but, meeting with great opposition in France, and his life even being threatened, he went to Leyden, Holl, where he preached under the auspices of the State Church. Meanwhile the Jesuitical order condemned him to suffer death, first by hanging, then by burning. This provoked the so celebrated work of his, Les Jesuites mis sur l'echlfaud (Leyden, 1649, 12mo, and often), in which he thoroughly exposed the workings of that nefarious clerical order. A controversy ensued, which finally resulted in the return of Jarrige, in 1650, to the Jesuits--due, no doubt, more to the threats against his life than anything else. He certainly turned the table like a zealous Jesuit, and now again condemned as heretics the very Christians with whom he had so lately associated, and whose cause he had professed to have embraced. He died Sept. 20, 1660. See  Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 26, 383 sq.; Bayle, Historical Dictionary, s.v.

## Jarrom, William[[@Headword:Jarrom, William]]

             an English Baptist minister, was born at Ely Place, Wisbeach, Cambridgeshire, July 29, 1814. After leaving school he spent some time in study at home, and in teaching the classics. He was for some time pastor of a church at Northampton, where he also conducted a school. He resigned his pastorate in 1841, but continued his school until he went as a missionary to China in 1845. While there, he labored at Ningpo with much success. He returned to England in 1851, and settled at Isleham in 1852.. He removed to Kegworth in 1856, where he opened a boardingschool, and preached frequently. In 1868 he went to Barton as co-pastor, and in 1874 to West Vale, near Halifax, as pastor. He finally removed to Coningsby, near Boston, Lincolnshire, where he taught and preached until a few days before his death, February 28, 1882. See Baptist Hand-book for 1883, page 266.

## Jarry, Pierre-Francois Theophile[[@Headword:Jarry, Pierre-Francois Theophile]]

             a French Roman Catholic religious writer, was born at St. Pierre, Normandy, in March, 1764. After completing his studies at Paris, he was appointed curate at Escots; but, refusing to sign the clerical obligation demanded by the revolutionists, he was obliged to leave the country in 1791. In 1798 the bishop of Auxerre met Jarry in Germany, and appointed him grand-vicar, and a short time after the exiled Pius VI appointed him archdeacon and canon of Liege, Belgium. Prevented, however, from assuming the functions of this position, he resided at Munster, where he was instrumental in the conversion of count Stolberg (q.v.). After the Restoration, he retired to Falaise. He died at Lisieux Aug. 31, 1820. Jarry wrote quite extensively, especially against the usurpations of the Revolutionists of France. His theological works of note are, Dissert. sur l'episcopat de St. Pierre a Antioche, avec la defense de l'authenticite des ecrits des Saints Pees (Paris, 1807, 8vo): — Examen d'une Dissert. (of the abbot Emery) sur la mitigation des peines des damnis (Leipz. 1810, 8vo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biographie Géneralé, 26, 386.

## Jarvis, Abraham, D.D[[@Headword:Jarvis, Abraham, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Norwalk, Conn., May 6 (0. S.) 1739. He passed A.B. in Yale College in 1761, and became a lay reader at Middletown, where, two years after, he ‘settled as rector, having previously received ordination in England. In 1776 he presided at a convention of the Episcopal clergy held at New Haven, when it was resolved to suspend all religious worship. In 1797 he was elected bishop. He subsequently removed to Cheshire, N.H., and died May 3,1813. His style of preaching is said to have resembled that of Tillotson and Sherlock. He published Two Sermons. See Sprague, Annals, 5, 237.

## Jarvis, Samuel Farmar, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Jarvis, Samuel Farmar, D.D., LL.D]]

             was born at Middletown, Conn., Jan. 20, 1786, and passed A.B. at Yale College in 1805. In 1811 he took charge of St. Michael's Church, Bloomingdale, and in 1813 became rector of St. James's, N. Y. He afterwards became professor of Biblical literature in the Genesis Theol. Seminary, N. Y. In 1819 the doctorate of divinity was conferred on him by  the University of Pennsylvania, and the degree of LL.D. in 1837, by Trinity College, Hartford. When rector of St. Paul's, Boston, in 1826, he embarked for Europe to procure materials for a work on Church history. During an absence of nine years, he examined all the important libraries of Europe on the subject to which his attention was directed, and, on his return, commenced A Complete History of the Christian Church portions of it were published in 1844 and 18501, which remains unfinished. He was appointed historiographer of the Church, and occupied various posts of honor in the diocese of Connecticut. He died in 1851. A list of his writings is given by Allibone, Dict. of Ath. 1, 956.

## Jasael[[@Headword:Jasael]]

             (Ι᾿ασαῆλος v. r. Α᾿σαῆλος), a Grmcized, or, rather, corrupt form (1Es 9:30) of the Hebrew name (Ezr 10:29) SHEAL SEE SHEAL (q.v.).

## Jashen[[@Headword:Jashen]]

             (Heb. Yashen'. יָשֵׁן, sleeping, as in Son 7:10, etc.; Septuag. Ι᾿ασέν v.r. Α᾿σάν), a person, several of whose “sons” are named as among David's famous bodyguard (2Sa 23:32), called in the parallel passage HASHEM the Gizonite (1Ch 11:34). Other discrepancies also occur between the two passages: the former names three, while the latter makes the first (Jonathan) son of the next, and both (with slight verbal variations) assign special patronymics to the last two. Perhaps the two accounts may best be reconciled by understanding the two braves referred to as being Jonathan BenShammah (or Ben-Shageh), and Ahiam Ben-Sharar (or Ben-Sacar), grandsons of Jashen (or Hashem) of Gizon, in the mountains of Judah hence called Hararites. B.C. considerable ante 1046. This name Kennicott believes (Dissertation, i, 201-3) lies concealed in the word rendered “the Gizonite” in Chronicles, and accordingly proposes to read in both places “Gouni, of the sons of Hashem; Jonathan, the son of Shamha the Hararite “his view being supported by the Alex. copy of the Sept., which reads υἱοὶ Α᾿σὰμ ὁ Γωϋνὶ Ι᾿ωνάθαν νίὸς Σαγὴ ὀ Α᾿ραρί. However, the want of the מbefore בְנֵי, and the הprefixed to the name read by him as Goumni are objections to this view, and Bertheau may probably be right (Chronik. p. 134), that בַנֵיis due to a repetition of the last three letters of the preceding word, “the Shaalbonite” (הִשִׁעִלבֹנַי), and that we should simply read  Hashem the Gizonite. In the list given by Jerome, in his Quaestiones Hebraicae, Jashen and Jonathan are both omitted. SEE DAVID.

## Jasher[[@Headword:Jasher]]

             (Heb. Yashar', יָשָׁר, upright). A volume by this title (סֵפֶר הִיָּשָׁר, the book of the upright man; Auth. Vers. “book of Jasher”) appears anciently to have existed among the Hebrews, containing the records of honored men, or other praiseworthy transactions. The work is no longer extant, but is cited in two passages of the O.T. in the following manner: “And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the book of Jasher? So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day,” etc. (Jos 10:13). The other passage is 2Sa 1:17-18 : “And David lamented with this lamentation over Saul and over Jonathan his son (also he bade them teach the children of Judah [the use of] the bow: behold, it is written in the book of Jasher).” After this follows the lamentation of David.

I. Views of the Incident in Joshua's Career. — The book of Jasher has attracted attention because it is appealed to in connection with the account of the sun and moon standing still. The compiler of the book of Joshua refers to it as containing a record of the miracle in question. It is therefore impossible to do justice to our subject without entering into an interpretation of the wonderful phenomenon on which so much ingenuity has been wasted. The misspent time which has been devoted to the passage in Joshua makes a critic sad indeed. Instead of looking at the words in their natural and obvious sense, men have been led away by their adherence to the letter into recondite, foolish, and absurd conjectures. One thing is a key to the right interpretation, viz. that the passage recording the miracle is a quotation from the poetical book of Jasher. The only difficulty is to discover where the quotation begins and where it ends. But, whatever difference of opinion there may be as to this point, it is clear that a strictly literal signification of the language ought not to be pressed upon a statement professedly extracted from a popular poetical work

1. The most obvious and ancient interpretation of this difficult passage is the literal one. At first it was contended that the sun itself, which was then believed to have revolved round the earth, stayed his course for a day. Those who take this view argue that the theory of the diurnal motion of  the earth, which has been the generally received one since the time of Galileo and Copernicus; is inconsistent with the Scripture narrative. Notwithstanding the general reception of the. Copernican system of the universe, this view continued to be held by many divines, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic, and was strenuously maintained by Buddeus (Hist. Eccles. V. T. Halle, 1715, 1744, p. 828 sq.) and others in the last century.

But in more recent times the miracle has been explained so as to make it accord with the now received opinion respecting the earth's motion, and the Scripture narrative supposed to contain rather an optical and popular than a literal account of what took place on this occasion; so that it was in reality the earth, and not the sun, which stood still at the command of Joshua (Clarke's Commentary, ad loc.).

2. Another opinion is that first suggested by Spinoza (Tract. Theolog. — Politic. c. 2, p. 22, and c. 6) and afterwards maintained by Le Clerc (Comment. ad loc.), that the miracle was produced by refraction only, causing the sun to appear above the horizon after its setting, or by some other atmospherical phenomena, which produced sufficient light to enable Joshua to pursue and discomfit his enemies. This seems to be the only view which grants the reality of the miracle, without encumbering it with unnecessary difficulties.

3. The last opinion we shall mention is that of the learned Jew Maimonides (More Nebochimn, 1, c. 53), viz. that Joshua only asked of the Almighty to grant that he might defeat his enemies before the going down of the sun, and that God heard his prayer, inasmuch as before the close of the day the five kings, with their armies, were cut in pieces. This opinion is favored by Vatablus, in the marginal note to this passage (see Robert Stephens's edition of the Bible, folio 1557), “Lord, permit that the light of the sun and moon fail us not before our enemies are defeated.” Grotius, while he admitted that there was no difficulty in the Almighty's arresting the course of the sun, or making it reappear by refraction, approved of the explanation of Maimonides, which has been since that period adopted by many divines, including Jahn among the Roman Catholics (who explains the whole as a sublime poetical trope, Introd. p. 2, § 30), and, among orthodox Protestants, by a writer in the Berlin Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, Nov. 1832, supposed to be the editor, the late professor Hengstenberg (Robinson's Biblical Repository, 1833, 3:791 sq. See Seiler's Biblical Hermeneutics, English translator's note, p. 175, 176). SEE JOSHUA.

II. Opinions as to the Character of the Book itself. As the word Jasher signifies just or upright, by which term it is rendered in the margin of our Bibles this book has generally been considered to have been so entitled as containing a history of just men. The former of the above passages in which the book is cited in Scripture is omitted by the Sept., while in the latter the expression is rendered βιβλίον τοῦ εὐθοῦςthe Vulg. has liber justorum in both instances. The Peshito Syriac in Joshua has “the book of praises or hymns,” reading הִשַׁירfor הִיָּשָׁר, and a similar transposition will account for the rendering of the same version in Samuel, “the book of Ashir.” The Targum interprets it “the book of the law,” and this is followed by Jarchi, who gives, as the passage alluded to in Joshua, the prophecy of Jacob with regard to the future greatness of Ephraim (Gen 48:19), which was fulfilled when the sun stood still at Joshua's bidding. The same Rabbi, in- his commentary on Samuel, refers to Genesis, “the book of the upright, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,” to explain the allusion to the book of Jasher; and Jerome, while discussing the “etymology of Israel,” which he interprets as “rectus Dei,” incidentally mentions the fact that Genesis was called ‘‘the book of the just” (liber Genesis appellatur εὐθέων, id est, justorum), from its containing the histories of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel (Comm. in Jes. 44:2). The Talmudists attribute this tradition to R. Johanan. R. Eliezer thought that by the book of Jasher was signified the book of Deuteronomy from the expressions in Deu 6:18; Deu 23:7, the latter being quoted in proof of the skill of the He-brews in archery. In the opinion of Rabbi Samuel benNachnian, the book of Judges was alluded to as the book of Jasher (Aboda Zara, c. 2); and that it was the book of the twelve minor prophets was held by some Hebrew writers, quoted without name by Sixtus Senensis (Bibl. Sanct. lib. 2). R. Levi ben-Gershom recognizes, though he does not follow, the tradition given by Jarchi, while Kimchi and Abarbanel adopt the rendering of the Targum. This diversity of opinions proves, if it proves nothing more, that no book was known to have survived which could lay claim to the title of the book of Jasher.

Josephus, in relating the miracle narrated in Joshua 10, appeals for confirmation of his account to certain documents deposited in the Temple (Ant. 5, 1, 17), and his words are supposed to contain a covert allusion to the book of Jasher as the source of his authority. But in his treatise against Apion he says the Jews did not possess myriads of books, discordant and contradictory, but twenty-two only; from which Abicht concludes that the  books of Scripture were the sacred books hinted at in the former passage, while Masius understood by the same the Annals which were written by the prophets or by the royal scribes. Theodoret (Quaest. xiv in Jesum Nave) explains the words in Jos 10:13, which he quotes as τὸ βιβλίον τὸ εὑρεθέν (prob. an error for εὐθές, as he has in Quaest. 4 in 2 Reg.), as referring to the ancient record from which the compiler of the book of Joshua derived the materials of his history, and applies the passage in 2 Samuel 2, 18 to prove that other documents, written by the prophets, were made use of in the composition of the historical books. Jerome, or, rather, the author of the Quaestiones Hebraicae, understood by the book of Jasher the books of Samuel themselves, inasmuch as they contained the history of the just prophets. Samuel, Gad, and Nathan. Another opinion, quoted by Sixtus Senensis, but on no authority, that it was the book of eternal predestination, is scarcely worth more than the bare mention.

That the book of Jasher was one of the writings which perished in the Captivity was held by R. Levi ben-Gershom, though he gives the traditional explanation above mentioned. His opinion has been adopted by Junius, Hottinger (Thes. Philippians 2, 2, § 2), and many other modern writers (Wolfii Bibl. Heb. 2, 223).

What the nature of the book may have been can only be inferred from the two passages in which it is mentioned and their context, and, this being the case, there is clearly wide room for conjecture. The theory of Masius (quoted by Abicht) was, that in ancient times, whatever was worthy of being recorded for the instruction of posterity was written in the form of annals by learned men, and that among these annals or records was the book of Jasher, so called from the trustworthiness and methodical arrangement of the narrative, or because it contained the relation of the deeds of the people of Israel, who are elsewhere spoken of under the symbolical name Jeshurun. Of the latter hypothesis Furst approves (Handw. s.v.). Sanctius (Comment. ad 2 Reg. 1) conjectured that it was a collection of pious hymns, written by different authors, and sung on various occasions, and that from this collection the Psalter was compiled. That it was written in verse may reasonably be inferred from the only specimens extant, which exhibit unmistakable signs of metrical rhythm; but that it took its name from this circumstance is not supported by etymology. Lowth, indeed (Prael. p. 306-7), imagined that it was a collection of national songs, so called because it probably commenced with אָז יָשַׁיר, adz yashir, ‘then sang,” etc., like the song of Moses in Exo 15:1; his  view of the question was that of the Syriac and Arabic translators, and was adopted by Herder. But, granting that the form of the book was poetical, a difficulty still remains as to its subject. That the book of Jasher contained the deeds of national heroes of all ages embalmed in verse, among which David's lament over Saul and Jonathan had an appropriate place, was the opinion of Calovius. A fragment of a similar kind is thought to appear in Num 21:14.

Gesenius conjectured that it was an anthology of ancient songs, which acquired its name, “the book of the just or upright,” from being written in praise of upright men. He quotes, but does not approve, the theory of Illgen, that, like the Hamasa of the Arabs, it celebrated the achievements of illustrious warriors, and from this derived the title of “the book of valor.” But the idea of warlike valor is entirely foreign to the root yashar. Dupin contended, from 2Sa 1:18, that the contents of the book were of a military nature; but Montanus, regarding rather the etymology, considered it a collection of political and moral precepts. Abicht, taking the lament of David as a sample of the whole, maintained that the fragment quoted in the book of Joshua was part of a funeral ode composed upon the death of that hero, and narrating his achievements. At the same time, he does not conceive it necessary to suppose that one book only is alluded to in both instances. It must be admitted, however, that there is very slight ground for any conclusion beyond that which affects the form, and that nothing can be confidently asserted with regard to the contents.

From the passage above referred to (2Sa 1:8; “Also he bade them teach the children of Israel [the use of] the bow”), it has been supposed by some (see Dr. Adam Clarke's Comment. ad loc., and Horne's Introd. vol. 1) that the book of Jasher contained a treatise on archery; but it has been observed (see Parker's translation of De Wette's Introd. 1, 301) that, according to the ancient mode of citation, which consisted in referring to some particular word in the document, “the bow” which the children of Israel were to be taught indicated the poetical passage from the book of Jasher in which the “bow of Jonathan” is mentioned (2Sa 1:22). One writer (Rev. T. M. Hopkins, in the Biblical Repository, 1845, p. 97 sq.) rashly proposes to reject both references to the book in question as spurious, and even the whole account of the miracle in Joshua.

De Wette (Einleitung, § 169) endeavors to deduce an argument in favor of the late composition of the book of Joshua from the circumstance of its citing a work (viz. the book of Jasher) which “points to the time of David,  inasmuch as his lamentation over Saul and Jonathan is contained in it.” But it has been supposed by others (although the American translator of De Wette's Introd. looks upon this as quite improbable) that the book may, as a collection of poems, have received accessions at various periods, and, nevertheless, been still quoted by its original name. Dr. Palfrey, who adopts this view of the book of Jasher in his Lectures, still refers the composition of Joshua to the time of Saul.

III. Attempted Reproductions of the Work.

1. Although conjecture might almost be thought to have exhausted itself on a subject so barren of premises, a scholar of our own day has not despaired of being able not only to decide what the book of Jasher-was in itself, but of reconstructing it from the fragments which, according to his theory, he traces throughout the several books of the Old Test. ‘In the preface to his Jashar, or Fragmenta Archetypa Carminun Hebraicorum in Masorethico Veteris Testamenti textu passini tessellata (London, 1854, 1860, 8vo), Dr. Donaldson advances a scheme for the restoration of this ancient record in accordance with his own idea of its scope and contents. Assuming that, during the tranquil and prosperous reign of Solomon, an unwonted impulse was given to Hebrew literature; and that the worshippers of Jehovah were desirous of possessing something on which their faith might rest, the book of “Jashar,” or “uprightness,” he asserts was written, or, rather, compiled- to meet this want. Its object was to show that in the beginning man was upright, but had, by carnal wisdom, forsaken the spiritual law; that the Israelites had been chosen to preserve and transmit this law of uprightness; that David had been made king for his religious integrity, leaving the kingdom to his son Solomon, in whose reign, after the dedication of the Temple, the prosperity of the chosen people reached its culminating point. The compiler of the book was probably Nathan the prophet, assisted, perhaps, by Gad the seer. It was thus “the first offspring of the prophetic schools, and ministered spiritual food to the greater prophets.”

Rejecting, therefore, the authority of the Masoretic text, as founded entirely on tradition and adhering to his own theory of the origin and subject of the book of Jasher, Dr. Donaldson proceeds to show that it contains the religious marrow of holy Scripture. In such a case, of course, absolute proof is not to be looked for, and it would be impossible here to discuss what measure of probability should be assigned to a scheme elaborated with considerable ingenuity. Whatever ancient fragments in the sacred books of the Hebrews exhibit the nature of uprightness, celebrate the  victories of the true Israelites, predict their prosperity, or promise future blessedness, have, according to this theory, a claim to be considered among the relics of the book of Jasher. Following such a principle of selection, the fragments fall into seven groups. The first part the object of which is to show that man was created upright: (יָשָׁאּ yashar), but fell into sin by carnal wisdom, contains two fragments' an Elohistic and a Jehovistic, both poetical, the latter being the more full. The first of these includes Gen 11:27-28; Gen 6:1-2; Gen 6:4-5; Gen 8:21; Gen 6:6; Gen 6:3; the other is made up of Gen 2:7-9; Gen 2:15-18; Gen 2:25; Gen 3:1-19; Gen 3:21; Gen 3:23-24. The second part, consisting of four fragments, shows how the descendants of Abraham, as being upright (יְשָׁרַים, yesharim), were adopted by God, while the neighboring nations were rejected. Fragment 1, Gen 9:18-27; fragment 2, Gen 4:2-8; Gen 4:8-16; fragment 3, Gen 16:1-4; Gen 16:15-16; Gen 17:9-16; Gen 17:18-26; Gen 21:1-14; Gen 21:20-21; fragment 4, Gen 25:20-34; Gen 27:1-10; Gen 27:14; Gen 27:18-20; Gen 27:25-40; Gen 4:18-19; Gen 26:34; Gen 36:2; Gen 4:23-24; Gen 36:8; Gen 28:9; Gen 26:35; Gen 27:46; Gen 28:1-4; Gen 28:11-19; Gen 29:1, etc., Gen 29:24; Gen 29:29; Gen 35:22-26; Gen 24:25-29; Gen 35:9-15; Gen 32:31. In the third part is related, euder the tigure of the Deluge, how the Israelites escaped from Egypt, wandered forty years in the wilderness, and finally, in the reign of Solomon, built a temple to Jehovah. The passages in which this is found are Gen 6:5-14; Gen 7:6; Gen 7:11-12; Gen 8:6-8; Gen 8:12; Gen 5:29; Gen 8:4; 1Ki 8:43; ‘Deu 6:18; Psa 5:8. The three fragments of the fourth part contain the divine laws to be observed by the upright people, and are found in

(1) Deu 5:1-22;

(2) Deu 6:1-5; Lev 19:18; Deu 10:12-21; Deu 11:1-5; Deu 11:7-9; and

(3) Deu 8:1-3; Deu 6:6-18; Deu 6:20-25.

The blessings of the upright, and their admonitions, are the subject of the fifth part, which contains the songs of Jacob (Genesis 49), Balaam (Numbers 23, 24), and Moses (Deuteronomy 32, 33). The wonderful victories and deliverances of Israel are celebrated in the sixth part, in the triumphal songs of Moses and Miriam (Exo 15:1-19), of Joshua (Jos 10:12-13), and of Deborah (Jdg 5:1-20). The seventh is a collection of various hymns composed' in the reigns of David and Solomon, and contains David's song of triumph over Goliath (!) (1Sa 2:1-10); his lament for Saul and Jonathan (2Sa 1:19-27),  and for Abner (2Sa 3:33-34); his psalm of thanksgiving (Psalms 18; 2 Samuel 22); his triumphal ode on the conquest of the Edomites (Psalms 60), and his prophecy of Messiah's kingdom (2Sa 23:1-7), together with Solomon's Epithalamium (Psalms 45), and the hymn sung at the dedication of the Temple (Psalms 68).

It cannot be denied that the critic has shown great ingenuity and constructive skill in elaborating his theory. His commentaries on the individual fragments composing the parts often exhibit striking and just remarks, with a right perception of the genius of some portions of the 0. T. Yet we must pronounce the attempt a failure. The leading positions are untenable. Donaldson's arguments are often weak and baseless. Most of the contents' which he assigns to the book of Jashar never belonged to it, such as the pieces of Genesis which he selects, etc. But it is needless to enter into a refutation of the hypothesis, ingeniously set forth in elegant Latin, and supported with considerable acuteness. Most of the book of Jashar cited in Joshua and 2nd Samuel is lost. It is very improbable that laws such as those in Deuteronomy 6, 10, 11 or historical pieces like Gen 16:1-4, ever belonged to it. It is also a most unfortunate conjecture that שַׁילֹה, in Gen 49:10, is abridged from שְׁלֹמה; or, even if it were, that furnishes a proof of the poem being written while Solomon was king (p. 27). We are persuaded that the critic gives great extension of meaning to the Hebrew word יָשָׁר, 2'makihmg it almost, if not altogether, an appellation of the Israelitish people. When he assumes that it is contained in יַשְׂרָאֵלthe notion is erroneous (p. 23).

Among the many strange results of Donaldson's arrangement, Shem, Ham, and Japheth are no longer the sons of Noah; who is Israel under a figure, but of Adam; and the circumstances of Noah's life related in Gen 9:18-27 are transferred to the latter. Cain and Abel are the sons of Shem, Abraham is the son of Abel, and Esau becomes Lamech, the son of Methuselah.

2 and 3. There are also extant, under the title of “the book of Jasher,” two Rabbinical works, one a moral treatise, written in A.D. 1394 by I. Shabbatai Carmuz Levita, of which a copy in MS. exists in the Vatican library; the other was written by Jacob ben-Meir, or R. Tam; who died in 1171, and contains a treatise on Jewish ritual questions. It was published at Cracow in 1586, 4to, and again at Vienna in 1811, but incorrectly. No translation of either was ever made.  4. An anonymous work under the same name was published at Venice in 1625, at Cracow in 1628, and at Prague in 1668. It contains the histories of the Pentateuch, Joshua, and Judges, and intermixes many fabulous things. It gives (88, 64) the account of Joshua's miracle nearly in the words of Scripture, making the sun to stand still “thirty-six times” (עַתַּים), i e. hours; but does not bring the history down later than the conquest of Canaan. The preface itself states that it was discovered at the destruction of Jerusalem by Sidrus one of the officers of Titus, who, while searching a house for the purpose of plunder, found in a secret chamber a vessel containing the books of the law, the prophets, and Hagiographa, with many others, which a venerable man was reading. Sidrus took the old man under his protection, and built for him a house at Seoville, where the books were safely deposited, and thence this one was conveyed to Naples, where it was printed. The book in question is probably the production of a Spanish Jew of the 13th century (Abicht, De libr. Recti, in Thes. Nov. Theol. Phil. 1, 525-34). A German version of it, with additions, was published by R. Jacob at Frankfort-on-the-Main (1674, 8vo), with the title תָּם וְיָשָׁר, perfect and right. A stereotyped translation of this work was published in New York in 1840, under the direction of M. M. Noah, with certificates of its fidelity to the original by eminent Hebrew scholars who had examined it.

5. The above works must not be confounded with the various editions of a fabrication which was first secretly printed at Bristol, and published in London in 1751 (4to), by an infidel type-founder of Bristol named Jacob Ilive, who was its real author. It was entitled “The Book of Jasher, with Testimonies and Notes explanatory of the Text: to which is prefixed Various Readings: translated into English from the Hebrew by Alcuin of Britain, who went a pilgrimage into the Holy Land.” This book was noticed in the Monthly Review for December 1751, which describes it as “a palpable piece of contrivance, intended to impose upon the credulous and ignorant, to sap the credit of the books of Moses, and to blacken the character of Moses himself.” The preface, purporting to be written by Alcuin, contains an account of the finding of the book in MS. at Gazna, in Persia, and the way in which it was translated. Having brought it to England, Alcuin says that he left it, among other papers, with a clergyman in Yorkshire. After two pages of various readings, the book itself follows, divided into thirty-seven chapters. Testimonies and notes are appended. The editor states, in a dedication at the beginning, that he bought the MS. at an auction in the north of England, and affirms that Wickliffe had written  on the outside, “I have read the book of Jasher twice over, and I much approve of it as a piece of great antiquity and curiosity, but I cannot assent that it should be made a part of the canon of Scripture.” This clumsy forgery was reprinted at Bristol in 1827, and published in London in 1829 (4to), as a new discovery of the book of Jasher. A prospectus of a second edition of this reprint was issued in 1833 by the editor, who therein styles himself the Rev. C. R. Bond. This literary fraud has obtained a notoriety far beyond its merits in consequence of the able critiques to which it gave rise, having been again exposed in the Dublin Christian Examiner for 1831, and elaborately refuted by Homer in his Introduction (ut sup.; new edition, 4:741-6).

See, besides the literature above referred to, Hilliger, ‘De Libro Recti (Lips. 1714); Nolte, De Libro Justorum (Helmst. 1719); Wolf, De Libro Rectorum (Lips. 1742); ‘Steger, De vocabulo יָשָׁר(Kiel, 1808); Anon. Jasher referred to in Joshua and San. (London, 1842); Hopkins, Plumbline Papers (Auburn, 1862, ch. 7); and the periodicals cited by Poole, Index, s.v. SEE JOSHUA.

## Jashobeam[[@Headword:Jashobeam]]

             (Heb. Yashobanm', י שָׁבְעָם, dweller among the people, or returner to the people, otherwise, to whom the people returns, or a returning people; Sept. in 1Ch 11:11, Ι᾿εβαάμ v. r. Ι᾿εσαβαδά; in 1Ch 12:6, Ι᾿εσβαάμ, v.r. Σοβοκάμ; in 1Ch 27:2, Ι᾿σβοάμ v. r. Ι᾿σβοάζ; Vulg. Jesbaam, but Jesboan in 1Ch 27:2), the name of several of David's favorite officers.

1. One of the Korhites, or Levite of the family of Korah (and therefore probably not identical with the following), who joined David's band at Ziklag (1Ch 12:6). B.C. 1053.

2. “Son” of Hachmoni, one of David's worthies, and the first named in the two lists which are given of them (2Sa 23:8; 1Ch 11:11). One of these texts is held to have suffered through the negligence of copyists, and, as Jashobeam is not otherwise historically known, commentators have been much embarrassed in comparing them. The former passage attributes to him the defeat of 800, the latter of 300 Philistines; and the question has been whether there is a mistake of figures in one of these accounts, or whether two different exploits are recorded. Further difficulties will appear in comparing the two texts. We have  assumed Jashobeam to be intended in both, but this is open to question. In Chronicles we read, “Jashobeam, the Hachmonite, chief of the captains: he lifted up his spear against 300 men, slain by him at one time;” but in Samuel [mar-gin], “Josheb-bassebet the Tachmonite, chief among the three, Adino, of Eznli, who lifted up his spear against: 800 men, whom he slew.” That Jashobeam the Hachmonite and Josheb-bash-shebeth the Tachmonite are the same person, is clear; but may not Adino of Ezni, whose name forms the immediate antecedent of the exploit, which, as related here, constitutes the sole discrepancy between the two texts, be another person?

Many so explain it, and thus obtain a solution of the difficulty. But a further comparison of the two verses will again suggest that the whole of the verse last cited must belong to Jasbobeam; for not only is the parallel incomplete if we take the last clause from him and assign it to another, but in doing this we leave the “chief among the captains” without an exploit, in a list which records some feat of every hero. We incline, therefore, to the opinion of those who suppose that Jashobeam, or Josheb-bash-shebeth, was the name or title of the chief, Adino and Eznite being descriptive epithets, and Hachmonite the patronymic of the same person; and the remaining discrepancy we account for, not on the supposition of different exploits, but of one of those corruptions of numbers of which several will be found in comparing the books of Chronicles with those of Samuel and Kings. B.C. 1014. SEE ADINO; SEE DAVID; SEE EZNITE.

The exploit of breaking through the host of the Philistines to procure David's draught of water from the well of Bethlehem is ascribed to the three chief heroes, and therefore to Jashobeam, who was the first of the three (2Sa 23:13-17; 1Ch 11:15-19). B.C. 1045.

3. We also find a Jashobeam who commanded 24,000, and did duty in David's court in the month Nisan (1Ch 27:2). He was the son of Zabdiel; if, therefore, he was the same as the foregoing Jashobeam, his patronymic of “the Hachmonite” must be referred to his race or office rather than to his immediate father. SEE HACHMONI.

## Jashub[[@Headword:Jashub]]

             [or Jash'ub] (Heb. Yashub', יָשׁוּב, returner; once by error, יָשַׁיב, Yashib', in text 1Ch 7:1; Samar. Pent. in Numbers Yosheb', יושב;  Sept. Ι᾿ασούβ), the name of two men, or, perhaps, the last is rather a place. SEE SHEAR-JASHUB.

1. The third named of the four sons of Issachar (1Ch 7:1; Num 26:24); called JOB (perhaps by contraction or corruption [or possibly only by substitution. both having the same meaning, one from שׂוּב, and the other from אוּב]) in the parallel passage (Gen 46:13). B.C. 1856. His descendants were called JASHUBITES (Hebrew Yashubi',

יָשֻׁבַי, Sept. Ι᾿ασουβί, Num 26:24).

2. One of the “sons” (? former residents) of Bani, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Exile (Ezr 10:29). B.C. 459.

## Jashubi-lehem[[@Headword:Jashubi-lehem]]

             (Heb. Yashu'bi-Le'chenm, לֶחֶם יָשֻׁבַי[“in pause” La'chem, לָחֶם], returning. home from battle or forfood; Sept. ἀπέστρεψεν αὐτούς v. r. ἀπέστρεψαν εἰς Λεέμ; Vulg. reversi sunt in Lahem), apparently a person named as a descendant of Shelah, the son of Judah (1Ch 4:22). B.C. perhaps cir. 995, since it added at the end of the list, “And these are ancient things. These were the potters, and those that dwelt among plants and hedges; there they dwelt with the king [? Solomon; but, according to some, Pharaoh, during the residence in Egypt] for his work.”' Possibly, however, “it is a place, and we should infer from its connection with Maresha and Chozeba — if Chozeba be Chezib or Achzib — that it lay on the western side of the tribe, in or near the Shephelah or ‘plain.' The Jewish explanations, as seen in Jerome's Quaest. Hebr. on this passage, and, in a slightly different form, in the Targum on the Chronicles (ed. Wilkins, p. 29, 30), mention of Moab as the key to the whole. Chozelba is Elimelech, Joash and Saraph are Mahlon and Chilion, who ‘had the dominion in Moab' from marrying the two Moabite damsels: Jashubi- Lehem is Naomi and Ruth, who returned.(Jashubi) to bread, or to Bethlehem, after the famine and the ‘ancient words' point to the book of Ruth as the source of the whole”

## Jashubite[[@Headword:Jashubite]]

             (Num 26:24). SEE JASHUB, 1.

## Jasideans[[@Headword:Jasideans]]

             SEE YEZIDIS.

## Jasiel[[@Headword:Jasiel]]

             (1Ch 11:46). SEE JAASIEL. Ja'son (Ι᾿άσων, he that will cure, originally the name of the leader of the Argonauts), a common Greek name, which was frequently adopted by Hellenizing Jews as the equivalent of Jesus, Joshua (Ι᾿ησοῦς; comp. Josephus, Ant. 12:5, 1; Aristeas, Hist. apud Hody, p. 7), probably with some reference to its supposed connection with ἰᾶσθαι(i.e. the healer). A parallel change occurs in Alcimus (Eliakim), while Nicolaus, Dositheus, Menelaus, etc., were direct translations of Hebrew names. It occurs with reference to several men in the Apocrypha, and one in the New Testament.

1. JASON, THE SON OF ELEAZER (comp. Sirach 1, 27,Ι᾿ησοῦς υἱὸς Σιρὰχ Ε᾿λεάζαρ, Codex A), was one of the commissioners sent by Judas Maccabaeus, in conjunction with Eupolemus, to conclude a treaty of amity and mutual support with the Romans, B.C. 161 (1Ma 8:17; Josephus, Ant. 12, 10, 6).

2. JASON, THE FATHER OF ANTIPATER, who was an envoy to Rome to renew the treaty, at a later period, under Jonathan Maccabaeus, in conjunction with Numenius, the son of Antiochus (1Ma 12:16; 1Ma 14:22), is probably the same person as No. 1.

3. JASON OF CYRENE, in Africa, was a Hellenizing Jew of the race of those whom Ptolemy Soter sent into Egypt (2 Maccabees 1; Josephus, Ant. 12, 1; Prideaux, Connection, 2, 176). He wrote in five books the history of Judas Maccabeus and his brethren, and the principal transactions of the Jews during the reigns of Seleucus IV Philopator, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, and Antiochus V Eupator (B.C. 187-162), from which five books most of the second book of Maccabees (q.v.) is abridged. In all probability it was written in Greek, and, from the fact of its including the wars under Antiochus V Eupator, it must have been written after B.C. 162. The sources from which Jason obtained his information are unknown, and it is not certain when either he or his epitomizer lived. All that we know of his history is contained in the few verses of the 2nd Macc. 2, 19-23.

4. JASON, THE HIGH-PRIEST, was the second son of Simon II, and the brother of Onias III. His proper name was JESUS, but he had changed it to  that of Jason (Ι᾿ησοῦς Ι᾿άσονα ἕαυτον μετωνόμασεν [Josephus, Ant. 12, 5,1]). Shortly after the accession of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Jason offered to the king 440 talents of yearly tribute if he would invest him with the high-priesthood, to the exclusion of his elder brother (4Ma 4:17) (B.C. cir. 175). Josephus says that Onias III was dead on the accession of Jason to the high-priesthood, and that Jason received this post in consequence of his nephew, Onias IV, the son of Onias III, being as yet an infant (Ant. 12, 5,1). Jason also offered a further 150 talents for the license “to set him up a place of exercise, and for, the training up of youth in the fashions of the heathen” (2Ma 4:7-9; Josephus, Ant. 12, 5, 1). This offer was immediately accepted by Antiochus, and Jason built a gymnasium at Jerusalem. The effect of this innovation was to produce a stronger tendency than ever for Greek fashions and heathenish manners, and they so increased under the superintendence of the wicked Jason that the priests despised the Temple, and “hastened to be partakers of the unlawful allowance in the place of exercise, after the game of Discus (q.v.) called them forth” (2Ma 4:14). Some of the Jews even “made themselves uncircumcised,” that they might appear to be Greeks when they were naked (1Ma 1:15; Josephus, Ant. 12:5,1). At last, as was the custom of the cities who used to send embassies to Tyre in honor of Hercules (Curtius, 4:2; Polybius, Reliq. 31, 20, 12), Jason sent special messengers (θεωρούς) from Jerusalem, who were the newly-elected citizens of Antioch (Α᾿ντιοχεῖς ὄντας; comp. 2Ma 4:9), to carry 300 drachme of silver to the sacrifice of that god. SEE HERCULES.

The money, however, contrary to the wish of the sender, was not used for the sacrifice of Hercules, but reserved for making triremes, because the bearers of it did not think it proper (διὰ τὸ μὴ καθήκειν) to employ it for the sacrifice (2Ma 4:19-20). In B.C. 172 Jason also gave a festival to Antiochus when he visited Jerusalem, Jason and the citizens leading him in by torchlight and with great shoutings (2Ma 4:22). Josephus mentions this visit, but says that it was an expedition against Jerusalem, and that Antiochus, upon obtaining possession of the city, slew many of the Jews, and plundered it of a great deal of money (Ant. 12:5, 3). The crafty Jason, however, soon found a yet more cunning kinsman, who removed him from his office in much the same manner a. he had done with his brother, Onias III. Menelaus, the son of Simon (Josephus, Ant. 12, 5,1; Simon's brother, 2Ma 4:23), governor of the Temple, having been sent by Jason to Antiochus, knew how, through flattery and by offering 300 talents more than Jason, to gain the favor of the king. Antiochus immediately gave him  the office of high priest, and Jason was forced to flee into the country of the Ammonites (2Ma 4:26). SEE MENELAUS.

In B.C. 170, Antiochus having undertaken his second expedition into Egypt, there was a rumor that he was dead, and Jason made an attack upon Jerusalem and committed many atrocities. He was, however, forced again to flee into the country of the Ammonites (2 Maccabees 5, 5-7). At length, being accused before Aretas, king of the Arabians, he was compelled “to flee from city to city, pursued of all men, and being held in abomination as an open enemy of his country and countrymen,” and eventually retired into Egypt (2 Maccabees 5, 8). He afterwards retired to take refuge among the Lacedaemonians, “thinking there to find succor by reason of his kindred” (2 Maccabees 5, 9; compare 1Ma 12:7; 1Ma 12:21; Josephus, Ant. 12:4, 10; see Prideaux, Connect. 2, 140; Frankel, Monatschrift, 1853, p. 456), and perished miserably “in a strange land'”(comp. Dan. 12:30 sq.; Macc. 1:12 sq.). His body remained without burial, and he had “none to mourn for him” (2Ma 5:9-10). SEE HIGH- PRIEST.

5. JASON OF THESSALONICA was the host of Paul and Silas at that city. In consequence, his house was assaulted by the ‘Jews in order to seize the apostle (S. but, not finding him, they dragged Jason and other brethren before the ruler of the city, who released them on security (Act 17:5-9). — A.D. 48. He appears to have been the same as the Jason mentioned in Rom 16:21 as one of the kinsmen of Paul, and probably accompanied him from Thessalonica to Corinth (A.D. 54). He was not one of those who accompanied the apostle into Asia, though Lightfoot conjectures that Jason and Secundus were the same person (Act 20:4). Alford says Secundus is altogether unknown (Acts , 1. c.). According to tradition, Jason was bishop of Tarsus (Fabricius, Lux Evangelii, p. 91, 92).

## Jasper[[@Headword:Jasper]]

             (י שְׁפֶה,yashepheh', prob. polished or glittering, ἴασπις), a gem of various colors, as purple, cerulean but mostly green like the emerald, although duller in hue (Plily, Nat. Hist. 37:8, 9; Epiphaluius, De Gemmis, § 6; Braun, De Vest. Sacerdot. 2, 19). “It was the last of the twelve inserted in the high-priest's breastplate (Exo 28:20; Exo 39:13), and the first of the twelve used in the foundation of the new Jerusalem (Rev 21:19): the difference in the order seems to show that no emblematical importance was attached to that feature. It was the stone employed in the superstructure (ἐνδόμησις): of the wall of the new Jerusalem  (Rev 21:18). It further appears among the stones which adorned the king of Tyre (Eze 28:13). Lastly, it is the emblematical image of the glory of the divine Being (Rev 4:3). The characteristics of the stone, as far as they are specified in Scripture (Rev 21:11) rare that it was.' most precious,' and ‘like crystal' (κρυσταλλίζων); not exactly ‘clear as crystal,' as in the A.V., but of a crystal hue: the term is applied to it in this sense by Dioscorides (5. 160: λίθος ἰάσπις ὁ μὲν τίς ἐστι σμαραγδιζων ὁ δὲ κρυσταλλóδης). We may also infer from Rev 4:3 that it was a stone of brilliant and transparent light.” The ancient jasper thus appears to have been frequently translucent, but the modern is opaque. A brown variety existed in Egypt. The jasper of the ancients, therefore, comprehended various precious stones not readily identifiable (Rosenmüller, Bibl. Alterthum, IV, 1, 42; Moore's Anc. Min. p. 163). What is now properly called jasper by mineralogists is a sub-species of rhomboidal quartz, of several varieties, mostly the common, the Egyptian, and the striped; of different colors-whitish; yellow, green, reddish, etc., sometimes spotted or banded; occurring either in masses or loose crystals, and susceptible of a fine polish (see the Lond. Encyclopedia, s.v.). SEE GEMI.

## Jaspis, Gottfried Siegmund[[@Headword:Jaspis, Gottfried Siegmund]]

             a German theologian, was born at Meissen April 8, 1766. He was educated at the University of Leipzig, and entered the ministry in 1792 as pastor at Püchau. In 1814 he was called to the Nicolai church at Leipzig, where he died, Feb. 15, 1823. While he distinguished himself greatly as a preacher, it is particularly as a writer in Biblical literature that Jaspis's name deserves to be mentioned here. He published an excellent Latin translation of the apostolic epistles (Lips. 1793-95; new ed. 1821, 8vo). His polemical and homiletical works are now-no longer regarded as of any value. “He was a man of pure aims and cheerful piety, and a good scholar and preacher.” Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.; Adelung's Addenda to Jocher, Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v.

## Jassasa, Al[[@Headword:Jassasa, Al]]

             (or the Spy), a Mohammedan name for a beast which is to be one of their signs of the approach of the day of judgment: When the sentence shall be ready to fall upon them, we will cause a beast to come forth unto them out of the earth, which shall speak unto then.  It is supposed by them that it will appear first in the temple of Mecca, or on Mount Safa, or in the territory of Tayef. She is to be a monster in size, and so swift that no human being shall be able to pursue her in her rapid flight through this world, marking the believers from the unbelievers, “that every person may be known at the day of judgment for what he really is.” See Sale, Prelimt. Dissert. to the Koran, p. 79; Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. 1, 506.

## Jasubus[[@Headword:Jasubus]]

             (Ι᾿ασοῦβος), the Greacized form (1Es 9:30) of the Heb. name (Ezr 10:29) JASHUB SEE JASHUB (q.v.).

## Jataka[[@Headword:Jataka]]

             (literally relating to birth) is the lame of a Buddhistic work consisting of a series of books which contain an account of 550 previous births of Sakya Muni, or the Buddha. Several tales that pass under the name of Esop's fables are to be found in this collection of legends. SEE BUDDHISM.

## Jatal[[@Headword:Jatal]]

             (Α᾿τάρ v.r. Ι᾿ατάλ), a corrupt Greek form (1Es 5:28) of thie Heb. name (Ezr 2:42; Neh 7:45) ATER SEE ATER (q.v.).

## Jathniel[[@Headword:Jathniel]]

             ( (Heb. Yathniel', יִתְנַיאֵל, given by God, otherwise praiser of God; Sept. Ναθανά v.r. Ναθαναήλ, Ι᾿αθαναήλ), the fourth son of Meshelemiah, one of the Levitical (Korhite) gate-keepers of the Temple (1Ch 26:2). B.C. 1014.

## Jattir[[@Headword:Jattir]]

             (Heb. Yattir', יִתַּיר [in Jos 15:48, elsewhere “defectively” יִתַּר], pre-eminent; Sept. Ι᾿εθέρ or Ι᾿έθερ), a city in the mountains of Judah (Jos 15:48, where it is named between Shamir and Socoh) assigned to the priests (Jos 21:14; 1Ch 6:57). It was one of the places in the south where David used to haunt in his freebooting days, and to his friends in which he sent gifts from the spoil of the enemies of Jehovah (1Sa 30:27). The two Ithrite heroes of David's guard (2Sa 23:38; 1Ch 11:40) were possibly from Jattir,  living memorials to him of his early difficulties. According to Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v. Jether), it was in their day a very large hamlet inhabited by Christians, twenty Roman miles from Eleutheropolis, in the district of the Daroma, near Molatha (Reland, Palcest. p. 885). It is named by Hap-Parchi, the Jewish traveler; but the passage is defective, and little can be gathered from it (Zunz, in Asher's Benj. of Tudela, 2, 442). The required position answers nearly to that of the modern village of ‘Attir, discovered by Dr. Robinson (Researches, 2, 194, 625) in this region, “marked by caves upon a hill” (comp. Wilson, Lands of Bible, i, 353), and situated fifteen miles south of Hebron, and five north of Moladah (Schwarz, Palestine, p. 105). It contains extensive ruins (Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 388).

## Jattir (2)[[@Headword:Jattir (2)]]

             The modern representative of this, Khurbet Attir, lies four and a quarter miles south-east of ed-Dhoheriyeh, and nine and three quarter miles north of Tell Milh (Moladah), and is thus described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (3:408): "Foundations, and heaps of stones; a great many caves; a ruined masonry tomb; several fallen pillar- shafts and cisterns. There is a kubbeh [dome] at the ruin, which stands on a knoll. Many of the caves have masonry arches to the doors. A large building remains, four courses of the wall being left. Below the ruins on the hill-side is a large oil-press."

## Jaubert (De Barrault), Jean[[@Headword:Jaubert (De Barrault), Jean]]

             a French prelate and theologian, was the son of Emeri, count of Barrault, and studied at La Fleche, both philosophy and theology, as an abbot of St. Pierre de Solognac, in the diocese of Limoges. He was consecrated bishop of Bazas at Rome, in August 1612. Two years afterwards he was at the assembly of.the clergy at Paris. He had been designated as grand-almoner to Henrietta Maria of France, queen of England, but the Protestants succeeded in preventing him from getting that position. In 1630 he was appointed archbishop of Aries. He presided over the assembly of the clergy, in 1635, at Paris, where he died, July 30, 1643, leaving Erreurs et Faussetes Remarquables (Bordeaux, 1622-31). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Jauffret, Gaspard Jean Andre Joseph[[@Headword:Jauffret, Gaspard Jean Andre Joseph]]

             a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born at La Roque-Brussane, Provence, Dec. 13, 1759. He was educated at Toulon and Aix, then entered the Church,' and was made canon of Aulp. He subsequently went to Paris, where he continued his theological studies under the priests of St. Roch and St. Sulpice, and in 1791 established the periodical Annales de la Religion et du Sentiment, aimed against the civil constitution of the clergy. He afterwards became one of the editors of the Annales Religieuses. About 1801 he acted as vicar-general of cardinal Fesch, at Lyon; during the latter's embassy to Rome, and he here labored with the people to reconcile them to the Concordat. Cardinal Fesch subsequently called him to Paris, where Jauffret established a number of religious societies, and obtained many privileges for divers congregations of monks and nuns through the influence of his patron. Made chaplain of the emperor, he was in July, 1806, appointed bishop of Metz, and consecrated Dec. 3 of the same year, still retaining his imperial chaplaincy. This position he improved by establishing a number of seminaries and Roman Catholic schools of all kinds. In 1810 he was one of the persons sent to meet the archduchess Maria Louisa, and subsequently became her confessor. In 1811 he was rewarded for his zeal-in promoting the divorce of Napoleon from his first wife by the archbishopric of Aix; but he never really held this position, on account of the difficulties between the pope and the emperor, and finally felt constrained to renounce it. He died at Paris May 13, 1823. He wrote De la Religion a l'Assemble Nationale (1790-1, 8vo; often reprinted under divers titles): — Du Culte public (1795, 2 vols. 8vo; 3rd ed. 1815): — Memoire pour servir a l'Hist. de la Religion et de la Philosophie (Anon.  Paris, 1803, 2 vols. 8vo), besides a number of controversial and practical works. See Ami de la Religion et du Roi, 36, 65-74; Chronique Religieuse, 6:289-305; Querard, La France Litteraire. — Hoefer, Nouv., Biog. Géneralé, 26:410 sq. (J. N. P.)

## Jauk (or Yauk)[[@Headword:Jauk (or Yauk)]]

             one of the five deified men mentioned in the Koran as having been worshipped by the ancient Arabians. They are supposed to have been antediluviamis who had been distinguished for their virtues. The Arabians represent Jauk under the figure of a horse.

## Java[[@Headword:Java]]

             an island in the Malay archipelago, and, after Sumatra and Borneo, the largest in the Studa group, is the principal seat of the Dutch power in the East. The island is 630 miles long, by 35 to 120 miles broad, and has an area of 49,730 square miles. The population has very rapidly increased since the beginning of the 19th century. While in 1812 it amounted only to 4,500,000 inhabitants, it numbered in 1845 9,560,000 (of whom 106,033 were Chinese, 31,216 Arabs, 16,308 Europeans and their descendants, and 5111 slaves); in 1864, 13,649,680 (26,460 Europeans, and 156,390 Chinese); and in 1884, 20,931,654 (Europeans, 35,000; Chinese, 215,000). The natives belong to the Malay race, but to two different nations-the Javanese in the east, and the less numerous Suflidanese in the west. The Javanese are a peaceable, frugal, and industrious people, who have made greater progress in agriculture than any other people of Asia except the Chinese and Japanese. In 1327 Java was invaded by the Arabs, who subjugated the whole island, and established in it the Mohammedan religion and customs. Only in the remote mountains a few thousand worshippers of Buddha and Brahma remain. The ruins of many temples, images, and tombs prove, however, that at an early period Brahmanism struck deep root among the people. The Portuguese, who came to Java in 1579, as well as the English who arrived later, were expelled by the Dutch, who established themselves in Java in 1594, and steadily advanced in the conquest of the island until only two native states were left — Soerakarta, or Solo, with 690,000 inhabitants, and Djodjkarta, with 340,000 inhabitants.

From 1811 to 1816 the island was under the rule of the British, who had conquered it, but in 1816 it was restored to the Dutch. In consequence of the bad administration a number of outbreaks took place, among which, in particular, that of Djepo Negoro, in 1825, was very dangerous, until at length the governors, Van der Capellen and Jan van den Busch, succeeded, by encouraging agriculture, and by other measures, in developing the productivity and prosperity of the island to a high degree. In accordance with a decree of Jan. 1, 1860, slavery was abolished in Java, as well as in all the Dutch colonies. During the rule of the Portuguese the Catholic missionaries formed some native congregations, of which only a  few remnants are left at Batavia and Depok. The Dutch government was decidedly opposed to missionary labor, and-Protestant missions were not begun until the island passed, in 1811, under the rule of England. The first society in the field was the London Missionary (since 1813), which was soon followed by the English Baptists. But both societies confined their efforts chiefly to the Chinese and the Malays. Their missionaries were allowed to remain after the restoration of the Dutch administration, but they had to submit to many restrictions, until, in 1842, all non-Dutch missionaries in the Dutch colonies were forbidden to perform any missionary labors. Thus only the Rotterdam Missionary Society, which had begun its operations in Batavia and the neighborhood in 1820, was able to continue the missionary work. A new impulse was given to the labors of this society by-a journey' of visitation on the part of its inspector.

A mission station was established at Samarang, and a second very promising field opened in the province of Surabaya, with Modjo Warno as center, whence the mission extended to Kediri and Malang. The society, in 1886, supported in Java seven missionaries and seven native agents. In 1851 a society for home and foreign missions was formed at Batavia, with which the Dutch section of the Java Committee at Amsterdam associated itself. The society labored. in Batavia and the neighborhood, in particular among the Malays and Chinese, and took several brethren of the Society of Gossner into its service. In 1854 the Mennonite Missionary Society at Amsterdam (Doopgezinde Vereeniging) began its operations at Djapara, while the Nederland Zendings Vereeniging, which was established in 1858, opened missions among the Sundanese, to whom it has also undertaken to give a translation of the Bible. It employed in 1866 five missionaries, and had four stations. The Nederl. Gereformeerde Zendings Vereeniging has also established several missions (in 1866 three missionaries) in Java, and the Utrecht Missionary Society has begun missionary operations on the neighboring island of Bali, where Buddhism is still prevalent. The Dutch government continues to be anything but favorable to the missions, but patronizes the diffusion of education, and has recently established for that purpose a native normal school at Bandong. The Roman Catholic Church has a vicar apostolic in the city of Batavia. The government pays the salaries of eight priests. The Catholic population consists almost exclusively of Dutch soldiers and Indo-Portuguese. — Newcomb, Cyclopedia of A Missions; Grundemann, fissions Atl Hts; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 12:569, 591. (A. J. S.)

## Javan[[@Headword:Javan]]

             (Hebrew Yavan', יָוָן, of foreign origin), the name of a person (borrowed from that of his descendants) and also of a city.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿αύαν in Gen 10:2; Gen 10:4; Ι᾿αϋάν in 1Ch 1:5; 1Ch 1:7; ἡ ῞Ελλάς in Isa 66:19 and Eze 27:13; elsewhere οἱ ῞Ελληνες) The fourth son of Japheth,-and the father of Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, and Dodanim (Gen 10:2; Gen 10:4; 1Ch 1:5; 1Ch 1:7). B.C. post 2514. Hence for the country settled by his posterity, supposed to be Greece, i.e. Ionia (whence the Heb. name), which province, settled by colonists from the mother country, was better known to the Orientals, as lying nearer to them, than Hellas itself (see Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 587). It is mentioned among the places where the Syrians obtained articles of traffic (comp. Bochart, Phaleg, 3, 3), namely, brass and slaves (Eze 27:13), as a distant country among the “isles of the sea” (Isa 66:19). Alexander the Great is styled king of Javan.(“Graeca,” Dan 8:21; Dan 10:20; Dan 11:2; Zec 9:13). In Joe 3:6, the patronymic occurs בְּנֵיאּהִיְּוָנֵים, sons of “the Grecians,” like the poetic υιες Α᾿χαίων. SEE ETHNOLOGY.

This name, or its analogue, is found as a designation of Greece not only in all the Shemitic dialects, but also in the Sanskrit, the Old Persic, and the Egyptian (Knobel. Volkertafel. p. 78 sq.), and the form Ι᾿άονες appears in Homer as the designation of the early inhabitants of Attica (Iliad, 13, 685), while Aeschylus and Aristophanes make their Persian interlocutors call the Greeks Ι᾿άονες (Aeschylus, Pers. 174, 055, 911, etc.; Aristoph. Acharn. 104, 106), and the Scholiast on the latter of these passages from Aristophanes expressly says, Πάντας τοὺς ῞Ελληνας Ι᾿άονας οἱ βάρβαροι ἐκάλουν. “The occurrence of the name in the cuneiform inscriptions of the time of Sargon (about B.C. 709), in the form of Yavnan or Yunan, as descriptive of the isle of Cyprus, where the Assyrians first came in contact with the power of the Greeks further shows that its use was not confined to the Hebrews, but was widely spread throughout the East. The name was probably introduced into Asia by the Phoenicians, to whom the Ionians were naturally better known than any other of the Hellenic races on account of their commercial activity and the high prosperity of their towns on the western coast of Asia Minor. The extension of the name westward to the general body of the Greeks, as they became known to the Hebrews through the Phoenicians, was but a natural process, analogous to that which we have already had to notice in the case  of Chittim. It can hardly be imagined that the early Hebrews themselves had any actual acquaintance with the Greeks; it is, however, worth mentioning, as illustrative of the communication which existed between the Greeks and the East, that, amongst the artists who contributed to the ornamentation of Esarhaddon's palaces, the names of several Greek artists appear in one of the inscriptions (Rawlinson's Herod. 1, 483). At a later period the Hebrews must have gained considerable knowledge of the Greeks through the Egyptians. Psammetichus (B.C. 6.64-610) employed Ionians and Carians as mercenaries, and showed them so much favor that the war-caste of Egypt forsook him in a body: the Greeks were settled near Bubastis, in a part- of the country with which the Jews were familiar (Herod. 2, 154). The same policy was followed by the succeeding monarchs, especially Amasis (B.C. 571-525),who gave the Greeks Naucratis as a commercial emporium. It is tolerably certain that any information which the Hebrews acquired in relation to the Greeks must have been through the indirect means to which we have adverted; the Greeks themselves were very slightly acquainted with the southern coast of Syria until the invasion of Alexander the Great. The earliest notices of Palestine occur in the works of Hecataeus (B.C. 594-486), who mentions only the two towns Canytis and Cardytts; the next are in Herodotus, who describes the country as Syria Palestina, and notices incidentally the towns Ascalon, Azotus, Ecbatama. (Batannea?), and Cadytis, the same as the Canytis of Hecateus, probably Gaza. These towns were on the border of Egypt, with the exception of the uncertain Ecbatana, and it is' therefore highly probable that no Greek had, down to this late period, travelled through Palestine” SEE GREECE.

2. (Sept. οινος v. r, Ι᾿ωνάν, Ι᾿αουάν) A region or town of Arabia Felix, whence' the Syrians' procured manufactures of iron, cassia, and calamus (Eze 27:19); probably the Javan mentioned in the Camûs (p. 1817) as” a town of Yemen,” and “a port of Ispahan.” Some confound this with the preceding name (Credner and Hitzig, on Joe 3:6; see Meier on Joel, p. 166), but Tuch (on Genesis p. 210) suggests that it may have been so named as having been founded by a colony of Greeks. By a change of reading (see Havernick, ad loc.) in an associated word (מֵאוּזָל.,from Uzal, for מְאוּזִּל, spun, i.e. thread), some critics have thought they find another place mentioned in the same vicinity (see Bochart, Phaleg, I, 2, 21; Rosenmüller, Bibl. Geog. 3:296-305). Javelin is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of two Heb. terms: חֲנַית(chanith', so called from its flexibility), a  lance (1Sa 18:10-11; 1Sa 19:9-10; 1Sa 20:33; elsewhere “spear”); and רֹמִח(ro'mach, from its piercing), a lance for heavy-armed troops (Num 25:7; “lancet,” i.e. spear-head, 1Ki 18:28; “bucklder,” incorrectly, 1Ch 12:8; elsewhere “spear”). SEE ARMOR.

## Javanese Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Javanese Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The language spoken on the island of Java is, next to Malayan, which is distinct from it, the most polished and most cultivated of Polynesian dialects. Since A.D. 1400, when the Javanese embraced Mohammedanism, many Arabic words have been adopted, by which the native deficiency of the dialect in abstract terms has been in some measure supplied. There are two principal styles of language, called boso kromo and boso ngoko. The bosos kromo is the higher style, used in addressing persons of superior rank, etc.; and the boso ngoko is the lower style, used-in addressing persons of lower rank; it is also found sometimes in older writings, and in narratives, etc.

The preparation of a Javanese version was first suggested by Dr. Wm. Hunter, of Calcutta, in 1812. When the Java Bible Society was formed in 1814, the translation was one of the first things considered, but the language was found very difficult of acquirement to Europeans. At length the Reverend Gottlob Bruckner, a native of Germany, stationed as minister of the Dutch Church at Samarang, undertook the difficult task. In 1820 he commenced the translation of the New Test., which was printed in 1831 at  Serampore. The translation of the Old Test. was undertaken by the Rev. Mr. Gericke, a missionary of the Netherlands Society. In 1831 he completed a version of the Psalms, which he sent to Holland, to the Netherlands Society, for publication.

Mr. Gericke also made a fresh translation of the New Test., on the basis of the preceding. The printing was conducted at the Hague, under the eyes of the translator, Professor Roorda assisting him in the correction of the proof-sheets. The revised New Test; was issued in 1848, and in 1857 the Old Test. was also published, under the auspices of the Netherlands Society. Of late, however, the British and Foreign Bible Society has undertaken to publish a revised edition, at the request of the Reverend P. Jansz of Djapara, supported by Mr.Haffenden, the society's agent in Singapore. "The people of Java," the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1883 states, "are said to number 19,000,000. Of these 8,000,000 are Javanese, 8,000,000 Sundanese, and 3,000,000 Malays. From many sources the committee learn that the existing version of the Bible is full of errors, some of which give a false meaning to the passages in which they occur, and that for practical purposes it is almost worthless. Mr. Haffenden has returned from a journey in Java, where he found the want of an intelligible version of the Scriptures." This induced the British and Foreign Bible Society to authorize the Reverend Jansz, who. for over thirty years has been a missionary in Java of the Baptist Society for the, Propagation of the Gospel in the Netherland Colonies, and who, besides, is the author of a Javanese Grammar and Dictionary which have reached a third edition, and of several religious books in the Javanese Tongue, to prepare a new version. In this work of retranslation, Mr. Jansz has the aid of two educated native Christians. In its revised form the gospel of Luke was printed at Singapore in 1884. See, Bible of Every Land, page 369. (B.P.)

## Jaw[[@Headword:Jaw]]

             (usually and properly לְחַי, lechi', rendered also “jaw-bone;”' once

מִלְקוֹחַים, mcikochin', “jaws,” Psa 22:15, elsewhere “prey;” also מְתִלְּעוֹת, methalleoth',” “jaws,”' Job 29:17 : “jaw teeth,” Pro 30:14; “cheek teeth,” Joe 1:6). The denuded jaw-bone of an ass afforded Samson (q.v.) a not unsuitable weapon (see Seifferheld, De maxilla asini, Tübing. 1716) for the great carnage which he once effected (Jdg 15:15). SEE LEHI.

## Jawas[[@Headword:Jawas]]

             were the physicians, priests, and advisers of the small kings among the nations inhabiting Florida. They claimed to-have converse with the spirits.

## Jawinna[[@Headword:Jawinna]]

             in Lettian mythology, was a friendly goddess of the ancient heathen Prussians, who blessed the sown fields with fruitfuliess.

## Jay, Guido Michael Le[[@Headword:Jay, Guido Michael Le]]

             SEE LEJAY.

## Jay, William[[@Headword:Jay, William]]

             a very distinguished English Independent minister, was born at Tisbtry, county of Wilts, May 8,1769. He was the son of a poor stonecutter, and obtained his education by the influence and charity of friends he made as a youth, distinguishing himself even then by great natural abilities and ready acquisition. When not quite sixteen years of age he began preaching, and before he had passed his minority he is said to have delivered no less than 1000 sermons. Like Wesley, he often preached out-doors; and he himself relates the history of his early life thus: “In the milder seasons which would allow of it, we often addressed large numbers out of doors; and many a clear and calm evening I have preached down the day on the corner of a common, or upon the green turf before the cottage door. These neighborhoods were supplied sometimes weekly and sometimes fortnightly, both on the weekdays and on the Sabbaths. We always on the Sabbaths avoided, if possible, the church hours; and on week-days we commonly omitted the services during the hay and corn harvest, that we might not give reasonable offence to the farmers, or entice the peasants away from their labor before their usual time.

I would also remark that we did not always, in these efforts, encounter much opposition; indeed, I remember only a few instances in which we suffered persecution from violence or rudeness.” Jan. 31, 1791, he was made preacher of Argyle Chapel, Bath, and here he labored for sixty-two years with great distinction. Jay was not excelled even by the greatest of pulpit orators for which England has been so justly celebrated within the last 100 years. John Foster calls him the  “prince of preachers;” Sheridan pronounced him “the most natural orator” he had ever heard; Dr. James Hamilton as a preacher who filled him “with wonder and delight;” and Beckford as possessing a mind like “a clear, transparent stream, flowing so freely as to impress us with the idea of its being inexhaustible.” He died Dec. 27, 1853, “beloved and trusted by religious professors of all sects” (London. Athenaeum, Sept. 30,1854). “Mr. Jay was not only a pious and eminently successful preacher, but a very genial and interesting man; a sagacious observer, yet of childlike simplicity in taste and disposition; possessed of a fine, though sometimes quaint humor; a most instructive and pleasant companion, rich in anecdote and reminiscence, and able, from personal knowledge, to give living sketches of most of the eminent men who had appeared in the religious world, high-flying bigots excepted, during the latter part of the 18th and the earlier part of the present century…. He was not a strict Calvinist, for he did not believe in the ‘exclusive' part of the Calvinistic creed in any form. He believed in ‘two grand truths' that if we are saved, it is entirely of God's grace; and if we are lost, it will be entirely from ourselves.' He held to these firmly, though he might not see the connection between them.

The connection,' he says, ‘is like a chain across the river; I can see the two ends, but not the middle; not because there is no real union, but because it is under water.' As to Church polity, Mr. Jay inclined, on the whole, to Presbyterianism, with a special leaning, perhaps, on one point-that of mutual ministerial oversight and responsibility to Wesleyan Methodism. But-he did not believe any particular form of polity to be of divine authority” (London Quart. Review, 1854, p. 553 sq.). Best known of his varied and extensive writings are Morning and Evening Exercises (vol. 1-4 of the collective edition of his Works, ed., of 1842): — The Christian contemplated (vol. 6 of his Works): — Mornings with Jesus (1854, 8vo). His Works were published entire (Bath, 1842-44, 12 vols. 8vo; New York, 3 vols. 8vo). See Autobiography of the Rev. William Jay, with Reminiscences of some distinguished Contemporaries, Selections from his Correspondence, etc., edited by George Redford, D.D., LL.D., and John Angell James (Lond. 1854, 8vo-; 3rd ed. 1855); Wilson, Memoir of Jay (1854, 8vo); Wallace. Portraiture of Jay (1852, 12mo); Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 857; Princeton Review, 5, 369 sq.; Meth. Quart. Review 5, 335. (J. H.W.)

## Jayadeva[[@Headword:Jayadeva]]

             a celebrated Hindu poet, who, according to some, lived about the middle of the 11th, according to others about the middle of the 16th century after Christ. His most renowned work is the Gitagovinda, an erotic poem in honor of the Hindû deity Krishna (an incarnation of Vishnu) and his wife Râdhâ. It is interpreted both in a literal and a mystical sense.

## Jayne, Peter[[@Headword:Jayne, Peter]]

             a pioneer Methodist Episcopal minister, born at Marblehead, Mass., in 1778, entered the itinerancy in 1797, and in 1805-6 was stationed in Boston, where he died Sept. 5, 1806. Mr. Jayne was a man of great promise and rare abilities. His style was terse and vigorous, his piety consistent, and his manners ingenuous. His early death was deplored by his brethren as the eclipse of a morning star. See Minutes of Conferences, i, 146; Stevens, Memorials of Methodists, 1, ch. 26. (G. L. T.)

## Jazar[[@Headword:Jazar]]

             (ηΙ῾᾿αζήρ v.r. Ι᾿αζήν), a Griecized form (1 Maccabees 5, 8) of JAAZER SEE JAAZER (q.v.).

## Jazer[[@Headword:Jazer]]

             (Num 32:1; Num 32:3; Jos 21:39; 2Sa 24:5; 1Ch 6:81; 1Ch 26:31; Isa 16:8-9; Jer 48:32). SEE JAAZER.

## Jaziz[[@Headword:Jaziz]]

             (Heb. Yaziz', יָזַיז., prominent; Sept. Ι᾿ωεζίζ v.r. Ι᾿αζίζ), a Hagarite overseer of David's flocks (1Ch 27:31), which were probably pastured on the east of Jordan, in the nomad country where the forefathers of Jaziz had for ages roamed (comp. 5, 19-22) B.C. 1014. SEE HAGARITE.

## Ja?r[[@Headword:Ja?r]]

             (Hebrew Ya'ir', יָאַיר, enlightener; Sept. Ι᾿αϊvρ, Ι᾿αείρ; but in 1Ch 2:22, some copies Α᾿είρ; hi Est 2:5, Ι᾿αϊvρος; compare Ι᾿άειρος, Mar 5:22; Josephus. War. 6. 1, 8), the name of three men, also of one other of different form in the Hebrew.

1. The son of Segub, which latter was of the tribe of Manasseh on his mother's side SEE ADOPTION, but of Judah on his father's (1Ch 2:22); but Ja'ïr is reckoned as belonging to Manasseh (Num 32:41; Deu 3:14; 1Ki 4:13), probably on account of his exploits and possessions in Gilead, where he appears to have been brought up with his mother (comp. 1Ch 2:21), being perhaps an illegitimate child (see Raumer in Tholuck's Liter. Az. 1836, p. 11), or, at all events, her heir (Schwarz, Palest. p. 185), although his possessions might strictly be claimed as an appendage to the tribe of Judah (Jos 19:5; Jos 19:34). SEE JUDAH UPON JORDAN.

He distinguished himself in an expedition against the kingdom of Bashan, the time of which is disputed, but may probably be referred to the last year of the life of Moses (B.C. 1618), and which seems to have formed part of the operations connected with the conquest of the country east of the Jordan (1Ch 3:23;  Num 33:41; Deu 3:14). He settled in the part of Argob bordering on Gilead, where we find the small towns thus taken (retaken) by him named collectively Havothjair, or “Ja'ïr's villages” (Num 32:41; Deu 3:14; Jos 13:30; 1Ki 4:13; 1Ch 2:22). SEE HAVOTH-JAIR.

These are variously stated to have been twenty-three (1Ch 2:22), thirty (Jdg 10:4), and sixty in number (1Ch 2:23; Jos 13:30; 1Ki 4:13, in which last passage they are said to have been “great cities, with walls and brazen bars”). The discrepancy may easily be reconciled by the supposition (warranted by Num 32:39-40) that although Ja'ïr, in conjunction with his relatives, captured the whole sixty cities composing the Gileadite district of the kingdom of Og in Bashan (Deu 3:4), only twenty-three of these were specially assigned to him; whereas, at a later date, his portion may have received some accessions; or the number attributed to his descendant of the same name may be only a round or approximate estimate, as being about one half the entire number. (For other methods of adjustment, see Winer's Realwörterbuch, s.v. Ja'ïr.)

2. The eighth judge of Israel, a native of Gilead, in Manasseh (Josephus, 4 nt. 5, 7, 6, Ι᾿αείρης), beyond the Jordan, and therefore probably descended from the preceding, with whom, indeed, he is sometimes confounded. He ruled twenty-two years (B.C. 1296-1274), and his opulence is indicated ill a manner characteristic of the age in which he lived; he had thirty sons, that rode on thirty ass-colts (עֲיָרַים), and they had thirty cities ( עֲיָרַיםagain), which are called Havoth-jair, in the land of Gilead” (Jdg 10:3-4). A young ass was the most valuable beast for riding then known to the Hebrews; and that Ja'ïr had so many of them, and was able to assign a village to every one of his thirty sons, is very striking evidence of his wealth (see Kitto's Dail., Bible Illustrat. or Jdg 5:6-10). The twenty-three villages of the more ancient Ja'ïr were probably among the thirty which this Ja'ïr possessed. His burial-place was Camon, doubtless in the same region (Jdg 10:5). It is probably one of his descendants (so numerous) that is called a JAIRITE (Heb. Yairi', יִאַירַי, Sept. Ι᾿αρί, 2Sa 20:26). Possibly, however, the genuine reading was יתרי, the Jathrite. SEE IRA.

3. A Benjamite son of Shimei and father of Mordecai, Esther's uncle (Est 2:5). B.C. ante 598.

4. (Heb. Yair', יָעַירmarg., but text Yco'r', יָעוֹר; perh. awake; Sept. Ι᾿αείρ, Vulg. corruptly scltus.) The father of Elhanan, which latter slew the brother of Goliath (1Ch 20:5). In the parallel passage (2Sa 21:19) we find, instead of Jair, “JIAAE” (יִעֲרֵי, apparently the plur. of the other word, q. d. יִעִר, a forest; Sept. Ι᾿αρέ, Vulg. again sultus), with the addition “Oregim” (אֹרְגַים, weavers; Sept. ὑφαίνοντες, Vulg. polymitarius), which has probably been erroneously taken by transcribers from the latter part of the same verse (see Kennicott's Diss. on the Hebrew Text, 1, 78). B.C. ante 1018. SEE ELUIANAN.

## Jealousy[[@Headword:Jealousy]]

             (קַנְאָה, ζῆλος), properly the feeling of suspicion of a wife's purity (Numbers 5, 14); often used of Jehovah's sensitive regard for the true faith of his Church (Exo 20:5, etc.; 2Co 11:2). SEE MARRIAGE. The same term is sometimes used for anger or indignation, or  an intense interest for the honor and prosperity of another (Psa 79:5; 1Co 10:22; Zec 1:14; Zec 8:2). Conjugal jealousy is one of the strongest passions of our nature (Pro 6:34; Son 8:6). When God is said to be a jealous God, or to be moved to jealousy, or when the still stronger expression is used, “Jehovah, whose name is Jealous” (Exo 24:14), we are to understand this language as employed to illustrate, rather than to represent, the emotions of the divine mind. The same causes operating upon the human mind would produce what we call anger, jealousy, repentance, grief, etc.; and therefore, when these emotions are ascribed to the mind of God, this language is used because such emotions can be represented to us by no other. Thus God is represented to us as a husband, related to his Church by a marriage covenant that binds her to be wholly for him, and not for another. The more sincere and constant the love, the more sensitive is the heart to the approach of a rival and the thought of such affection being alienated or corrupted fills the soul with grief and indignation. So God commends the purity, the fervency, and the sincerity of his love to his Church by the most terrific expressions of jealousy. SEE IDOLATRY.

## Jealousy, Image Of[[@Headword:Jealousy, Image Of]]

             (סֵמֶל הִקַּנְאָה, Sept. εἰκὼν τοῦ ζήλους,Vulg. idolum zeli), an idolatrous object seen by the prophet in that remarkable vision which portrayed to him the abominations that called down the divine vengeance on Jerusalem (Eze 8:3; Eze 8:5). SEE IMAGERY, CHAMBER OF. It stood upon apedestal (מוֹשָׁב, “seat”) within the inner or priests' court of the Temple, adjoining the great altar, and seems to have been identical with the statue of Astarte, which Manasseh had the audacious effrontery to erect within the sacred precincts (2Ki 21:7). SEE ASHTORETH. This idol, arresting the attention of all who came to worship just as they entered, claimed, as the rival of Jehovah, their adoration, and thus was peculiarly offensive to the God of heaven (see Henderson, Commentary, ad loc.; Biedermann, De idolo zeli, Freib. 1757). SEE IDOL.

## Jealousy, Waters Of[[@Headword:Jealousy, Waters Of]]

             (מֵי הִמָּרַים הִמְאָרְרַים, Num 5:19, bitter waters that cur se, Sept. ὕδωρ τοῦἐλεγμοῦ τοῦ ἐπικαταρωμένου, Vulg. aquee istce amarissinzce in quas maledicta congessi, A.V. “this bitter water that causeth the curse”). (See Acoluthi. De aquis amaris maledictionems inferentibus [Lips. 1862]). When a Hebrew wife was suspected of adultery, her husband brought her first before the judges, and, if she still asserted her innocence, he required that she should drink the waters of jealousy, that God might, by these means, discover what she attempted to conceal (Num 5:12, etc.). The further details are thus described by Dr. Clarke (Com. ad loc.) from the rabbinical authorities (comp.Wagenseil's Sota, pass.): “The man then produced his witnesses, and they were heard. After this, both the man and the woman were conveyed to Jerusalem, and placed before the Sanhedrim; and if she persisted in denying the fact, she was led to the eastern gate of the court of Israel, stripped of her own clothes, and dressed in black, before great numbers of her own sex. The priest then told her that, if she was really innocent, she had nothing to fear; but if guilty, she might expect to suffer all that the law had denounced against her, to which she answered ‘Amen, amen.' The priest then wrote the terms of the law in this form: ‘If a strange man hath not come near you, and you are not. polluted by forsaking the bed of your husband, these bitter waters, which I have cursed, will not hurt you; but if you have polluted yourself by coming near to another man, and gone astray from your husband, may you be accursed of the Lord, and become an example for all his people; may your thigh rot, and your belly swell till it burst; may these cursed waters enter into your belly, and, being swelled therewith, may your thighs putrefy.' After this, the priest filled a pitcher out of the brazen vessel near the altar of burnt offerings, cast some dust of the payment into it, mingled something with it as bitter as wormwood, and then read the curses, and received her answer of Amen. Another priest in the mean time tore off her clothes as low as her bosom,  made her head bare, untied the tresses of her hair, fastened her clothes (which were thus torn) with a girdle under her breast, and then presented her with the tenth part of an ephah, or about three pints of barley-meal. The other priest then gave her the-waters of jealousy or bitterness to drink, and, as soon as the woman had swallowed them, he gave her the meal, in a vessel like a frying pan, into her hand. This was stirred before the Lord, and part of it thrown into the fire of the altar. If the wife was innocent, she returned with her husband, and the waters, so far from injuring her, increased her health, and made her more fruitful; but if she was guilty, she grew pale immediately, her eyes swelled, and, lest she should pollute the Temple, she was instantly carried out with these symptoms upon her, and died immediately, with all the ignominious circumstances related in the curses.”

This ordeal appears to have contained the essence of an oath varied for the purpose of peculiar solemnity, so that a woman would naturally hesitate to take such an oath, understood to be an appeal to heaven of the most solemn kind, and also to be accompanied, in case of perjury, by most painful and fatal effects. The drinking appears to have been a symbolical action. When “the priest wrote the curses in a book,” and washed those curses into the water which was to be drunk, the water was understood to be impregnated as it were, or to be tinctured with the curse, the acrimony of which it received; so that now it was metaphorically bitter, containing the curse in it. The drinking of this curse, though conditionally effective or non-effective, could not but have a great effect on the woman's mind, and an answerable effect on the husband's jealousy, which it was designed to cure and to dissipate. We read of no instance in which the trial took place; and, if the administration of the ordeal were really infrequent, we may regard that as an evidence of its practical utility, for it would seem that the trial and its result were so dreadful that the guilty rather confessed their crime, as they were earnestly exhorted to do, than go through it. The rabbins say that a woman who confessed in such circumstances was not put to death, but only divorced without dowry. It has been well remarked that this species of ordeal could not injure the innocent at all, or punish the guilty except by a miracle, whereas in the ordeals by fire, etc., in the Dark Ages, the innocent could scarcely escape except by a miracle. SEE ADULTERY.

## Jealousy-Offering[[@Headword:Jealousy-Offering]]

             (מַנְחִת קְנָאוֹת, Septuag. θυσία ζηλοτυπίας, Vulgate oblatio zelotypice) was the name of a “meat-offering” which a husband was to bring when he subjected his wife, under charge of adultery, before the priest, to the ordeal of the bitter waters (Num 5:11 sq.). It consisted of a tenth of an  ephah of barley-meal, without oil or frankincense. The priest must wave it (Num 5:25), and burn a handful on the altar (Num 5:26). The Mishna gives more minute directions (Sotahi, 2, 1; 3:1, 6). SEE ADULTERY. Barley, as an inferior grain to wheat (Pheedrus, 2, 8, 9), was symbolical of the suspected condition of the wife (Philo, Opp. 2, 307). Oil and incense, as emblems of joy and piety, were obviously unsuitable to the occasion. SEE OFFERING.

## Jean[[@Headword:Jean]]

             SEE JOHN.

## Jeanes, Henry[[@Headword:Jeanes, Henry]]

             an English divine, was born at Allensay, county of Somerset, in 1611, and was educated at Oxford University. He held first the rectory of Beercrocomb and Capland, and, after Walter Raleigh's expulsion, the rectory of Chedzoy. He died in 1662. Jeanes wrote several theological treatises:

(1) Abstinence from Evil: —

(2) Indifference of Human Actions: —

(3) Original Righteousness; besides several polemical tracts in a controversy which he waged against Dr. Hammond, Jeremy Taylor, Goodwin, etc.

An answer to Milton's Iconoclasts, entitled The Image Unbroken, was generally believed to be written by Jeanes, but Watt ascribes the work to Joseph Jane (see Allibone, Dict. of Authors, p. 957). — Hook, Eccles. Biogr. 6, 280.

## Jearim[[@Headword:Jearim]]

             (Heb. Yeirin', יְעָרַיםforests; Sept. Ι᾿αρείμ), the name of a mountain on the border of Judah, between Mount Seir and Beth-shemesh (Jos 15:10):. stated to be the site of CHESALON SEE CHESALON (q.v.). Kesla stands, seven miles due west of Jerusalem, “on a high point on the north slope of the lofty ridge between wady Ghurab and wady Ismael. The latter of these is the southwestern continuation of wady Beit-Hanina, and the former runs parallel to and northward of it, and they are separated by this ridge, which is probably Mount Jearim”. (Robinson, New Researches, p. 154). Forests, in our sense of the word, there are none; but we have the testimony of the latest traveler that “such thorough woods, both for loneliness and obscurity, he had not seen since he left Germany” (Tobler, Wanderung, 1857, p. 178). — Smith. Perhaps the hill behind Kurvet el- Enab may be Mount Seir; from it the border “passed over (wady Ghurab) to the shoulder ועבּר אלאּכתŠ) of Mount Jearim… and then went down to Beth-shemesh.” It may be that a considerable district of the mountains in this locality was called Jearim, for Baalah is called Kirjath-Jearim (“the town of Jearim”); and if so, then we can see the reason why the explanatory phrase. is added, “Mount Jearim, which is Chesalon,” to limit the more general appellative to the narrow ridge between the two wadys  (see Keil on Joshua, ad loc.; Porter, Handbook for S. and Pal. p. 285). SEE KIRJATH-JEARIM.

## Jeaterai[[@Headword:Jeaterai]]

             (Heb. Ye'theray', יְא תְרִי, perhaps for i יְעִתְרִי, rich; Sept. Ι᾿εθρί,Vulg. Jethrai), son of Zerah, a Levite of the family of Gershom (1Ch 6:21); apparently the same called ETHNI in 1Ch 6:41.

## Jeaurat, Edme[[@Headword:Jeaurat, Edme]]

             an eminent French engraver, was born in Paris about 1680, and studied under Bernard Picart. The following are some of his best works; The Meeting of David and Abigail; John the Baptist Baptizing the Jews; The Interview between Jacob and Rachel; The Finding of Moses.

## Jebb, John (1), M.D., F.R.S[[@Headword:Jebb, John (1), M.D., F.R.S]]

             a Socinian writer, was born in London in 1736. He studied at Trinity College, Dublin, and Peterhouse, Cambridge, of which latter he became fellow. He was made rector of Ovington, Norfolk, in 1764, but, having changed from orthodoxy to Socinianism, he declined any longer serving the Church, and resigned in 1775, to apply himself to the study of medicine. He died at London in 1786. His writings have been published entire, entitled Works, Theological, Medical, etc., with memoirs by John Disney, D.D. (London, 1787, 3 vols. 8vo). See A Letter to the Rev. Mr. Jebb with Relation to his Sentiments, etc. (Lond. 1778, 8vo); Resignation no Proof, a Letter to Mr. Jebb, by a member of the University of Cambridge (London, 1776, 8vo); A Letter to the Rev. John Jebb, M.A., etc. (Lond. 1776, 8vo); Atkins, General Biography; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 26, 609; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 957..

## Jebb, John (2)[[@Headword:Jebb, John (2)]]

             bishop of Limerick, an eminent Irish theologian, was born at Drogheda Sept. 27, 1775. He studied at Dublin University, where his proficiency attracted the notice of Broderick, bishop of Kilmore, who made him curate of Swanlibar. When Broderick became archbishop of Cashel, he gave Jebb the living of Abington, one of the richest in Ireland. ‘He was finally made bishop of Limerick in 1823. A Protestant bishop in a district chiefly inhabited by Roman Catholics, he overcame the prejudices of the people by his liberal spirit, and staunchly defended their rights. He died at Limerick Dec. 7,1833. His principal works are Sermons on Subjects chiefly practical, etc. (Lond. 1815, 8vo, and often): — Practical Theology (Lond. 1830, and again 1837, 2 vols. 8vo): — Pastoral Instructions on the Character of the Church of England (London, 1831 [new ed. 1844], sm. 8vo): — Thirty Years Correspondence with Alexander Knox, Esq. (London, 1834, 2 vols. 8vo). But by far his most important work is his  Sacred Literature (London, 1820, 8vo, and often), intended chiefly as a review of the works of Lowth on Hebrew poetry and Isaiah. “Bishop Jebb undertakes to controvert some of the principles of Dr. Lowth, and to show that the criteria by which the latter would determine what is poetry in Hebrew are to be found in the New Testament as well as the Old. Aside from this controversy with Lowth, the work contains many illustrations and explanations of difficult or obscure passages, valuable to the Biblical scholar. ‘No book of criticism has lately appeared more worthy the attention of the student of the Bible.” See Life of Bishop Jebb, with a selection from his letters, by Rev. Charles Forster (2nd ed. Lond. 1837, 8vo); Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, s.v. (J. H.W.)

## Jeberechiah[[@Headword:Jeberechiah]]

             (Heb. Yeberekyah', only in the paragogic form Yeberekya'hu, יְבֶרֶכְיָהוּ, blessed by Jehovah; Sept. Βαραχίας), the father of Zechariah, which latter Isaiah took as one of the witnesses of his marriage with “the prophetess” (Isa 8:2). B.C. cir. 739. Both the Sept. and the Vulg. give the name in its ordinary form, Barachiah, and, as we do not find it elsewhere, the initial יis probably an error, which may be accounted for by supposing the preceding word בוto have been originally plural, בני, the two witnesses being both sons of Barachiah, and the final letter, by a mistake of the copyist, to have been prefixed to the following word. The same pair of names seems to have been of no unfrequent occurrence in the priestly houses. Zechariah the prophet was son of Berechiah (Zec 1:1), and we have “Zacharias, son of Barachias” (Mat 23:3; Mat 23:5). Josephus also (War, 4:5, 4) mentions another Zacharias, son of Baruch. SEE ZECHARIAH.

## Jebis (or Jebisu)[[@Headword:Jebis (or Jebisu)]]

             in Japanese mythology, was the younger brother of the sun deity, but because he was informed he was cast off by his parents. He lived by fishing, and amassed great wealth. After his death he was worshipped as god of the sea, and as one of the seven gods of wealth. He is represented as the god of waters, the protector of sailors and fishermen, sitting on a lotus-flower, or on a rock, with a line and a fish in his hands.

## Jebus[[@Headword:Jebus]]

             (Heb. Yebus', יְבוּס, trodden hard, i.e. perh. fastness; Sept. Ι᾿εβούς), the name of the ancient Canaanitish city which stood on Mount Zion, one of the hills on which Jerusalem was built (Jebusi, Jos 15:8; Jos 18:16; Jos 18:28). In Jdg 19:10 it is identified with Jerusalem, and in 1Ch 11:4-5, the only other passage in which the name occurs, it is identified with the castle of Zion, subsequently called the castle or city of David. The sides of Zion descended precipitously on the west and south into the deep valley of Hinnom, and on the east into the Tyropoeon, which separated it from Moriah. On the north side a branch valley, the upper part of-the  Tyropceon, swept round it; and here was a ledge of rock on which a massive tower was afterwards founded, perhaps on the site of an older one. Recent excavations on the site remarkably corroborate these facts. SEE JERUSALEM.

Jebus was thus naturally a place of great strength; and, being strongly fortified besides, it is not strange that the Jebusites should have gloried in it as impregnable (see Rose, Practicum Jebusceorum castri expugnati, Alt. 1729), and that the capture of it by David should have been considered one of his most brilliant achievements (2Sa 5:8). Even after Jebus was captured, and Jerusalem founded and made the capital of Israel, Zion was separately fortified. It seems that in addition to the “castle” on the summit of the hill there was a lower city or suburb, perhaps lying in the bottom of the adjoining valleys; for we read that the children of Judah had captured and burned Jerusalem (Jdg 1:7-8), while afterwards it is said “the Benjamites did not drive out the Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem” (Jdg 1:21). The Jebusites still held the “castle,” which was within the allotted territory of Benjamin, but the children of Judah drove them out of the lower town, which was situated within their borders. This is, in substance, the explanation given by Josephus (Ant. 5, 2, 2 and 5). SEE JEBUSITE.

## Jebusi[[@Headword:Jebusi]]

             (Heb. Yebusi'), a word used in the original of a place and its inhabitants.

1. “Jebusi” ( הִיְּבוּסַר=theJebusite; Sept. Ι᾿εβουσαί, Ι᾿εβοῦς, Vulg. Jebusceus), the name employed for the city of JEBUS, only in the ancient document describing the landmarks and the towns of the allotment of Judah and Benjamin (Jos 15:8; Jos 18:16; Jos 18:28). In the first and last place, the explanatory words, “‘which is Jerusalem,” are added. In the first, however, our translators have given it as “the Jebusite.” A parallel to this mode of designating the town by its inhabitants is found in this very list in Zemaraim (Jos 18:22), Avim (Jos 18:23), Ophni (Jos 18:24), and Japhletite (jos 16:3), etc.

2. “Jebusite” or “Jebusites,” forms indiscriminately employed in the A.Vers., although in the original the name, whether applied to individuals or to thenation, is never found in the plural; always singular. The full form isהִיְּבוּסַי; but in a few places viz. 2 Samuel 5, 6; 2Sa 24:16; 2Sa 24:18; 1Ch 21:18 only--it is “defectively” written הִיְבֻסַי. Without the article, יְבוּסַיit occurs in 2Sa 5:8; 1Ch 11:6;  Zec 9:7. In the first two of these the force is much increased by removing the article introduced in- the A. Vers., and reading “and smiteth a Jebusite.” See JEBUSITE

## Jebusite[[@Headword:Jebusite]]

             (Heb. Yebusi', יְבוּסַי, Sept. Ι᾿εβουσαῖος, but Ι᾿εβοῦς in Jos 15:8; Jos 18:28, or Ι᾿εβούς in Jdg 19:11; 1Ch 11:4; also Ι᾿εβουσαί in Jos 18:16, and Ι᾿εβουσί in Ezr 9:1; A.V. “Jebusi' in Jos 18:16; Jos 18:28), the name of the original inhabitants of Jebus, frequently mentioned (usually last in the list) amongst the seven Canaanitish nations doomed to destruction (Gen 10:16; Gen 15:21; Exo 3:8; Exo 3:17; Exo 13:5; Exo 23:23; Exo 33:2; Exo 34:11; Num 13:29; Deu 7:1; Deu 20:17; Jos 3:10; Jos 9:1; Jos 11:3; Jos 12:8; Jos 24:11; Jdg 3:5; 1Ki 9:20; 1Ch 1:14 : 2Ch 8:7; Ezr 9:1; Neh 9:8). They appear to have descended from a grandson of Ham (Gen 10:16). “His place in the list is between Heth and the Amorites (Gen 10:16; 1Ch 1:14), a position which the tribe maintained long after (Num 13:29; Jos 11:3); and the same connection is traceable in the words of Eze 16:3; Eze 16:45, who addresses Jerusalem as the fruit of the union of an Amorite with a Hittite” (Smith). At the time of the arrival of the Israelites (see Jour. Siac. Lit. Oct. 1851, p. 167) they were found to be a considerable tribe on the west of Jordan (Jos 9:1), seated on one of the hills of Judah (some have wrongly inferred Moriah from 2Ch 3:1, but in 2Sa 5:9 it is clearly identified with Zion), near the Hittites and Amorites (Num 13:30; Jos 11:3), where they had founded a city called JEBUS (Jos 18:28; comp. 19:10), probably after the name of their progenitor, and established a royal form of government, being then ruled by Adonizedek (Jos 10:1; Jos 10:23). SEE SALEIM. They seem to have been a warlike tribe; and, although they were defeated with much slaughter, and Adoni-zedek, their king, slain by Joshua (Joshua 10), and though a part of their city seems to have been afterwards taken, sacked, and burned by the warriors of Judah (Jdg 1:8), yet they were not wholly subdued, but were able to retain at least their acropolis (Jdg 1:21), and were not entirely dispossessed of it till the time of David (2 Samuel 5). Being situated on the border (Jos 15:8; Jos 18:16), between Judah and Benjamin, to either of which it is indifferently assigned (Jos 15:63; Jos 18:28; Jdg 1:21), it was only at this late date  secured to the actual territory of David's tribe (1 Chronicles 11). He made it the capital of his kingdom instead of Hebron (Ewald, Isr. Gesch. 2, 583), but did not wholly expel the natives (1Ki 9:20). By that time the inveteracy of the enmity between the Hebrews and such of the original inhabitants as remained in the land had much abated, and the rights of private property were respected by the conquerors. This we discover from the fact that the site on which the Temple afterwards stood belonged to a Jebusite named Araunah, from whom it was purchased by king David, who declined to accept it as a free gift from the owner (2 Samuel 244; 1 Chronicles 21). This afterwards became the site of Solomon's Temple (2Ch 3:1). It appears that the Jebusites subsisted under his reign in the state. of tributaries or slaves (2Ch 8:7) and even so continued to the times of the return from Babylon (Ezr 9:1). SEE JERUSALEM.

The name “Jebusite” is sometimes put for the city itself inhabited by them (i. q. “city of the Jebusite,” Jdg 19:11), as in Jos 15:8; Jos 18:16; also poetically, in later times, for its successor, Jerusalem (Zec 9:7). SEE JEBUS.

“In the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles, the ashes of Barnabas, after his martyrdom in Cyprus, are said to have been buried in a cave where the race of the Jebusites formerly dwelt, and previous to this is mentioned the arrival in the island of a pious Jebusite, a kinsman of Nero (Act. Apost. Apocr p. 72,73, ed Tisch.)”

## Jecamiah[[@Headword:Jecamiah]]

             (1Ch 3:18). SEE JELKAIAH. Jechiel ben-Joseph, of Paris, a Rabbi, flourished in the 13th century. He was a disciple of the celebrated Jehudah Sir-Leon (q.v.). But little is known of the early history of his life. In the prime of life we find him in Paris, at the head of a theological school, and an officiating Rabbi in the capital of France. During the reign of Louis IX the Romanists made every effort to cause the expulsion of the Jews from France, where they were enjoying at this time special favors. They accused the Jews of manifold crimes, and asserted that the Talmud contained disrespectful language towards Jesus, etc.; and though the king hesitated to believe this, he was finally persuaded to appoint a commission of both Christians and Jews to search the Talmud for obnoxious passages. Of the four Rabbis appointed, Jechiel-ben-Joseph headed the Jewish commission, and he alone, in the main, carried on the disputation, which  resulted unfavorably to the Jews. In the dispute Jechiel displayed great ability and learning, but it is to be deplored that he injured his cause in the eyes of the historian by the assertion which he made that the name of Jesus occurring in the Talmud does not refer to ‘Jesus the Christ. See Jews in France; Wagenseil, Tela ignea Saatdme (2 vols. 4to); Gritz, Geschichte der Juden, 7, 115 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Jechiel[[@Headword:Jechiel]]

             in the Talmud, is the supreme genius of the good genii ruling the animal kingdom. Subordinate to him are Pasiel, Gaviel, and Qhamiel.

## Jechiel De Pesaro[[@Headword:Jechiel De Pesaro]]

             SEE PESARO, JECHIEL.

## Jechiel Nathan[[@Headword:Jechiel Nathan]]

             SEE NATHAN BEN-JECHIEL.

## Jecholiah[[@Headword:Jecholiah]]

             (2Ki 15:2). SEE JECOLIAH.

## Jechonias[[@Headword:Jechonias]]

             (Ι᾿εχονίας), a Graecized form of two Hebrew names occurring in the Apocrypha and N.T.

1. In Esther 11:4; Bar 1:3; Bar 1:9; Mat 1:11-12, for king JEHOIAKIN SEE JEHOIAKIN (q.v.).

2. In 1Es 8:92 for SHECHANIAH SEE SHECHANIAH (q.v.), who encouraged Ezra in the matter of divorcing the Gentile wives (Ezr 10:2).

## Jecoliah[[@Headword:Jecoliah]]

             (Heb. Yekolyah', יְכָלְיָה, 2Ch 26:3, where the text erroneously has יְכָילְיָה; Auth. Vers. “Jecholiah;” in 2Ki 15:2, the paragogic form Yekolya'hu, יְכָלְיָהוּ, able through Jehovah; Sept. Ι᾿εχελία; Josephus Α᾿χιάλας, Ant. 9:10,1; Vulg. Jechelia), a female of Jerusalem, mother of king Uzziah, and consequently wife of king Amaziah, whom she appears to have survived: her character may be inferred from the general piety of her son. B.C. 824-807.

## Jeconiah[[@Headword:Jeconiah]]

             (1Ch 3:16-17; Jer 24:1; Jer 27:20; Jer 28:4; Jer 29:1; Est 2:6). SEE JEHOIACHIN.

## Jeconias[[@Headword:Jeconias]]

             (Ι᾿εχονίας), a Graecized form (1Es 1:9) of the name elsewhere given (2Ch 35:9) as CONANIAH SEE CONANIAH (q.v.).

## Jedaeus[[@Headword:Jedaeus]]

             (Ι᾿εδαῖος), a less correct form (1Es 9:30) of the Hebrew name (Ezr 10:29) ADAIAH SEE ADAIAH (q.v.).

## Jedaiah[[@Headword:Jedaiah]]

             (Heb. Yedayah'), the name of several men, of different form in the original.

1. (יְדָיָה, tinvoker of Jehovah; Sept. Ε᾿διά v.r. Ι᾿εδιά and Ι᾿εδαϊvα) Son of Shimri and father of Allon, of the ancestors of Ziza, a chief Simeonite who migrated to the valley of Gedor (1Ch 4:37). B.C. long ante 711.

2. (Same Hebrew name as preceding; Sept. ‘Ieiala.) Son of Harumaph, and one of those that repaired the walls of Jerusalem after the exile (Neh 3:10). B.C. 446.

3. (יְדִעְיָה, knowing Jehovah; Sept. Ι᾿δεία) The chief of the second division of priests as arranged by David (1Ch 24:7). B.C. 1014.

4. (Same Heb. name as preceding; Sept. Ι᾿ωδαέ, Ι᾿εδδουά, Ι᾿αδία, Ι᾿δεϊvας, ᾿Ωδουϊvας, ῎Εδιος, Ι᾿εδεϊού, Αἰδειού) A priest who officiated in Jerusalem after the exile (1Ch 9:10; Neh 11:10; in which latter passage, however, he is styled the son of Joiarib, evidently the same as the Jehoiarib with whom he is merely associated in the former passage). From Ezr 2:36; Neh 7:39, he appears to have belonged to the family of Jeshua (973 of his relatives having returned with him from Babylon), so that he is probably the same with the priest Jedaiah enumerated (Neh 12:6) amongst the contemporaries of Jeshua who returned with Zerubbabel (the name apparently being repeated in Neh 12:7; comp. Neh 12:19; Neh 12:21, where the same repetition occurs, although with the mention of different sons), and probably also identical with the Jedaiah whom the prophet was directed to crown with the symbolical wreath (Zec 6:10; Zec 6:14). ῥ B.C. 536-520.

## Jedaja Penini[[@Headword:Jedaja Penini]]

             SEE PENINI, JEDAJA.

## Jeddu[[@Headword:Jeddu]]

             (Ι᾿εδδού), a corrupt form (1Es 5:24) for the Hebrew name (Ezr 2:36) JEDAIAH SEE JEDAIAH (q.v.).

## Jediael[[@Headword:Jediael]]

             [most Jedi'ael] (Heb. Yedial', יְדַיעֲאֵל, known by God; Sept. Ι᾿αδιήλ, Α᾿διήλ, Ι᾿εδιήλ), the name of at least three men.

1. One of the sons of Benjamin (1Ch 7:6), whose sons (1Ch 7:10) and descendants are enumerated as being 17,200 warriors in David's census (1Ch 7:11). He is, perhaps, the same elsewhere called ASHBEL (1Ch 8:1). SEE BENJAMIN; SEE JACOB.

2. A Shimrite (q.v.); one of David's famous bodyguard (1Ch 11:45); probably the Manassite of the same name who joined David's troop at Zikiag (1Ch 12:20). B.C. 1053-1046.

3. A Korhite of the Levitical family of Ebiasaph, second son of Meshelemiah, and one of the gate-keepers to the tabernacle or Temple (1Ch 26:2). B.C. 1014.

## Jedidah[[@Headword:Jedidah]]

             (Heb. Yedidah', יְדַידָה, beloved, Septuag. Ι᾿εδδίδα; Josephus Ι᾿εδή, Ant. 11:4, 1), daughter of Adaiah of Boskath and mother of king Josiah, consequently wife of king Amon, whom she appears to have survived (2Ki 22:1). Her character may be inferred from the piety of her son. B.C. 648-639. Jedidi'ah (Heb. Yedideyah', יְדַידנְיָה, beloved by Jehovah; Sept. Ι᾿εδιδά), the name specially given by the Lord to SOLOMON SEE SOLOMON (q.v.) at his birth, through Nathan, in token of the divine favor purposed towards him (2Sa 12:25).

## Jedithun[[@Headword:Jedithun]]

             SEE JEDUTHUN.

## Jedna[[@Headword:Jedna]]

             (Ι᾿εδνά), a town mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome (Onomnast. 5.) as lying “in the desert, six miles from Eleutheropolis towards Hebron,” precisely in which location stands the modern village Idhna (Robinson, Researches, 2, 404).

## Jeduthun[[@Headword:Jeduthun]]

             (Hebrew Yeduthun', ידוּתוּןor יְדֻתוּן; also יְדַיתוּן, Yedithun', in 1Ch 16:38; Neh 11:17; Psalms 30, 77, titles; lauder; Sept. ‘Ιιιουᾷ, but ‘ΙτΣο')5 in 1Ch 9:16), a Levite of Merari's family, and one of the four great masters of the Temple music appointed by David (1Ch 16:41-42; 1Ch 25:1, etc.). B.C. 1014. From a comparison of 1Ch 15:17; 1Ch 15:19, with 1Ch 16:41-42; 1Ch 25:1; 1Ch 25:3; 1Ch 25:6; 2Ch 35:15, some infer that he was identical with ETHAN SEE ETHAN (q.v.). In 2Ch 35:15, he bears the title of “the king's seer.” His sons sometimes appear as exercising the same office (1Ch 25:1; 1Ch 25:3), at others as door-keepers of the sacred edifice (1Ch 16:42). His name is also put for his descendants (Jeduthunites, a “sons of Jeduthun”), who occur later as singers and players on instruments (2Ch 35:15; Neh 11:17). In the latter signification it occurs in the superscriptions to Psalms 39, 62, 77; but Aben- Ezra supposes it to denote here a species of song, and Jarchi a musical instrument. The form of the phrase (עִל יְדֻתוּן, “upon Jeduthun”) favors the latter interpretation (Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. — 569), indicating a kind of instrumental music, or perhaps a style or tune of performance (Ewald, ieb. Poesie p. 176) invented or introduced by Jeduthun; a conclusion strengthened by finding a phrase indicative of authorship (לַידוּתוּן, “to Jeduthun,” i.e. composed by him); ascribed in a similar connection (Psalms 39, title), since he is elsewhere recognized as an inspired character (2Ch 35:15). SEE MUSICIAN.

## Jeejeebhoy, Sir Jamsetjee[[@Headword:Jeejeebhoy, Sir Jamsetjee]]

             a Parsee merchant prince and great philanthropist, who was born of poor parents at Bombay, July 15, 1783, and at the age of twenty had already amassed a fortune which secured him the universal acknowledgment as the “first merchant in the East,” spent a good portion of his fortune in the endowment of schools and hospitals. From 1822 to 1858 he is reported to have spent “upwards of a quarter of a million pounds sterling in founding, endowing, or supporting undertakings of a purely benevolent character;” but what is more noteworthy still is that this Parsee merchant by no means confined his charitable efforts to his own confession: Christian, Hindu, and Mussulman also shared the benefits of his magnanimous acts. In 1857  queen Victoria conferred on him the honor of knighthood the first occasion on which that dignity was bestowed on an Eastern. He died April 15,1859.

## Jeeli[[@Headword:Jeeli]]

             (Ι᾿εηλί v.r. Ι᾿ειηλεί), a corrupt Grecizel form (1Es 5:33) of the Heb. name (Ezra 2, 56) JAALAH SEE JAALAH (q.v.).

## Jeelus[[@Headword:Jeelus]]

             (Ι᾿έηλος v.r. Ι᾿εήλ), a Graecized form (1Es 8:92) of the Heb. name (Ezr 10:2) JEHIEL SEE JEHIEL (q.v.).

## Jeezer[[@Headword:Jeezer]]

             (Hebrew le'zer, אַיעֶזֶר, abridged for Abiezer; Sept. Α᾿χιέζερ), a son of Gilead of Manasseh (Num 26:30); elsewhere (Jos 17:2, etc.) called ABIEZEA SEE ABIEZEA (q.v.). The patronymic JEEZERITES (אַיעֶזֶרַי, Hcb. lezeri', Sept. Α᾿χιεζερί) is in like manner applied to his descendants (Num 26:30), elsewhere called ABIEZRITES (Jdg 6:11, etc.).

## Jeezerite[[@Headword:Jeezerite]]

             (Num 26:30). SEE JEEZER.

## Jeffery, John[[@Headword:Jeffery, John]]

             an English theologian, was born at Ipswich in 1647. He studied at Catharine Hall, Cambridge, entered the Church, and was appointed rector of Dennington, Suffolk; then of a parish in Norwich. His exemplary conduct, sound teachings, and great erudition rendered him very popular. In 1687 he obtained the livings of Kirton and Falkenham, and in 1694, Tillotson, with whom he was intimately acquainted, made him archdeacon of Norwich. He died in 1720. Jeffery was much opposed to religious controversies, holding that they generated “more heat than light.” He published Sir Thomas Browne's Christian Morals; Moral and Religious Aphorisms, taken from Dr. Wicheote's papers. A complete collection of his own Sermons and Tracts was published (London, 1753, 2 vols. 8vo). See Memoirs prefixed to the collection; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26:632; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 959.

## Jeffries, George[[@Headword:Jeffries, George]]

             an English lawyer of the crown, born about 1640, was chief justice of the King's Bench during the reign of James II, and is execrated in ecclesiastical history for his conduct towards Baxter (q.v.) and Fairfax (q.v.). He seems to have been a man of low inclinations, and a ready tool in the hands of the court. In the year 1688, after the flight of king James, he was recognized at London during the riots by the rabble, and, after “having suffered far more than the bitterness of death, he was safely lodged in the fortress (the Tower of London), where some of his most illustrious victims had passed their last days, and where his own life was destined to close in unspeakable ignominy and horror.” He died April 18,1689. No one has better delineated his character than Macaulay (History of England, vol. 2), and we refer our readers to this able master for further details. See also Neale, History of the Puritans, 2, 317 sq., 341.

## Jegar-sahadutha[[@Headword:Jegar-sahadutha]]

             (Chald. Yegar'-Sahadutha', יְגִר שָׂהֲוּתָא, pile of the testimony; Sept. βουνὸς τῆςμαρτυρίας, Vulgate tumulus testis), the Aramsean name given by Laban as a Syrian to the mound of stones erected as a memorial of his league with Jacob, whereas the latter styled it (Gen 31:47) by the equivalent. Hebrew name of GAL-EED SEE GAL-EED q.v.).

## Jehaleleel[[@Headword:Jehaleleel]]

             [many Jehal'elel] (Heb. Yehallelel', יְהִלֶּלְאֵל, praiser of God), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿αλλελήλ, Vulg. Jaleleel.) A descendant of Judah, several of whose sons are enumerated, although his own immediate parentage is not mentioned (1Ch 4:16). B.C. apparently cir. 1618.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿αλλήλ) Vulg. Jalaleel, Auth.Vers. “Jehalelel.”) A Levite of the family of Merari, whose son Azariah aided in restoring the Temple services under Hezekiah (2Ch 29:12). B.C. ante 726.

## Jehalelel[[@Headword:Jehalelel]]

             (2Ch 29:12). SEE JEHALELEEL, 2. Jehdei'ah [some Jehde'iah or Jehdei'ah] (Hebrew Yechdeyah', only in the paragogic form  יֶחְדְּיָהוּ, Vecideya'hu, rejoicer in Jehovah; Sept. Ι᾿αδαϊvα, Ι᾿αδίας), the name of two men.

1. A descendant of Shubael or Shebuel, of the family of Gershom, who appears to have been head of a division of the Levitical Temple attendants as arranged by David (1Ch 24:20; comp. 23:16). B.C. 1014.

2. A Meronothite, and herdsman of the royal asses under David and Solomon (1Ch 27:30). B.C. 1014. Jehez'ekel (1Ch 24:16). SEE Ezekiel , 1. Jehi'ah (Hebrew Yechiyah', יְחַיָּה, Jehovah's living one; Sept. Ι᾿εαϊά), a Levite associated with Obed-edom as door- keeper of the sacred ark when brought by David to Jerusalem (1Ch 15:24); elsewhere (1Ch 15:18) called JEHIEL SEE JEHIEL (q.v.). Jehi'el (Heb. Yechiel', יְחַיאֵל, God's living one),. the name of several men.

1. (1Ch 9:35.) SEE JEIEL, 1.

2. (1Ch 11:44.) SEE JEIEL, 2.

3. (Sept. Ι᾿εϊήλ or Ι᾿ειήλ, but v.r. Ι᾿αδιήλ in 1Ch 16:5.) One of the Levites “of the second degree” appointed by David to execute the music on the occasion of the removal of the ark to Jerusalem (1Ch 15:18-20, in which latter passage they are said to have performed “with psalteries on Alamoth”). He is apparently the same with the person mentioned (1Ch 15:24) by the synonymous name JEHIAH, although; from the similar collocation of names, others have confounded this with the JEIEL of ch. 1Ch 16:5, a name of different signification. He is probably identical with the one named as chief amongst the three descendants of Laadan (i.e. Libni) arranged by David in charge of the Temple porters (1Ch 23:8, and hence likewise with the Gershonite with whom were deposited the gems offered by the people for the sacred structures and utensils (1Ch 29:8). B.C. 1043-1014. It is doubtless his descendants who were called JEHIELITES (Hebrew Yechieli, יְחַיאֵלַיSept. Ι᾿ειήλ, A.V. “Jehieli,” 1Ch 26:21-22).

4. (Sept. Ι᾿εριήλ, Ι᾿εήλ, Vulg. Jahiel.) A Hachmonite (“son of Hachmoni”) who appears to have been tutor in the royal family towards the close of David's reign (1Ch 27:32). B.C. cir. 1030. “The mention of Ahithophel (1Ch 27:33) seems to fix the date of this list. as before the revolt. In Jerome's Qucest. lebraicce on this passage, Jehiel is said to be David's  son Chileab or Daniel; and ‘Achamoni,' interpreted as Sapientissi mus, is taken as an alias of David himself” (Smith).

5. (Sept. Ι᾿εϊήλ) The second-named of the six sons of king Jehoshaphat (2Ch 21:2), exclusive of his first-born and heir, Jehoram, who, on his accession, murdered all his brothers (2Ch 21:4). B.C. 887.

6. (Sept. Ι᾿εϊήλ) A descendant of Heman, and one of the Levites who assisted Hezekiah in his reformation of the public religion (2Ch 29:14, where the Hebrew text has יְחוּאֵל, Vechuel'), and who eventually was appointed one of the superintendents. of the sacred offerings (31:13). B.C. 726.

7. (Sept. Ι᾿εϊήλ.) One of those who contributed liberally to the renewal of the Temple sacrifices under Josiah; stated to have been a “prince” or courtier, and, at the same time. a:' ruler of the house of God,” which implies some union of civil and religious functions (2Ch 35:8). B.C. 623.

8. (Sept. Ι᾿εειήλ v.r. Ι᾿εϊήλ.) The father of Obadiah, which latter returned with his relatives of the sons of Joab, 218 males, from Babylon with Ezra (Ezr 8:9). B.C. ante 459.

9. (Sept. Ι᾿εήλ v.r. Ι᾿εειήλ, also Ι᾿αϊήλ v.r. Αἰειήλ) One of the “sons” of Elam (? Persian) who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:26); probably the same with the father of Shechaniah, who proposed that measure (Ezr 10:2). B.C. 459.

10. (Sept. Ι᾿ειήλ v.r. Ι᾿εήλ) One of the priests, “sons” of Harim, who divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity (Ezr 10:21). B.C. 459.

## Jehieli[[@Headword:Jehieli]]

             (1Ch 26:21-22). SEE JEHIEL, 3.

## Jehizkiah[[@Headword:Jehizkiah]]

             (Heb. Yechizkiyah', only in the paragogic form Yechizkiya'hu, יְחַזְקַיָּהוּ, i.e. HEZEKIAH; Sept. Ε᾿ζεκίας), son of Shallum,' one of the Ephraimitish leaders who, at the instance of the prophet Oded (q.v.), insisted upon the liberation and humane treatment of the captives taken and brought to  Samaria in the incursion of Pekah upon the kingdom of Judah. (2Ch 28:12; comp. 8,13,15). B.C. cir. 738.

## Jehoadah[[@Headword:Jehoadah]]

             (Heb. Yehoiddah', יְהוֹעִדָּה, Jehovah is his ornament; Sept. Ι᾿ωιαδά v.r. Ι᾿αδά), son of Ahaz, and father of Alemeth and others of the descendants of Saul through Mephibosheth (1Ch 8:36), called JARAH ( יִעְרָהYarah', dropping of honey, as in 1Sa 14:27, otherwise woodsman, but more probably a corrupt reading for יִעְדָּה, Yahda', i.q. Jehoadah; Sept. Ι᾿αδά, Vulg. Jara) in the parallel passage (1Ch 9:42).. B.C. considerably post 1037. Jehoad'dan (Heb. ‘Yehoaddan', יְהוֹעִדָּן,i. q. Jehoadah; Sept. Ι᾿ωαδέν), a female of Jerusalem, mother of king Amaziah, and consequently wife of king Jehoash, whom she appears to have survived (1Ki 14:2; 2Ch 25:1; in the former of which passages the text has יְהוֹעִדַּין, Yehoaddin'). Her character may perhaps be inferred from the partially good conduct. of her son. B.C. 862-837.

## Jehoahaz[[@Headword:Jehoahaz]]

             (Heb. Yehoachaz', יְהוֹאָהָז, Jehovah is his holder, i.e. sustainer; Sept. Ι᾿ωαχαζ; written also in the contracted form יוֹאָחָז, Yodchaz', 2Ki 14:1; 2Ch 34:8; 2Ch 26:2; 2Ch 26:4; Sept. Ι᾿ωάχαζ; A.V. ‘Jehoahaz”), the name of thiee kings. SEE JOAHAZ.

1. One of the names of the youngest son of Jehoram of Judah (2Ch 21:17, Sept. Ο᾿χοζίας,), and father of Josiah (2Ch 25:23, Sept. Ι᾿ωάχαζ); usually called AHAZIAH SEE AHAZIAH (q.v.).

2. The son and successor of Jehu, the twelfth separate king of Israel (2Ki 10:35). He reigned seventeen years, B.C. 855-838 (Josephus Ι᾿ώαζος, Ant. 9:8, 5). As he followed the evil courses of the house of Jeroboam, the Syrians, under Hazael and Benhdadad, were suffered to prevail over him; so that at length he had only left, of all his forces, fifty horsemen, ten chariots, and 10,000 foot. Overwhelmed by his calamities, Jehoahaz at length acknowledged the authority of Jehovah over Israel, and humbled himself before him, in consideration of which a deliverer was raised up for Israel in the person of Jehoash, this king's son (B.C. 841, whence the latter's viceroyship is dated, 2Ki 13:10), who was  enabled to expel the Syrians and re-establish the affairs of the kingdom (2Ki 13:1-9; 2Ki 13:25). SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

3. The third of the four sons of Josiah by Hamutal, born B.C. 632, originally called SHALLUM, seventeenth separate king over Judah for three months only, B.C. 609 (Josephus Ι᾿ωάχαζος, Ant. 10, 5, 2). After his father had been slain in resisting the progress of Pharaoh-necho, Jehoahaz, who was then twenty-three years of age, was raised to the throne by the people in preference to his elder brother Jehoiakim (2Ki 23:31; 2Ki 23:36), and received at Jerusalem the regal anointing, which seems to have been usually omitted in times of order and of regular succession (the oldest brother, Johanan [1Ch 3:15], having apparently died without issue, and Zedekiah being yet too young [2Ch 26:11]). He found the land full of trouble, but free from idolatry. Instead, however, of following the excellent example of his father, Jehoahaz fell into the accustomed crimes of his predecessors, and, under the encouragements which his example or indifference offered, the idols soon reappeared. He is therefore described by his contemporaries as an evil-doer (2Ki 23:32) and an oppressor (Eze 19:3), and such is his traditional character in Josephus (Ant. 10:5, 2); but his deposition seems to have been lamented by the people (Jer 22:10; Eze 19:1). Pharaoh- necho, on his victorious return from the Euphrates, thinking it politic to reject a king not nominiated by himself, removed him from the throne, and set thereon his brother Jehoiakim. The deposed king was at first taken as a prisoner to Riblah, in Syria, but was eventually carried to Egypt, where he died (2Ki 23:30-35; 2Ch 36:1-4; 1Ch 3:15; Jer 22:10; Jer 22:12). See Prideaux, Connection, an. 610; Ewald, Gesch. Isr. 3, 719; Rosenmüller, Schol. in Jer 22:11.

SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

## Jehoash[[@Headword:Jehoash]]

             (Heb. Yehoish', יְהיֹאָשׁ, Jehovah-given; in most of the passages in 2 Kings ‘only; more usually in the contracted form Yoash', יוֹאָשׁ, “Joash,” Sept. Ι᾿ωάς, Josephus Ι᾿ώασος), the name of two kings. SEE JOASH.

1. The son of king Ahaziah by Libnah of Beersheba,' was born B.C. 884; made king at the age of-seven years, and reigned eighth over the separated kingdom of Judah forty years, B.C. 877-837. Jehoash, when an infant, was. secretly-saved by his aunt Jehoshebath, who was married to the high-priest Jehoiada, from the general massacre of the family by Athaliah, who had usurped the throne. SEE JEHOIALA. Jehoram having himself killed all his own brethren, and all his sons, except Ahaziah, having been killed by the irruption ‘of the Philistines and Arabians, and all Ahaziah's remoter relations having been slain by Jehu and now all his sons being put to death by Athaliah (2Ch 21:4; 2Ch 21:17; 2Ch 22:1; 2Ch 22:8-10), the house of David was reduced to the lowest ebb, and Jehoash appears to have been the only surviving descendant of Solomon. By the high-priest and his wife the child was privately brought up in the chambers connected with the Temple till he was in his eighth year, when Jehoiada deemed that the state of ‘affairs required him to produce the youthful heir of the throne to the people, and claim for him the crown which his grandmother had so unrighteously usurped. Finding the influential persons whom he consulted favorable to the design, everything was secretly but admirably arranged for producing Jehoash, and investing him with the regalia, in such a manner that Athaliah could have no suspicion of the event till it actually occurred. On the day appointed, the sole surviving scion of David's illustrious house appeared in the place of the kings, by a particular pillar in the Temple court, and was crowned and anointed with the usual ceremonies. The high wrought enthusiasm of the spectators then found vent in clapping of hands and exulting shouts of “Long live the king!” The joyful uproar was heard even in the palace, and brought Athaliah to the Temple, from which, at a word from Jehoiada, she was led to her death. SEE ATHALIAH.

Jehoash behaved well during his minority, and so long after as he remained under the influence of the high priest. Excepting that the high-places were still resorted to ‘for incense and sacrifice, pure religion was restored, large contributions were made for the repair of the Temple, which was accordingly restored, and the country seems to have been free from foreign invasion and domestic disturbance. But when this venerable adviser died the king seems to have felt himself relieved from a yoke, and, to manifest  his freedom, began to take the contrary course to that which he had followed while under pupilage. Gradually the persons who had possessed influence formerly, when the house of David was contaminated by its alliance with the house of Ahab, insinuated themselves into his councils, and ere long the worship of Jehovah and the observances of the law were neglected, and the land was defiled with idolatries and idolatrous usages. The prophets then uttered their warnings, but were not heard;' and the infatuated king had the atrocious ingratitude to put to death Zechariah, the son and successor of his benefactor Jehoiada. For these deeds Jehoash was made an example of the divine judgments. He saw his realm devastated by the Syrians under Hazael; his armies were cut in pieces by an enemy of inferior numbers; and he was even besieged in Jerusalem, and only preserved his capital and crown by giving up the treasures of the Temple. Besides this, a painful malady embittered all his latter days, and at length he became so odious that his own servants conspired against him, and slew him on his bed.' They are said to have done this to avenge the blood of Zechariah, who at his death had cried, “The Lord look upon it and require it';” and it is hence probable that public opinion ascribed all the calamities of his life and reign to that-infamous deed. SEE ZECHARAI. Jehoash was buried in the city of David, but a place in the sepulchre of the kings was denied to his remains (2 Kings 11; 2 Kings 12; 2 Chronicles 24). He is one of the three kings (Ahaziah, Jehoash, Amaziah) omittted by Matthew in the genealogy of Christ (Mat 1:8).

With regard to the different, accounts of the Syrian invasion given in 2 Kings and in 2 Chronicles, which have led some (as Thenius and many other commentators) to imagine two distinct Syrian invasions, and others to see a direct contradiction, or at least a strange incompleteness in the narratives, as Winer, the difficulty exists solely in the minds of the critics. SEE SYRIA. The narrative given above, which is also that of Keil and Eo Bertheau (Exe. Handb. z. A. T.) as well as of Josephus (Ant. 9:8. 1) perfectly suits the two accounts, which are merely different abridgments of the one fuller account contained in the original chronicles of the kingdom. SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

2. The son and successor of Jehoahaz, king of Israel; reigned thirteenth over the separate kingdom sixteen (nominal) years, B.C. 838-823, and for about one year contemporaneously with his namesake of Judah (2Ki 14:1; comp. with 12:1, 13:10). When he succeeded to the crown the kingdom was in a deplorable state from the devastations of Hazael and  Benhadad, kings of Syria, of whose power at this time we had also evidence in the preceding article. Jehoash, it is true, followed the example of his predecessors in the policy of keeping up the worship of the golden calves; but, apart from this, he bears a fair character, and had intervals, at least, of sincere piety and true devotion to the God of his fathers (comp. Josephus, Ant. 9, 8, 6). Indeed, custom and long habit had so established the views of political expediency on which the schismatical establishments at Dan and Bethel were founded, that at length the reprehension which regularly recurs in the record of each king's reign seems rather to apply to it as a mark of the continuance of a public crime than as indicative of the character or disposition of the reigning prince, which is to be sought in the more detailed accounts of his own conduct. These accounts are favorable with respect to Jehoash. He held the prophet. Elisha in high honor, looking up to him as a father. When he heard of his last illness he repaired to the bedside of the dying prophet, wept over his face, and addressed him as “the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof.” The prophet promised him deliverance from the Syrian yoke in Aphelk, the scene of Ahab's great victory over a former Benhadad (1Ki 20:26-30). He then bid him smite upon the ground, and the king smote thrice and then stayed. The prophet rebuked him for staying, and limited to three his victories over Syria.

These promises were accomplished after the prophet's death. God took compassion upon the extreme misery of Israel, and, in remembrance of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, interposed to save them from entire destruction. In three signal and successive victories Jehoash overcame the Syrians and retook from them the towns which Hazael had rent from Israel. These advantages rendered the kingdom of Israel more potent than that of Judah. Jehoash, however, sought no quarrel with that kingdom, but he nevertheless became involved in a war with Amaziah, king of Jadah. The grounds of this war are given fully in 2 Chronicles 25. SEE AMAZIAH.

The hiring of 100,000 men of Israel for 100 talents of silver by Amaziah is the only instance on record of such a transaction and implies that at that time the kingdom of Israel was free from all fear of the Syrians. These mercenary soldiers, having been dismissed by Amaziah, at the instigation of a prophet, without being allowed to take part in the Edomitish expedition, returned in great wrath to their own country, and sacked and plundered the cities of Judah in revenge for the slight put upon them, and also to indemnify themselves for the loss of their share of the  plunder. It was to avenge this injury that Amaziah, on his return from his triumph over the Edomites, declared war against Jehoash, in spite of the warning of the prophet; but Jehoash, when he received the defiance from Amaziah, answered with becoming spirit in a parable (q.v.), which by its images calls to mind that of Jotham; the cool disdain of the answer must have been, and in fact was, exceedingly galling to Amaziah: “The thistle that was in Lebanon sent to the cedar that was in Lebanon, saying, Give thy daughter to my son to wife; and there came by a wild beast that was in Lebanon and trod down the thistle.” This was admirable; nor was the application less so: “Thou has indeed smitten Edom, and thine heart hath lifted thee up: glory of this and tarry at home; for why shouldest thou meddle to thy hurt, that thou shouldest fall, even thou and Judah with thee.” In the war, or, rather, action which followed, Jehoash was victorious. Having defeated Amaziah at Beth-shemesh, in Judah, he advanced to Jerusalem, broke down the wall to the extent of 400 cubits and carried away the treasures both of the Temple and the palace, together with hostages for the future good behavior of the crestfallen Amaziah. Jehoash himself did not long survive this victory; he died in peace and was buried in Samaria (2Ki 14:1-17). SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

## Jehohanan[[@Headword:Jehohanan]]

             (Heb. Yehochanan', יְחֹוֹחָנָןJehovah-granted, q.d. θεοδῶρος), the name of several men. SEE JOHANAN; SEE JOHN, etc.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿ωνάν) A Korhite and head of the sixth division of Levitical Temple porters (1Ch 26:3). B.C. 1014.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿ωανάν) Jehoshaphat's second “captain,” in command of 280,000 (?) men (2Ch 17:15); probably the same whose son Ishmael supported Jehoiada in his restoration of prince Jehoash (2Ch 23:1). B.C. cir. 910.

3. (Sept. Ι᾿ωανάν, Auth. Vers. “Johanan.”) The father of Azariah, which latter was one of the Ephraimite chiefs who insisted upon the return of the captives from the rival kingdom (2Ch 28:12). B.C. ante 738.

4. (Sept. Ι᾿ωανάν, A. Vers. “Johanan.”) A priest, the “son” of Eliashib, into whose chamber Ezra retired to bewail the profligacy of his countrymen in marrying Gentile wives (Ezr 10:6); doubtless the same elsewhere  called JOHANAN in the original (Neh 12:22-23) and perhaps identical with No. 7 below.

5. (Sept. Ι᾿ωανάν) One of the “sons” of Bebai, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Babylonian exile (Ezr 10:28). B.C. 459.

6. (Sept. Ι᾿ωνάθαν v.r. Ι᾿ωνάν, Auth. Vers. “Johanan.”) Son of Tobiah, the Samaritan enemy of the Jews; and son-in-law of Meshullam (Neh 6:18). B.C. 446.

7. (Sept. Ι᾿ωνάν) One of the priests who celebrated with music the reparation of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh 12:42). B.C. 446. He was perhaps the same with No. 4 or No. 8.

8. (Sept. Ι᾿ωανάν) A leading priest, the “son” of Amariah and contemporary with Joiakim (Neh 12:13). B.C. cir. 406. He may have been identical with the preceding.

## Jehoiachin[[@Headword:Jehoiachin]]

             (Heb. Yehoyakin', יְהוֹיָכַין, Jehovah appointed; Sept. Ι᾿εχονίαςin in 2Ki 24:6; 2Ki 24:8; 2Ki 24:12; 2Ki 24:15; 2Ki 25:27; Ι᾿εχονίαςin 2Ch 36:8-9; Ι᾿ωακείμ in Jer 52:31; Josephus Ι᾿ωάχιμος Ant. 10, 6, 3; 7, 1; N. Test. Ι᾿εχονίας, “Jechonias,” Mat 1:11-12; contracted once יוֹיָכַין, Yoyakin', Eze 1:2, Sept. Ι᾿ωακείμ, Auth. Vers. “Jehoiachin”), also in the contracted forms JECONIAH (יְכָנְיָה, Yekonyah', Sept. Ι᾿εχονίας in Jer 27:20; Jer 28:4; Jer 29:2; 1Ch 3:16-17; but omits in Est 2:6; likewise paragogic יְכָנְיָהוּ, Yekonya'hu, Jer 24:1; Sept. Ι᾿εχονίας) and CONIAH (Konyah', only paragogic כָּנְיָהוּ, Konya'hu, Jer 22:24; Jer 22:28; Jer 37:1, Sept. Ι᾿εχονίας), son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, by Nehushta, daughter of Elnathan of Jerusalem; he succeeded his father as the nineteenth monarch of that separate kingdom, but only for three months and ten days, B.C. 598. He was then eighteen years of age according to 2Ki 24:8, but only eight according to 2Ch 36:9. Many attempts have been made to reconcile these dates (see J. D. Müller, De reb. duar. tribuum regni Jud. adversis, Lipsiae, 1745; Oeder, Freie Untersuch. über einige Alttest. — Bucher, p. 214; Offerhaus, Spicileg. p. 193), the most usual solution being that he had reigned ten years in conjunction with his father, so that he was eight when he began his joint reign, but eighteen when he began to reign alone. There are, however,  difficulties in this view which, perhaps, leave it the safest course to conclude that “eight”: in 2Ch 26:9, is a corruption of the text, such as might easily occur from the relation of the numbers eight and eighteen. (All the versions read eighteen in Kings and so the Vulg. and many MSS. of the Sept. in Chronicles, as well as at 1Es 1:43. Among recent commentators, Keil, Thenius, and Hitzig favor the reading eighteen, while Bertheau prefers eight. The language in Jer 22:24-30 is not decisive, for the epithets there applied to Jechoniah do not necessarily imply adult age, although they more naturally agree with it. The same remark applies to the allusion in Eze 19:5-9. The decided reprobation, however, in 2Ki 24:9, and in 2Ch 36:9, would hardly be used of a mere child. The mention of his mother in 2Ki 24:12 does not imply his minority, for the queen dowager was a very important member of the royal family. The number eight, indeed, would bring Jehoiachin's birth in the year of the beginning of the captivity by Nebuchadnezzar's invasion and thus exactly agree with the language in Mat 1:11; but the expression “and his brethren” added there, as well as the language of the following verse, agrees better with a less precise correspondence, as likewise the qualifying “about” indicates. The argument drawn from his father's age at death, thirty-six [2Ki 23:36], is favorable to Jehoiachin's maturity at the time, for most of these kings became fathers very early, Josiah, e.g., at fifteen [2Ki 22:1, comp. with 23:36].) He was, therefore, born in B.C. 616.

Jehoiachin followed the evil courses which had already brought so much disaster upon the royal house of David and upon the people under its sway. He seems to have very speedily indicated a political bias adverse to the interests of the Chaldaean empire, for in three months after his accession we find the generals of Nebuchadnezzar again laying siege to Jerusalem, according to the predictions of Jeremiah (Jer 22:24-30). Jehoiachin had come to the throne at a time when Egypt was still prostrate in consequence of the victory at Carchemish and when the Jews had been for three or four years harassed and distressed by the inroads of the armed bands of Chaldaeans, Ammonites, and Moabites, sent against them by Nebuchadnezzar in consequence of Jehoiakim's rebellion. SEE JEHOIAKIM.

Jerusalem at this time, therefore, was quite defenseless and unable to offer any resistance to the regular army which Nebuchadnezzar sent to besiege it in the eighth year of his reign and which he seems to have joined in person after the siege was commenced (2Ki 24:10-11). In  a very short time, apparently, and without any losses from famine or fighting which would indicate a serious resistance, Jehoiachin surrendered at discretion; and he, and the queen mother, and all his servants, captains, and officers, came out and gave themselves up to Nebuchadnezzar, who treated them, with the harem and the eunuchs, as prisoners of war (Jer 29:2; Eze 17:12; Eze 19:9). He was sent away as a captive to Babylon, with his mother, his generals, and his troops, together with the artificers and other inhabitants of Jerusalem, to the number of ten thousand. (This number, found in 2Ki 24:14, is probably a round number, made up of the 7000 soldiers of 2Ki 24:16 and the 3023 nobles of Jer 52:28, exclusive of the 1000 artificers mentioned in 2Ki 24:16; see Brown's Ordo Soeclorum, p. 186.) Among these was the prophet Ezekiel. Few were left but the poorer sort of people and the unskilled laborers; few indeed, whose presence could be useful in Babylon or dangerous in Palestine. SEE CAPTIVITY.

Neither did the Babylonian king neglect to remove the treasures which could yet be gleaned from the palace or the Temple and he now made spoil of those sacred vessels of gold which had been spared on former occasions. These were cut up for present use of the metal or for more convenient transport, whereas those formerly taken had been sent to Babylon entire and there laid up as trophies of victory. If the Chaldaean king had then put an end to the show of a monarchy and annexed the country to his own dominions, the event would probably have been less unhappy for the nation; but, still adhering to his former policy, he placed on the throne Mattaniah, the only surviving son of Josiah, whose name he changed to Zedekiah (2Ki 24:11-16; 2Ch 36:9-10; Jer 37:1). SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR.

Jehoiachin remained a captive at Babylon — actually in prison (בֵּית כֶּלֶא) and wearing prison garments (Jer 52:31; Jer 52:33) — for thirty-six years, viz. during the lifetime of Nebuchadnezzar; but, when that prince died, his son, Evil-merodach, not only released him, but gave him an honorable seat at his own table, with precedence over all the other dethroned kings who were kept at Babylon and an allowance for the support of his rank (2Ki 25:27-30; Jer 52:31-34). B.C. 561. To what he owed this favor we are not told, but the Jewish commentators allege that Evil-merodach had himself been put into prison by his father during the last years of his reign and had there contracted an intimate friendship with the deposed king of Judah. We learn from Jer 28:4 that, four years after Jehoiachin had gone to Babylon,  there was a great expectation at Jerusalem of his return, but it does not appear whether Jehoiachin himself shared this hope at Babylon. The tenor of Jeremiah's letter to the elders of the captivity (Jeremiah 29) would, however, indicate that there was a party among the captivity, encouraged by false prophets, who were at this time looking forward to Nebuchadnezzar's overthrow and Jehoiachin's return; and perhaps the fearful death of Ahab, the son of Kolaiah (Jer 29:22), and the close confinement of Jehoiachin through Nebuchadnezzar's reign, may have been the result of some disposition to conspire against Nebuchadnezzar on the part of a portion of the captivity. But neither Daniel or Ezekiel, who were Jehoiachin's fellow captives, make any further allusion to him, except that Ezekiel dates his prophecies by the year “of king Jehoiachin's captivity” (Eze 1:2; Eze 8:1; Eze 24:1, etc.); the latest date being “the twenty-seventh year” (Eze 29:17; Eze 40:1).

We also learn from Est 2:6 that Kish, the ancestor of Mordecai, was Jehoiachin's fellow captive. But the apocryphal books are more communicative. Thus the author of the book of Baruch (Bar 1:3) introduces “Jechonias, the son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah,” into his narrative and represents Baruch as reading his prophecy in his ears and in the ears of the king's sons, and the nobles and elders and people, at Babylon. At the hearing of Baruch's words, it is added, they wept and fasted and prayed, and sent a collection of silver to Jerusalem, to Joiakim, the son of Hilkiah, the son of Shallum, the high priest, with which to purchase burnt offerings, and sacrifices and incense, bidding them pray for the prosperity of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar his son. The history of Susanna and the elders also apparently makes Jehoiachin an important personage, for, according to the author, the husband of Susanna was Joiakim, a man of great wealth, and the chief person among the captives, to whose house all the people resorted for judgment — a description which suits Jehoiachin. Africanus (Ep. ad Orig.; Routh, Rel. Sac. 2:113) expressly calls Susanna's husband king and says that the king of Babylon had made him his royal companion (σύνθρονος). He is also mentioned in 1Es 5:5, but the text seems to be corrupt. That Zedekiah, who in 1Ch 3:16 is called “his son,” is the same as Zedekiah his uncle (called “his brother” in 2Ch 36:10), who was his successor on the throne, seems certain. But it is probable that “Assir” ( אִסַּר= captive), who is reckoned amongst the family of Jeconiah in 1Ch 3:17, may really have been only an appellative of Jeconiah himself (see Bertheau on 1Ch 3:16). SEE ASSIR.

In the genealogy of Christ (Mat 1:11) he is named in the received text  as the “son of Josias” his grandfather, the name of Jehoiakim having probably been omitted by erroneous transcription. SEE GENEALOGY.

In the dark portrait of his early character by the prophet (Jer 22:30), the expression “Write ye this man childless” refers to his having no successor on the throne, for he had children (see Meth. Quar. Review, Oct. 1852, p. 602-4). SEE SALATHIEL.

Josephus, however (Ant. 10, 7,1), gives him a fair character (see Keil, Commentary on Kings p. 602). The compiler of 1 Esd. gives the name of Jechonias to Jehoahaz, the son of Josiah, who reigned three months after Josiah's death and was deposed and carried to Egypt by Pharaoh-necho (1Es 1:34, 2Ki 23:30). He is followed in this blunder by Epiphanius (1:21), who says “Josiah begat Jechoniah, who is also called Shallum. This Jechoniah begat Jechoniah who is called Zedekiah and Joakim.” It has its origin, doubtless, in the confusion of the names when written in Greek by writers ignorant of Hebrew. SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

## Jehoiada[[@Headword:Jehoiada]]

             (Hebrew Yehôyada', יְהוֹיָדָעJehovah known; Sept. Ι᾿ωιαδά, Ι᾿ωιαδέ, Ι᾿ωδαέ), the name of two or more priests.

1. The father of Benaiah, which latter was one of David's chief warriors (2Sa 8:18; 2Sa 20:23; 2Sa 23:20; 2Sa 23:22; 1Ki 1:8; 1Ki 1:26; 1Ki 1:32; 1Ki 1:36; 1Ki 1:38; 1Ki 1:44; 1Ki 2:25; 1Ki 2:29; 1Ki 2:34-35; 1Ki 2:16; 1Ki 4:4; 1Ch 11:22; 1Ch 11:24; 1Ch 18:17; 1Ch 27:5). B.C. ante 1046. He is probably the same mentioned as assisting David at Hebron as leader (נָגַיד) of 3700 armed Aaronites (1Ch 12:27); Josephus, who calls him Ι᾿ώδαμος, says 4700 Levites (Ant. 7, 2, 3). In 1Ch 27:34, his name seems to have been erroneously transposed with that of his son.

2. The high priest at the time of Athaliah's usurpation of the throne of Judah (B.C. 883-877) and during the most of the reign of Jehoash. It does not appear when he first became high priest, but it may have been as early as the latter part of Jehoshaphat's reign. He married Jehosheba or Jehoshabeath, daughter of king Jehoram and sister of king Ahaziah (2Ch 22:11); and when Athaliah slew all the royal family of Judah after Ahaziah had been put to death by Jehul, he and his wife stole Jehoash from amongst the king's sons and hid him for six years in the Temple and eventually replaced him on the throne of his ancestors. SEE ATHALIAH.

In effecting this happy revolution, by which both the throne of David and the  worship of the true God according to the law of Moses were rescued from imminent danger of destruction, Jehoiada displayed great ability and prudence. Waiting patiently till the tyranny of Athaliah and, we may presume, her foreign practices and preferences had produced disgust in the land, he at length, in the 7th year of her reign, entered into secret alliance with all the chief partisans of the house of David and of the true religion. He also collected at Jerusalem the Levites from the different cities of Judah and Israel, probably under cover of providing for the Temple services, and then concentrated a large and concealed force in the Temple by the expedient of not dismissing the old courses of priests and Levites when their successors came to relieve them on the Sabbath. By means of the consecrated shields and spears which David had taken in his wars, and which were preserved in the treasury of the Temple (comp. 1Ch 18:7-11; 1Ch 26:20-28; 1Ki 14:26-27), he supplied the captains of hundreds with arms for their men. Having then divided the priests and Levites into three bands, which were posted at the principal entrances, and filled the courts with people favorable to the cause, he produced the young king before the whole assembly, and crowned and anointed him, and presented to him a copy of the Law according to Deu 17:18-20. SEE HILKIAH.

The excitement of the moment did not make him forget the sanctity of God's house. None but the priests and ministering Levites were permitted by him to enter the Temple and he gave strict orders that Athaliah should be carried without its precincts before she was put to death. In the same spirit he inaugurated the new reign by a solemn covenant between himself as high priest, and the people and the king, to renounce the Baal worship which had been introduced by the house of Ahab and to serve Jehovah. This was followed up by the immediate destruction of the altar and temple of Baal and the death of Mattan, his priest. He then gave orders for the due celebration of the Temple service, and, at the same time, for the perfect reestablishment of the monarchy, all which seems to have been effected with great vigor and success, and without any cruelty or violence. The young king himself, under this wise and virtuous counsellor, ruled his kingdom well and prosperously and was forward in works of piety during the lifetime of Jehoiada. The reparation of the Temple, in the 23d year of his reign, of which a full and interesting account is given in 2 Kings 12 and 2 Chronicles 24 was one of the most important works at this period. At length, however, Jehoiada died and for his signal services to his God, his king, and his country, which have earned him a place amongst the very  foremost well doers in Israel, he had the unique honor of burial amongst the kings of Judah in the city of David. — Smith. His decease, though at an advanced age, yet occurred too soon for the welfare of the nation and of Jehoash, who thereupon immediately fell into idolatry, and was even guilty of the most cruel ingratitude towards the family of Jehoiada. SEE JEHOASH, 1.

His age at his death is stated (2Ch 24:15) to have been 130 years, which Hervey (Genealogy of our Lord, p. 304) proposes to change to 103, in order to lessen the presumed disparity between Jehoiada's age and that of his wife, as well as on the ground that a man of 90 could hardly have exhibited such energy as he displayed in displacing Athaliah; but the change is wholly arbitrary and unnecessary. Josephus, in his history (Ant. 9, 7, 1, where he Graecizes the name, Ι᾿ώδαος), follows the Bible account; but in his list of the high priests (Ant. 10, 8, 6), the corresponding name seems to be Axioramus (Α᾿ξεώραμος, perhaps by corruption for “Joram”). In the Jewish chronicle (Seder Olam), however, it correctly appears as Jehoiadah and with a date tolerably answering to the scriptural requirements. In both authorities, many of the adjoining names are additional to those mentioned in the O.T. SEE HIGH PRIEST.

It is probably this Jehoiada who is alluded to in Jer 29:26 as a preeminent incumbent of the office (see Rosenmüller and Hitzig, ad loc.), and he is doubtless the same with the BERECHIAH (Βαραχίας) of Mat 23:25. SEE ZEDEKIAH.

3. (Neh 3:6). SEE JOIADA.

## Jehoiakim[[@Headword:Jehoiakim]]

             (Heb. Yehôyakinm', יְהוֹיָקַים, Jehovah established; Sept. Ι᾿ωαλόμ, oftener Ι᾿ωακείμ, Josephus Ι᾿ωάκιμος; compare JOIAKIM, JOKIM), the second son of Josiah by Zebudah, daughter of Pedaiah of Rumah (probably the Dumah of Jos 15:52); born B.C. 634, and eighteenth king of the separate throne of Judah for a period of eleven years, B.C. 609-598. He is mentioned in 2Ki 23:34-36; 2Ki 24:1; 2Ki 24:5-6; 2Ki 24:19; 1Ch 3:15-16; 2Ch 36:4-5; 2Ch 36:8; Jer 1:3; Jer 22:18; Jer 22:24; Jer 24:1; Jer 25:1; Jer 26:1; Jer 26:21-23; Jer 27:1; Jer 27:20; Jer 28:4; Jer 35:1; Jer 36:1; Jer 36:9; Jer 36:28-30; Jer 36:32; Jer 37:1; Jer 45:1; Jer 46:2; Jer 52:2; Dan 1:1-2. His original name was ELIAKIM SEE ELIAKIM (q.v.), but the equivalent name of Jehoiakim was given him by the Egyptian king who set him on his father's throne (2Ki 23:34). This change is significant of his dependence and loss of liberty, as heathen kings were accustomed to give new names to those who entered their  service (Gen 41:45; Ezr 5:14; Dan 1:7), usually after their gods. In this case, as the new name is Israelitish, it is probable that Pharaoh-necho gave it at the request of Eliakim himself, whom Hengstenberg supposes to have been influenced by a desire to place his name in closer connection with the promise (2Sa 7:12); where not El, but Jehovah is the promiser; and to have done this out of opposition to the sentence of the prophets respecting the impending fall of the house of David (Christol. 2:401, Eng. trans.). There exists the most striking contrast between his beautiful name and his miserable fate (Jer 22:19). ( SEE ECKHIRD, Vom Esels-Begräbniss, Lpz. 1716.) SEE NAME.

Jehoiakim's younger brother Jehoahaz, or Shallum, as he is called Jer 22:11, had been in the first instance made king by the people of the land on the death of his father Josiah, probably with the intention of following up Josiah's policy, which was to side with Nebuchadnezzar against Egypt, being, as Prideaux thinks, bound by oath to the kings of Babylon (Jeremiah 1:50). SEE JEHOAHAZ.

Pharaoh-necho, therefore, having borne down all resistance with his victorious army, immediately deposed Jehoahaz and had him brought in chains to Riblah, where, it seems, he was on his way to Carchemish (2Ki 23:33-34; Jer 22:10-12). SEE NECHO.

He then set Eliakim, his elder brother, upon the throne — changed his name to Jehoiakim (see above) — and, having charged him with the task of collecting a tribute of 100 talents of silver and one talent of gold = nearly $200,000, in which he muleted the land for the part Josiah had taken in the war with Babylon, he eventually returned to Egypt, taking Jehoahaz with him, who died there in captivity (2Ki 23:34; Jer 22:10-12; Eze 19:4). Pharaoh- necho also himself returned no more to Jerusalem; for, after his great defeat at Carchemish in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, he lost all his Syrian possessions (2Ki 24:7; Jer 46:2), and his successor Psammis (Herod. 2, 141) made no attempt to recover them. Egypt, therefore, played no part in Jewish politics during the seven or eight years of Jehoiakim's reign. After the battle of Carchemish Nebuchadnezzar came into Palestine as one of the Egyptian tributary kingdoms, the capture of which was the natural fruit of his victory over Necho. He found Jehoiakim quite powerless. After a short siege he entered Jerusalem, took the king prisoner, bound him in fetters to carry him to Babylon (2Ch 36:6-7), and took also some of the precious vessels of the Temple and carried them to the land of Shinar, to the temple of Bel his god. It was at  this time, in the fourth, or, as Daniel reckons, in the third year of his reign, SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR, that Daniel and Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah, were taken captives to Babylon (Dan 1:1-2); but Nebuchadnezzar seems to have changed his purpose as regarded Jehoiakim, and to have accepted his submission, and reinstated him on the throne, perhaps in remembrance of the fidelity of his father Josiah (q.v.). The year following the Egyptians were defeated upon the Euphrates (Jer 46:2), and Jehoiakim, when he saw the remains of the defeated army pass by his territory, could not but perceive how vain had been that reliance upon Egypt against which he had been constantly cautioned by Jeremiah (Jer 31:1; Jer 45:1). In the same year the prophet caused a collection of his prophecies to be written out by his faithful Baruch and to be read publicly by him in the court of the Temple. This coming to the knowledge of the king, he sent for it and had it read before him. But he heard not much of the bitter denunciations with which it was charged before he took the roll from the reader, and, after cutting it in pieces, threw it into the brazier which, it being winter, was burning before him in the hall. The counsel of God against him, however, stood sure; a fresh roll was written, with the addition of a further and most awful denunciation against the king, occasioned by this foolish and sacrilegious act. “He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David: and his dead body shall be cast out in the day to the heat and in the night to the frost” (Jeremiah 36). All this, however, appears to have made little impression upon Jehoiakim, who still walked in his old paths. SEE JEREMIAH.

After three years of subjection, Jehoiakim, deluded by the Egyptian party in his court (compare Josephus, Ant. 10:6, 2), ventured to withhold his tribute and thereby to throw off the Chaldaean yoke (2Ki 24:1). This step, taken contrary to the earnest remonstrances of Jeremiah, and in violation of his oath of allegiance, was the ruin of Jehoiakim. What moved or encouraged Jehoiakim to this rebellion it is difficult to say, unless it were the restless turbulence of his own bad disposition and the dislike of paying the tribute to the king of Babylon, which he would have rather lavished upon his own luxury and pride (Jer 22:13-17), for there was really nothing in the attitude of Egypt at this time to account for such a step. It seems more probable that, seeing Egypt entirely severed from the affairs of Syria since the battle of Carchemish, and the king of Babylon wholly occupied with distant wars, he hoped to make himself independent. Though Nebuchadnezzar was not able at that time to come in person to  chastise his rebellious vassal, he sent against him numerous bands of Chaldaean, with Syrians, Moabites, and Ammonites, who were all now subject to Babylon (2Ki 24:7), and who cruelly harassed the whole country, being for the most part actuated by a fierce hatred against the Jewish name and nation. It was perhaps at this time that the great drought occurred described in Jeremiah 14 (compare Jer 15:4 with 2Ki 24:2-3). The closing years of this reign must have been a time of extreme misery. The Ammonites appear to have overrun the land of Gad (Jer 49:1), and the other neighboring nations to have taken advantage of the helplessness of Israel to ravage their land to the utmost (Ezekiel 25). There was no rest or safety out of the walled cities. We are not acquainted with the details of the close of the reign. Probably, as the time approached for Nebuchadnezzar himself to come against Judaea, the desultory attacks and invasions of his troops became more concentrated. Either in an engagement with some of these forces, or else by the hand of his own oppressed subjects, who thought to conciliate the Babylonians by the murder of their king, Jehoiakim seems to have come to a violent end in the eleventh year of his reign. His body, as predicted, appears to have been cast out ignominiously on the ground; perhaps thrown over the walls to convince the enemy that he was dead; and then, after being left exposed for some time, to have been dragged away and buried “with the burial of an ass,” without pomp or lamentation, “beyond the gates of Jerusalem” (Jer 22:18-19; Jer 36:30; see 1Ch 3:15; 2Ki 23:34-37; 2Ki 24:1-7; 2Ch 36:4-8). Yet it was not the object of Nebuchadnezzar to destroy altogether a power which, as tributary to him, formed a serviceable outpost towards Egypt, which seems to have been the great final object of all his designs in this quarter. He therefore still maintained the throne of Judah and placed on it Jehoiachin, the son of the late king. Nor does he appear to have removed any considerable number of the inhabitants until provoked by the speedy revolt of this last appointee. SEE JEHOIACHIN.

The expression in Jer 36:30, “He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David,” is not to be taken strictly; and yet, as the reign of Jehoiachin was for only thirteen weeks, Jehoiakim may be said to have been comparatively without a successor, since his son scarcely sat down upon his throne before he was deposed. The same explanation applies to 2Ki 23:34, where Eliakim or Jehoiakim is said to have succeeded his father Josiah, whereas the reign of Jehoahaz intervened. This was also  so short, however, as not to be reckoned in the succession. In Mat 1:11, in the received text, the name of Jehoiakim (Ι᾿ωακείμ, “Jakim”) is omitted, making Jehoiachin appear as the son of Josiah; but in some good MSS. it is supplied, as in the margin (see Strong's Greek Harmony of the Gospels, note on § 9). SEE GENEALOGY.

Josephus's history of Jehoiakim's reign is consistent neither with Scripture nor with itself. His account of Jehoiakim's death and Jehoiachin's succession appears to be only his own inference from the Scripture narrative. According to Josephus (Ant. 10, 6), Nebuchadnezzar came against Judaea in the 8th year of Jehoiakim's reign, and compelled him to pay tribute, which he did for three years, and then revolted, in the 11th year, on hearing that the king of Babylon had gone to invade Egypt. Such a campaign at this time is extremely improbable, as Nebuchadnezzar was fully occupied elsewhere; it is possible, however, that such a rumor may have been set afloat by interested parties. Josephus then inserts the account of Jehoiakim's burning Jeremiah's prophecy in his fifth year, and concludes by saying that a little time afterwards the king of Babylon made an expedition against Jehoiakim, who admitted Nebuchadnezzar into the city upon certain conditions, which Nebuchadnezzar immediately broke; that he slew Jehoiakim and the flower of the citizens, and sent 3000 captives to Babylon, and set up Jehoiachin for king, but almost immediately afterwards was seized with fear lest the young king should avenge his father's death, and so sent back his army to besiege Jerusalem; that Jehoiachin, being a man of just and gentle disposition, did not like to expose the city to danger on his own account, and therefore surrendered himself, his mother, and kindred to the king of Babylon's officers on condition of the city suffering no harm, but that Nebuchadnezzar, in direct violation of the conditions, took 10,832 prisoners, and made Zedekiah king in the room of Jehoiachin, whom he kept in custody. SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

All the accounts we have of Jehoiakim concur in ascribing to him a vicious and irreligious character. The writer of 2Ki 23:37 tells us that “he did that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah,” a statement which is repeated in 2Ki 24:9, and 2Ch 36:5 The latter writer uses the yet stronger expression “the acts of Jehoiakim, and the abominations which he did” (2 Chronicles 8). But it is in the writings of Jeremiah that we have the fullest portraiture of him. If, as is probable, the 19th chapter of Jeremiah belongs to this reign, we have a detail of the abominations of idolatry practiced at Jerusalem under the king's sanction,  with which Ezekiel's vision of what was going on six years later, within the very precincts of the Temple, exactly agrees: incense offered up to “abominable beasts,” “women weeping for Thammuz,” and men in the inner court of the Temple, “with their backs towards the temple of the Lord,” worshipping “the sun towards the east” (Ezekiel 8). The vindictive pursuit and murder of Urijah, the son of Shemaiah, and the indignities offered to his corpse by the king's command, in revenge for his faithful prophesying of evil against Jerusalem and Judah, are samples of his irreligion and tyranny combined. Jeremiah but narrowly escaped the same fate (Jer 26:20-24). The curious notice of him in 1Es 1:38 — that he put his nobles in chains, and caught Zaraces, his brother, in Egypt, and brought him up thence to Jerusalem — also points to his cruelty. His daring impiety in cutting up and burning the roll containing Jeremiah's prophecy, at the very moment when the national fast was being celebrated, has been noticed above (see also Stanley, Jewish Church, 2, 597 sq.). His oppression, injustice, covetousness, luxury, and tyranny are most severely rebuked (Jer 22:13-17); and it has frequently been observed, as indicating his thorough selfishness and indifference to the sufferings of his people, that, at a time when the land was so impoverished by the heavy tributes laid upon it by Egypt and Babylon in turn he should have squandered large sums in building luxurious palaces for himself (Jer 22:14-15). SEE IMAGERY, CHAMBERS OF.

## Jehoiarib[[@Headword:Jehoiarib]]

             (Hebrew Yehôyarib', יְהוֹיָרַיבwhose cause Jehovah defends; Sept. Ι᾿ωαρείβ or Ι᾿αρείβ v.r. Ι᾿ωαρίμ; 1Ch 9:10; 1Ch 24:7 only; elsewhere, both in Heb. and A.V., the name is abbreviated to JOIARIB), a distinguished priest at Jerusalem (1Ch 9:10), head of the first of the twenty-four sacerdotal “courses” (1Ch 24:7). B.C. 1014. Of these courses, only four are mentioned as having returned from Babylon — those of Jedaiah, Immer, Pashur, and Harim (Ezr 2:36-39; Neh 7:39-42); and Jewish tradition says that each of these was divided into six, so as to preserve the original number with the original names (Talm. Hieros. Taanith, ch. 4, p. 68, Colossians 1 in ed. Bomberg). This might account for our finding, at a later period, Mattathias described as of the course of Joarib (1Ma 2:1), even though this course did not return from Babylon (Prideaux, Connection, 1, 136, 8th ed.). We find, however, that some of the descendants of Jehoiarib did return from Babylon (1  Chronicles 9:10; Neh 11:10; SEE JEDAIAH ); we find, also, that in subsequent lists other of the priestly courses are mentioned as returning, and in one of these that of Jehoiarib is expressly mentioned (Neh 10:2-8; Neh 12:1-7), and mention is made of Mattenai as chief of the house of Joiarib in the days of Jeshua (Neh 12:19). The probability, therefore, is, that the course of Jehoiarib did go up, but at a later date, perhaps, than those four mentioned in Ezr 2:36-39, and Neh 7:39-42. To the course of Joiarib Josephus tells us he belonged (Ant. 11, 6, 1; Life, § 1). SEE PRIEST.

## Jehonadab[[@Headword:Jehonadab]]

             (Heb. Yehonadab', יְהוֹדָב, to whom Jehovah is liberal, 2Sa 13:5; 2Ki 10:15; 2Ki 10:23; Jer 35:8; Jer 35:14; Jer 35:16; Jer 35:18; Sept. Ι᾿ωναδάβ, Auth. Version “Jonadab,” except in 2Ki 10:15; 2Ki 10:23), also in the contracted form JONADAB (יוֹדָב, Yonadab', 2Sa 13:3; 2Sa 13:32; 2Sa 13:35; Jer 35:6; Jer 35:10; Jer 35:19; Sept. Ι᾿ωναδάβ), the name of two men.

1. A son of Shimeah and nephew of David, a very crafty person (מְאֹדחָכָם; the word is that usually translated “wise,” as in the case of Solomon, 2Sa 13:3), i.e. apparently one of those characters who, in the midst of great or royal families, pride themselves, and are renowned, for being acquainted with the secrets of the whole circle in which they move. His age naturally made him the friend of his cousin Amnon, heir to the throne (2Sa 13:3). He perceived from the prince's altered appearance that there was some unknown grief — “Why art thou, the king's son, so lean?” — and, when he had wormed it out, he gave him the fatal advice for ensnaring his sister Tamar (2Sa 13:5-6). B.C. cir. 1033. SEE AMNON.

Again, when, in a later stage of the same tragedy, Amnon was murdered by Absalom, and the exaggerated report reached David that all the princes were slaughtered, Jonadab was already aware of the real state of the case. He was with the king and was able at once to reassure him (2Sa 13:32-33). SEE ABSALOM.

2. A son or descendant of Rechab, the progenitor of a peculiar tribe, who held themselves bound by a vow to abstain from wine and never to relinquish the nomadic life (Jer 35:6-19). SEE RECHAB.

It appears from 1Ch 2:55 that his father or ancestor Rechab (“the rider”) belonged to a branch of the Kenites, the Arabian tribe which entered Palestine with the Israelites. One settlement of them was to be  found in the extreme north, under the chieftainship of Heber (Jdg 4:11), retaining their Bedouin customs under the oak which derived its name from their nomadic habits. The main settlement was in the south. Of these, one branch had nestled in the cliffs of Engedi (Jdg 1:16; Num 24:21). Another had returned to the frontier of their native wilderness on the south of Judah (Jdg 1:16). A third was established, under a fourfold division, at or near the town of Jabez, in Judah (1Ch 2:55). SEE KENITE.

To which of these branches Rechab and his son Jehonadab belonged is uncertain; he was evidently, however, the chieftain of an important family, if not the generally acknowledged head of the entire clan. The Bedouin habits, which were kept up by the various branches of the Kenite tribe (see Jdg 1:16; Jdg 4:11), were inculcated by Jehonadab with the utmost minuteness on his descendants or retainers; the more so, perhaps, from their being brought into closer connection with the inhabitants of the settled districts. The vow or rule which he prescribed to them is preserved to us: “Ye shall drink no wine, neither ye nor your sons forever. Neither shall ye build houses, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any: but all your days ye shall dwell in tents; that ye may live many days in the land where ye be strangers” (Jer 35:6-7). This life, partly monastic, partly Bedouin, was observed with the tenacity with which, from generation to generation, such customs are continued in Arab tribes; and when, many years after the death of Jehonadab, the Rechabites (as they were called from his father) were forced to take refuge from the Chaldaean invasion within the walls of Jerusalem, nothing would induce them to transgress the rule of their ancestor, and, in consequence, a blessing was pronounced upon him and them by the prophet Jeremiah (Jer 35:19): “Jonadab, the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me forever.” SEE RECHABITE.

Bearing in mind this general character of Jehonadab as an Arab chief, and the founder of a half-religious sect, perhaps in connection with the austere Elijah, and the Nazarites mentioned in Amo 2:11 (see Ewald, Alterthümer, p. 92, 93), we are the better able to understand the single occasion on which he appears before us in the historical narrative (2Ki 10:15 sq.). B.C. 883. Jehu was advancing, after the slaughter of Betheked, on the city of Samaria, when he suddenly met the austere Bedouin coming towards him (2Ki 10:15). It seems that they were already known to each other (Josephus, Ant. 9:6, 6). The king was in his  chariot; the Arab was on foot. It is not altogether certain which was the first to speak. The Hebrew text — followed by the A.V. — implies that the king blessed (A. Vers. “saluted”) Jehonadab. The Sept. and Josephus (Ant. 9, 6, 6) imply that Jehonadab blessed the king. Each would have its peculiar appropriateness. The king then proposed their close union. “Is thy heart right, as my heart is with thy heart?” The answer of Jehonadab is slightly varied. In the Hebrew text he vehemently replies, “It is, it is: give me thine hand.” In the Sept. and in the A.V., he replies simply, “It is;” and Jehu then rejoins, “If it is, give me thine hand.” The hand, whether of Jehonadab or Jehu was offered and grasped. The king lifted him up to the edge of the chariot, apparently that he might whisper his secret into his ear, and said, “Come with me and see my zeal for Jehovah.” It was the first indication of Jehu's design upon the worship of Baal, for which he perceived that the stern zealot would be a fit coadjutor. Having intrusted him with the secret, he (Sept.) or his attendants (Heb. and A.V.) caused Jehonadab to proceed with him to Samaria in the royal chariot. Jehonadab was evidently held in great respect among the Israelites generally; and Jehu was alive to the importance of obtaining the countenance and sanction of such a man to his proceedings; and as it is expressly said that Jehonadab went out to meet Jehu, it seems probable that the people of Samaria, alarmed at the menacing letter which they had received from Jehu, had induced Jehonadab to go to meet and appease him on the road. His venerated character, his rank as the head of a tribe, and his neutral position, well qualified him for this mission; and it was quite as much the interest of Jehonadab to conciliate the new dynasty, in whose founder he beheld the minister of the divine decrees, as it was that of Jehu to obtain his concurrence and support in proceedings which he could not but know were likely to render him odious to the people. So completely had the worship of Baal become the national religion, that even Jehonadab was able to conceal his purpose under the mask of conformity. No doubt he acted in concert with Jehu throughout; but the only occasion on which he is expressly mentioned is when (probably from his previous knowledge of the secret worshippers of Jehovah) he went with Jehu through the temple of Baal to turn out any that there might happen to be in the mass of pagan worshippers (2Ki 10:23). SEE JEHU.

## Jehonathan[[@Headword:Jehonathan]]

             (Heb. Yehonathan', יְהוֹנָתָן, Jehovah given; Sept. Ι᾿ωνάθαν), the full form of the name of four men.

1. The oldest son of king Saul (1Sa 14:6; 1Sa 14:8; 1Sa 14:21; 1Sa 18:1; 1Sa 18:3-4; 1Sa 19:2; 1Sa 19:4; 1Sa 19:6-7; 1 Samuel 20 throughout and all later passages except 1Ch 10:2, in all which the A.V. has JONATHAN SEE JONATHAN [q.v.], as the Hebrew likewise elsewhere has).

2. Son of Uzziah and superintendent of certain of king David's storehouses (אֹצָרוֹת, the word rendered “treasures” earlier in the verse and in 27, 28 “cellars”) (1Ch 27:25). B.C. 1014.

3. One of the Levites who were sent by Jehoshaphat through the cities of Judah, with a book of the Law, to teach the people (2Ch 17:8). B.C. 910.

4. A priest (Neh 12:18), and the representative of the family of Shemaiah (Neh 12:6) when Joiakim was high priest — that is, in the next generation after the return from Babylon under Zerubbabel and Jeshua. B.C. post 536.

## Jehoram[[@Headword:Jehoram]]

             (Heb. Yehoram', יְהוֹרָם, Jehovah exalted, 1Ki 22:50; 2Ki 1:17; 2Ki 3:1; 2Ki 3:6; 2Ki 8:16; 2Ki 8:25; 2Ki 8:29; 2Ki 9:15; 2Ki 9:17; 2Ki 9:21-24; 2Ki 12:18; 2Ch 17:8; 2Ch 21:1; 2Ch 21:3-5; 2Ch 21:9; 2Ch 21:16; 2Ch 22:1; 2Ch 22:5-7; 2Ch 22:11; Septuag. Ι᾿ωράμ, A.V. “Joram” in 2Ki 9:15; 2Ki 9:17; 2Ki 9:21-23), also in the contracted form JORAM (יוֹרָם, Yoram', 2Sa 8:10; 2Ki 8:16; 2Ki 8:21; 2Ki 8:23-25; 2Ki 8:28-29; 2Ki 9:14; 2Ki 9:16; 2Ki 9:29; 2Ki 11:2; 1Ch 3:11; 1Ch 26:25; 2Ch 22:5; 2Ch 22:7; Sept. Ι᾿ωράμ,, but Ι᾿εδδουράμ in 2Sa 8:10), the name of five men.

1. Son of Toi, king of Hamath, sent by his father to congratulate David upon his victory over Hadadezer (2Sa 8:10; Heb. and A.V. “Joram”); elsewhere called HADORAM (1Ch 18:10).

2. A Levite of the family of Gershom, employed with his relatives in special sacred services connected with the Temple treasury (1Ch 26:25; Heb. and A.V. “Joram”). B.C. 1014.  3. One of the priests sent by Jehoshaphat to instruct the people in the Law throughout the land (2Ch 17:8). B.C. 910.

4. (Josephus Ι᾿ώραμος, Ant. 9:2, 2.) The son of Ahab and Jezebel, and successor to his elder brother Ahaziah, who died childless. He was the tenth king on the separate throne of Israel and reigned 12 years, B.C. 894- 883 (2Ki 1:17; 2Ki 3:1). The date of his accession, in the second year of the reign of Jehoram of Judah (2Ki 1:17), must be computed from a viceroyship of the latter during his father Jehoshaphat's war at Ramoth- gilead (1Ki 22:2 sq.). The reckoning in 2Ki 9:29 is according to Jehoram's actual reign; that in 2Ki 8:25, according to the years of his reign as beginning prophetically with the Israelitish calendar or regnal point, i.e. the autumn, as those of Judah do in the spring. SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

The Moabites had been tributary to the crown of Israel since the separation of the two kingdoms; but king Mesha deemed the defeat and death of Ahab so heavy a blow to the power of Israel that he might safely assert his independence. He accordingly did so, by withholding his tribute of “100,000 lambs and 100,000 rams, with the wool.” The short reign of Ahaziah had afforded no opportunity for any operations against the revolters, but the new king hastened to reduce them again under the yoke they had cast off. The good king of Judah, Jehoshaphat, was too easily induced to take a part in the war. He perhaps feared that the example of Moab, if allowed to be successful, might seduce into a similar course his own tributary, the king of Edom, whom he now summoned to join in this expedition. Accordingly, the three kings of Israel, Judah, and Edom marched through the wilderness of Edom to attack Mesha. The three armies were in the utmost danger of perishing for want of water. The piety of Jehoshaphat suggested an inquiry of some prophet of Jehovah, and Elisha, the son of Shaphat, at that time, and since the latter part of Ahab's reign, Elijah's attendant (2Ki 3:11; 1Ki 19:19-21), was found with the host. From him Jehoram received a severe rebuke, and was bid to inquire of the prophets of his father and mother the prophets of Baal. Nevertheless, for Jehoshaphat's sake, Elisha inquired of Jehovah, and received the promise of an abundant supply of water, and of a great victory over the Moabites, a promise which was immediately fulfilled. The same water which, filling the valley, and the trenches dug by the Israelites, supplied the whole army and all their cattle with drink, appeared to the Moabites, who were advancing, like blood when the morning sun shone  upon it. Concluding that the allies had fallen out and slain each other, they marched incautiously to the attack, and were put to the rout. The allies pursued them with great slaughter into their own land, which they utterly ravaged and destroyed, with all its cities. Kirharaseth alone remained and there the king of Moab made his last stand. An attempt to break through the besieging army having failed, he resorted to the desperate expedient of offering up his eldest son, the heir to his throne, as a burnt offering upon the wall of the city, in the sight of the enemy. Upon this, the Israelites retired and returned to their own land (2 Kings 3). B.C. cir. 890. SEE MESHA.

It was, perhaps, in consequence of Elisha's rebuke, and of the above remarkable deliverance granted to the allied armies according to his word, that Jehoram, on his return to Samaria, put away the image of Baal which Ahab, his father, had made (2Ki 3:2); for in 2 Kings 4 we have an evidence of Elisha's being on friendly terms with Jehoram in the offer made by him to speak to the king in favor of the Shunammitess. (He is highly spoken of in the Talmud [Berachoth, 10]; but he did not remove the golden calves introduced by Jeroboam.) The impression on the king's mind was probably strengthened by the subsequent incident of Naaman's cure, and the temporary cessation of the inroads of the Syrians, which doubtless resulted from it (2 Kings 5). SEE NAAMAN.

Accordingly, when, a little later, war again broke out between Syria and Israel, we find Elisha befriending Jehoram. The king was made acquainted by the prophet with the secret counsels of the king of Syria and was thus enabled to defeat them; and, on the other hand, when Elisha had led a large band of Syrian soldiers, whom God had blinded, into the midst of Samaria, Jehoram reverentially asked him, “My father, shall I smite them?” and, at the prophet's bidding, not only forbore to kill them, but made a feast for them, and then sent them home unhurt. This procured another cessation from the Syrian invasions for the Israelites (2Ki 6:23). SEE BEN-HADAD.

What happened after this to change the relations between the king and the prophet we can only conjecture. But, putting together the general bad character given of Jehoram (2Ki 3:2-3) with the fact of the prevalence of Baal worship at the end of his reign (2Ki 10:21-28), it seems probable that when the Syrian inroads ceased, and he felt less dependent upon the aid of the prophet, he relapsed into idolatry, and was rebuked by Elisha, and threatened with a return of the calamities from which he had escaped. Refusing to repent, a fresh invasion by the Syrians  and a close siege of Samaria actually came to pass, according probably to the word of the prophet. Hence, when the terrible incident arose, in consequence of the famine, of a woman boiling and eating her own child, the king immediately attributed the evil to Elisha, the son of Shaphat, and determined to take away his life. The message which he sent by the messenger whom he commissioned to cut off the prophet's head, “Behold, this evil is from Jehovah, why should I wait for Jehovah any longer?” coupled with the fact of his having on sackcloth at the time (2Ki 6:30; 2Ki 6:33), also indicates that many remonstrances and warnings, similar to those given by Jeremiah to the kings of his day, had passed between the prophet and the weak and unstable son of Ahab. The providential interposition by which both Elisha's life was saved and the city delivered is narrated in 2 Kings 7 and Jehoram appears to have returned to friendly feelings towards Elisha (2Ki 8:4). B.C. cir. 888-884. SEE ELISHA.

It was very soon after the above events that Elisha went to Damascus, and predicted the revolt of Hazael, and his accession to the throne of Syria in the room of Ben-hadad; and it was during Elisha's absence, probably, that the conversation between Jehoram and Gehazi, and the return of the Shunammitess from the land of the Philistines, recorded in 2 Kings 8 took place. Jehoram seems to have thought the revolution in Syria, which immediately followed Elisha's prediction, a good opportunity to pursue his father's favorite project of recovering Ramoth-gilead from the Syrians. He accordingly made an alliance with his nephew, Ahaziah, who had just succeeded Jehoram on the throne of Judah, and the two kings proceeded to strengthen the eastern frontier against the Syrians by fortifying Ramoth- gilead, which had fallen into Jehoram's hands, and which his father had perished in the attempt to recover from the Syrians. This strong fortress thenceforth became the headquarters of the operations beyond the river. Hazael was scarcely settled on the throne before he took arms and marched against Ramoth, in the environs of which the Israelites sustained a defeat. Jehoram was wounded in the battle and obliged to return to Jezreel to be healed of his wounds (2Ki 8:29; 2Ki 9:14-15), leaving his army in the charge of Jehu, one of his ablest and most active generals, to hold Ramoth- gilead against Hazael. Jehu, however, in this interval was anointed king of Israel by the messenger of Elisha, and immediately he and the army under his command revolted from their allegiance to Jehoram (2 Kings 9), and Jehu, hastily marching to Jezreel, surprised Jehoram, wounded and defenseless as he was. Jehoram, going out to meet him, fell pierced by an  arrow from Jehu's bow on the very plat of ground which Ahab had wrested from Naboth the Jezreelite, thus fulfilling to the letter the prophecy of Elijah (1Ki 21:21-29). B.C. 883. SEE JEHU.

5. (Josephus Ι᾿ώραμος, Ant. 9:5, 1.) The eldest son and successor of Jehoshaphat, and fifth king on the separate throne of Judah, who began to reign (alone) at the age of thirty-six years, and reigned three years, B.C. 887-884. It is indeed said in the general account (2Ch 21:5; 2Ch 21:20; 2Ki 8:16) that he began to reign at the age of thirty-two and that he reigned eight years; but the conclusions deducible from the fact that his reign began in the fifth year of Jehoram, king of Israel (2Ki 8:16), show that the reign thus stated dates back three years into the reign of his father, who from this is seen to have associated his eldest son with him in the later years of his reign, as, indeed, is expressly stated in this last cited passage (see Keil's Com. on 2Ki 1:17; Reime, Harmon. vitae Josaphat, Jen. 1713, and Diss. de num. annor. regni Josaph., ib.). This appears to have been on the occasion of Jehoshaphat's absence in the conflict with confederate invaders, the Moabites, Ammonites, and Edomites (2 Chronicles 20); and must be distinguished from a still earlier copartnership (2Ki 1:17), apparently during the allied attack upon the Syrians at Ramoth-gilead, in which Ahab lost his life. SEE JEHOSHAPHAT.

Jehoram's daughter Jehosheba was married to the high priest Jehoiada (q.v.). He had himself unhappily been married to Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, and her influence seems to have neutralized all the good he might have derived from the example of his father. One of the first acts of his reign was to put his six brothers to death and seize the valuable appanages which their father had in his lifetime bestowed upon them. After this we are not surprised to find him giving way to the gross idolatries of that new and strange kind the Phoenician which had been brought into Israel by Jezebel and into Judah by her daughter Athaliah. For these atrocities the Lord let forth his anger against Jehoram and his kingdom. The Edomites revolted, and, according to old prophecies (Gen 27:40), established their permanent independence. It was as much as Jehoram could do, by a night attack with all his forces, to extricate himself from their army, which had surrounded him. Next Libnah, the city of the priests (Jos 21:13), one of the strongest fortified cities in Judah (2Ki 19:8), and perhaps one of those “fenced cities” (2Ch 21:3) which Jehoshaphat had given to his other sons, renounced  allegiance to Jehoram because he had forsaken Jehovah, the God of his fathers. But this seemed only to stimulate him to enforce the practice of idolatry by persecution. He had early in his reign received a writing from Elijah the prophet admonishing him of the dreadful calamities which he was bringing on himself by his wicked conduct, but even this failed to effect a reformation in Jehoram. SEE ELIJAH.

At length the Philistines on one side, and the Arabians and Cushites on the other, grew bold against a king forsaken of God, and in repeated invasions spoiled the land of all its substance; they even ravaged the royal palaces, and took away the wives and children of the king, leaving him only one son, Ahaziah. Nor was this all: Jehoram was in his last days afflicted with a frightful disease in his bowels, which, from the terms employed in describing it, appears to have been malignant dysentery in its most shocking and tormenting form (see R. Mead, Bibl. Krankh. 44; but comp. Bartholin. Morb. Bibl. c. 12; G. Detharding, De morbo reg. Jorami, Rostock, 1731). SEE DISEASE.

After a disgraceful reign and a most painful death, public opinion inflicted the posthumous dishonor of refusing him a place in the sepulchre of the kings. Jehoram was by far the most impious and cruel tyrant that had as yet occupied the throne of Judah, though he was rivalled or surpassed by some of his successors (2Ki 8:16-24; 2 Chronicles 21). His name appears, however, in the royal genealogy of our Saviour (Ι᾿ωράμ, “Joram,” Mat 1:8). SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

## Jehoshabeath[[@Headword:Jehoshabeath]]

             (2Ch 22:11). SEE JEHOSHEBA.

## Jehoshaphat[[@Headword:Jehoshaphat]]

             (Heb. Yehoshaphat', יַהוֹשָׁפָט, Jehovah judged, i.e. vindicated; Sept. Ι᾿ωσαφάτ); sometimes in the contracted form JOSHAPHAT (יוֹשָׁפָט, Yoshaphat', 1Ch 11:43; 1Ch 15:24; Ι᾿ωσαφάτ, A. Vers. in the latter passage “Jehoshaphat;” N.T. Ι᾿ωσαφάτ, “Josaphat,” Mat 1:8; Josephus Ι᾿ωσάφατος), the name of six men.

1. A Mithnite, one of David's famous bodyguard (1Ch 11:43; Heb. and A.V. “Josaphat”). B.C. 1046.

2. One of the priests appointed to blow the trumpets before the ark on its removal to Jerusalem (1Ch 15:24; Heb. “Josaphat”). B.C. cir. 1043.  3. Son of Ahilud, and royal chronicler (q.v.) under David and Solomon (2Sa 8:16; 2Sa 20:24; 1Ki 4:3; 1Ch 18:15). B.C. 1014.

4. Son of Paruah and Solomon's purveyor (q.v.) in Issachar (1Ki 4:17). B.C. circ. 995. SEE SOLOMON.

5. The fourth separate king of Judah (“Israel” in 2Ch 21:2, last clause, is either a transcriber's error or a general title), being son of Asa (by Azubah, the daughter of Shilhi), whom he succeeded at the age of thirty-five and reigned twenty-five years, B.C. 912-887 (1Ki 22:41-42; 2Ch 20:31). He commenced his reign by fortifying his kingdom against Israel (2Ch 17:1-2); and, having thus secured himself against surprise from the quarter which gave most disturbance to him, he proceeded to cleanse the land from the idolatries and idolatrous monuments by which it was still tainted (1Ki 22:43). Even the high places and groves which former well-disposed kings had suffered to remain were by the zeal of Jehoshaphat in a great measure destroyed (2Ch 17:6), although not altogether (2Ch 20:33). In the third year of his reign, chiefs, with priests and Levites, proceeded from town to town, with the book of the Law in their hands, instructing the people, and calling back their wandering affections to the religion of their fathers (2Ch 17:7-9). The results of this fidelity to the principles of the theocracy were, that at home he enjoyed peace and abundance and abroad security and honor. His treasuries were filled with the “presents” which the blessing of God upon the people, “in their basket and their store,” enabled them to bring. His renown extended into the neighboring nations, and the Philistines, as well as the adjoining Arabian tribes, paid him rich tributes in silver and in cattle. He was thus enabled to put all his towns in good condition, to erect fortresses, to organize a powerful army, and to raise his kingdom to a degree of importance and splendor which it had not enjoyed since the revolt of the ten tribes (2Ch 17:10-19).

The weak and impious Ahab at that time occupied the throne of Israel; and Jehoshaphat, after a time, having nothing to fear from his power, sought, or at least did not repel, an alliance with him. This is alleged to have been the grand mistake of his reign and that it was such is proved by the consequences. Ahab might be benefited by the connection, but under no circumstances could it be of service to Jehoshaphat or his kingdom, and it  might, as it actually did, involve him in much disgrace and disaster, and bring bloodshed and trouble into his house. Jehoshaphat's eldest son Jehorain married Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel. It does not appear how far Jehoshaphat encouraged that ill-starred union. The closeness of the alliance between the two kings is shown by many circumstances: Elijah's reluctance when in exile to set foot within the territory of Judah (Blunt, Und. Coinc. 2, § 19, p. 199); the identity of names given to the children of the two royal families; the admission of names compounded with the name of Jehovah into the family of Jezebel, the zealous worshipper of Baal; and the alacrity with which Jehoshaphat accompanied Ahab to the field of battle. Accordingly, we next find him on a visit to Ahab in Samaria, being the first time any of the kings of Israel and Judah had met in peace. He here experienced a reception worthy of his greatness; but Ahab failed not to take advantage of the occasion, and so worked upon the weak points of his character as to prevail upon him to take arms with him against the Syrians, with whom, hitherto, the kingdom of Judah never had had any war or occasion of quarrel. However, Jehoshaphat was not so far infatuated as to proceed to the war without consulting God, who, according to the principles of the theocratic government, was the final arbiter of war and peace.

The false prophets of Ahab poured forth ample promises of success, and one of them, named Zedekiah, resorting to material symbols, made him horns of iron, saying, “Thus saith the Lord, with these shalt thou smite the Syrians till they be consumed.” Still Jehoshaphat was not satisfied; and the answer to his further inquiries extorted from him a rebuke of the reluctance which Ahab manifested to call Micah “the prophet of the Lord.” The fearless words of this prophet did not make the impression upon the king of Judah which might have been expected; or, probably, he then felt himself too deeply bound in honor to recede. He went to the fatal battle of Ramoth-gilead, and there nearly became the victim of a plan which Ahab had laid for his own safety at the expense of his too-confiding ally. He persuaded Jehoshaphat to appear as king, while he himself went disguised to the battle. This brought the heat of the contest around him, as the Syrians took him for Ahab; and, if they had not in time discovered their mistake, he would certainly have been slain (1Ki 22:1-33). Ahab was killed and the battle lost; but Jehoshaphat escaped and returned to Jerusalem (2 Chronicles 18). B.C. 895. SEE AHAB.

On his return from this imprudent expedition he was met by the just reproaches of the prophet Jehu (2Ch 19:1-3). The best atonement he could make for this error was by the course he actually took. He resumed his labors in the further extirpation of idolatry in the instruction of the people and the improvement of his realm. He now made a tour of his kingdom in person, “from Beersheba to Mount Ephraim,” that he might see the ordinances of God duly established and witness the due execution of his intentions respecting the instruction of the people in the divine law. This tour enabled him to discern many defects in the local administration of justice, which he then applied himself to remedy (see Selden, De Synedr. 2, ch. 8, § 4). He appointed magistrates in every city for the determination of causes civil and ecclesiastical; and the nature of the abuses to which the administration of justice was in those days exposed may be gathered from his excellent charge to them: “Take heed what ye do, for ye judge not for man, but for the Lord, who is with you in the judgment. Wherefore now let the fear of the Lord be upon you, take heed and do it; for there is no iniquity with the Lord our God, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts.” Then he established a supreme council of justice at Jerusalem, composed of priests, Levites, and “the chiefs of the fathers,” to which difficult cases were referred and appeals brought from the provincial tribunals. This tribunal also was inducted by a weighty but short charge from the king, whose conduct in this and other matters places him at the very head of the monarchs who reigned over Judah as a separate kingdom (2Ch 19:4-11).

The activity of Jehoshaphat's mind was next turned towards the revival of that maritime commerce which had been established by Solomon. The land of Edom and the ports of the Elanitic Gulf were still under the power of Judah and in them the king prepared a fleet for the voyage to Ophir. Unhappily, however, he yielded to the wish of the king of Israel and allowed him to take part in the enterprise. For this the expedition was doomed of God and the vessels were wrecked almost as soon as they quitted port. Instructed by Eliezer, the prophet, as to the cause of this disaster, Jehoshaphat equipped a new fleet, and, having this time declined the cooperation of the king of Israel, the voyage prospered. The trade, however, was not prosecuted with any zeal and was soon abandoned (2 Chronicles 20:55-37; 1Ki 22:48-49). B.C. 895. SEE COMMERCE.

After the death of Ahaziah, king of Israel, Jehoram, his successor, persuaded Jehoshaphat to join him in an expedition against Moab. B.C. cir.  891. This alliance was, however, on political grounds, more excusable than the two former, as the Moabites, who were under tribute to Israel, might draw into their cause the Edomites, who were tributary to Judah. Besides, Moab could be invaded with most advantage from the south, round by the end of the Dead Sea; and the king of Israel could not gain access to them in that quarter but by marching through the territories of Jehoshaphat. The latter not only joined Jehoram with his own army, but required his tributary, the king of Edom, to bring his forces into the field. During the seven days' march through the wilderness of Edom the army suffered much from want of water, and by the time the allies came in sight of the army of Moab they were ready to perish from thirst. In this emergency, the pious Jehoshaphat thought, as usual, of consulting the Lord, and, hearing that the prophet Elisha was in the camp, the three kings proceeded to his tent. For the sake of Jehoshaphat, and for his sake only, deliverance was promised and it came during the ensuing night in the shape of an abundant supply of water, which rolled down the exhausted wadys and filled the pools and hollow grounds. Afterwards Jehoshaphat took his full part in the operations of the campaign till the armies were induced to withdraw in horror by witnessing the dreadful act of Mesha, king of Moab, in offering up his eldest son in sacrifice upon the wall of the town in which he was shut up (2Ki 3:4-27). SEE JEHORAM.

This war kindled another much more dangerous to Jehoshaphat. The Moabites, being highly exasperated at the part he took against them, turned all their wrath upon him. They induced their kindred, the Ammonites, to join them, obtained auxiliaries from the Syrians, and even drew over the Edomites, so that the strength of all the neighboring nations may be said to have been united for this great enterprise. The allied forces entered the land of Judah and encamped at Engedi, near the western border of the Dead Sea. In this extremity Jehoshaphat felt that all his defense lay with God. A solemn fast was held and the people repaired from the towns to Jerusalem to seek help of the Lord. In the presence of the assembled multitude, the king, in the court of the Temple, offered up a fervent prayer to God, concluding with, “O our God, wilt thou not judge them, for we have no might against this great company that cometh against us, neither know we what to do; but our eyes are upon thee.” He ceased; and in the midst of the silence which ensued, a voice was raised pronouncing deliverance in the name of the Lord, and telling them to go out on the morrow to the cliffs overlooking the camp of the enemy, and see them all overthrown without a  blow from them. The voice was that of Jahaziel, one of the Levites. His words came to pass. The allies quarrelled among themselves and destroyed each other; so that when the Judahites came the next day they found their dreaded enemies all dead, and nothing was left for them but to take the rich spoils of the slain. This done, they returned with triumphal songs to Jerusalem. This great event was recognized even by the neighboring nations as the act of God; and so strong was the impression which it made upon them, that the remainder of Jehoshaphat's reign was passed in quiet (2 Chronicles 20). B.C. 890. His death, however, took place not very long after this, at the age of sixty, after having reigned twenty-five years, B.C. 887. He left the kingdom in a prosperous condition to his eldest son Jehoram, whom he had in the last years of his life associated with him in the government. SEE JEHORAM, 5.

“Jehoshaphat, who sought the Lord with all his heart,” was the character given to this king by Jehu, when, on that account, he gave to his grandson an honorable grave (2Ch 22:9). This, in fact, was the sum and substance of his character. The Hebrew annals offer the example of no king who more carefully squared all his conduct by the principles of the theocracy. He kept the Lord always before his eyes, and was in all things obedient to his will when made known to him by the prophets. Few of the kings of Judah manifested so much zeal for the real welfare of his people, or took measures so judicious to promote it. His good talents, the benevolence of his disposition, and his generally sound judgment, are shown not only in the great measures of domestic policy which distinguished his reign, but by the manner in which they were executed. No trace can be found in him of that pride which dishonored some and ruined others of the kings who preceded and followed him. Most of his errors arose from that dangerous facility of temper which sometimes led him to act against the dictates of his naturally sound judgment, or prevented that judgment from being fairly exercised. The kingdom of Judah was never happier or more prosperous than under his reign; and this, perhaps, is the highest praise that call be given to any king. His name (Ι᾿ωσαφάτ, “Josaphat”) occurs in the list of our Savior's ancestors (Mat 1:8). SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

6. The son of Nimshi and father of king Jehu of Israel (2Ki 9:2; 2Ki 9:14). B.C. ante 883.

## Jehoshaphat, Valley of[[@Headword:Jehoshaphat, Valley of]]

             (עֵמֶק יַהוֹשָׁפָט, Sept. Κοιλ1ς, Vulg. Vallis Josaphat), a valley mentioned in Scripture by the prophet Joel only, as the spot in which, after the return of Judah and Jerusalem from captivity, Jehovah would gather all the heathen (Joe 3:2 [4:2]), and would there sit to judge them for their misdeeds to Israel (Joe 3:12 [5:4]). The nations referred to seem to be those who specially oppressed Israel and aided in their overthrow, particularly the Sidonians, Tyrians, and Phoenicians generally (Joe 3:4). The passage is one of great boldness, abounding in the verbal turns in which Hebrew poetry so much delights; and, in particular, there is a play between the name given to the spot — Jehoshaphat, i.e. “Jehovah's judgment” — and the “judgment” there to be pronounced. The Hebrew prophets often refer to the ancient glories of their nation: thus Isaiah speaks of the “day of Midian,” and of the triumphs of David and of Joshua in “Mount Perazim” and in the “valley of Gibeon,” and in like manner Joel, in announcing the vengeance to be taken on the strangers who were annoying his country (Joe 3:14), seems to have glanced back to that triumphant day when king Jehoshaphat, the greatest king the nation had seen since Solomon, and the greatest champion of Jehovah, led out his people to a valley in the wilderness of Tekoah and was there blessed with such a victory over the hordes of his enemies as was without a parallel in the national records (2 Chronicles 20 : see J. E. Gerhardt, Dissert. v. d. Citation ins Thal Josaphat [Bayreuth, 1775]). SEE JOEL.

But, though such a reference to Jehoshaphat is both natural and characteristic, it is not certain that it is intended. The name may be only an imaginary one, conferred on a spot which existed nowhere but in the vision of the prophet. Such was the view of some of the ancient translators. Thus Theodotion renders it χώρακρίσεως, and so the Targum of Jonathan — “the plain of the division of judgment.” Michaelis (Bibel für Ungelehrte, Remarks on Joel) takes a similar view and considers the passage to be a prediction of the Maccabaean victories. By others, however, the prophet has been supposed to have had the end of the world in view (see Henderson, Keil, etc., ad loc.).

The name “Valley of Jehoshaphat” (generally simply el-Jôs, more fully wady Jusafat, also wady Shafat or Faraun), in modern times, is attached  to the deep ravine which separates Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives, through which at one time the Kedron forced its stream. At what period the name was first applied to this spot is not known. There is no trace of it in the Bible or in Josephus. In both the only name used for this gorge is KIDRON (N.T. “CEDRON”). We first encounter its new title in the middle of the 4th century, in the Onomasticon of Eusebius and Jerome (s.v. Coelas) and in the commentary of the latter father on Joel. Since that time the name has been recognized and adopted by travellers of all ages and all faiths. It is used by Christians — as Arculf, in 700 (Early Trav. p. 4); the author of the Citez de Jherusalem, in 1187; and Maundrell, in 1697 (Early Trav. p. 469) and by Jews, as Benjamin of Tudela, about 1170 (Asher 1:71; see Reland, Palaest. p. 356). By the Moslems it is still said to be called by the traditional name (Seetzen, 2, 23, 26), though the name usually given to the valley is wady Sitti-Maryam. Both Moslems and Jews believe that the last judgment is to take place there. To find a grave there is a frequent wish of the latter (Briggs, Heathen and Holy Lands, p. 290), and the former show as they have shown for certainly two centuries the place on which Mohammed is to be seated at the last judgment: a stone jutting out from the east wall of the Haram area, near the south corner, one of the pillars which once adorned the churches of Helena or Justinian, and of which multitudes are now imbedded in the rude masonry of the more modern walls of Jerusalem. This pillar is said to be called et-Tarik, “the road” (De Saulcy, Voyage, 2, 199). From it will spring the bridge of As-Sirat, the crossing of which is to test the true believers. Those who cannot stand the test will drop off into the abyss of Gehenna, in the depths of the valley (Ali Bey, p. 224, 5; Mejr ed-Dîn in Robinson's Research. 1, 269). The steep sides of the ravine, wherever a level strip affords the opportunity, are crowded in places almost paved by the sepulchres of the Moslems, or the simpler slabs of the Jewish tombs, alike awaiting the assembly of the last judgment. (For a full description of this valley, see Robinson, Bibl. Researches, 1, 342, 355, 396-402; 2, 249.)

So narrow and precipitous a glen is quite unsuited to the Biblical event, but this inconsistency does not appear to have disturbed those who framed or, those who hold the tradition. It is, however, implied in the Heb. terms employed in the two cases. That by Joel is émek (עֵמֶק), a word applied to spacious valleys such as those of Esdraelon or Gibeon (Stanley, Syria and Palest., Appendix, § 1). On the other hand, the ravine of the Kidron is invariably designated by náchal (נִחִל), answering to the modern Arabic  wady. There is no instance in the O.T. of these two terms being convertible, and this fact alone would warrant the inference that the tradition of the identity of the émek of Jehoshaphat and the náchal Kidron did not arise until Hebrew had begun to become a dead language. The grounds on which it did arise were probably these:

1. The frequent mention throughout this passage of Joel of Mount Zion, Jerusalem, and the Temple (Joe 2:32; Joe 3:1; Joe 3:6; Joe 3:16-18) may have led to the belief that the locality of the great judgment would be in the immediate neighborhood. This would be assisted by the mention of the Mount of Olives in the somewhat similar passage in Zechariah (Zec 14:3-4).

2. The belief that Christ would reappear in judgment on the Mount of Olives, from which he had ascended. This was at one time a received article of Christian belief and was grounded on the words of the angels, “He shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven” (Adrichomius, Theatr. Terrae Sanctae, s.v. Jerusalem, § 192; Corn. à Lapide on Acts 1). Sir John Maundeville gives a different reason for the same. “Very near this” — the place where Christ wept over Jerusalem — “is the stone on which our Lord sat when he preached; and on that same stone shall he sit on the day of doom, right as he said himself.” Bernard the Wise, in the 8th century, speaks of the church of St. Leon, in the valley, “where our Lord will come to judgment” (Early Travels, p. 28).

3. There is the alternative that the valley of Jehoshaphat was really an ancient name of the valley of the Kidron, and that, from the name, the connection with Joel's prophecy and the belief in its being the scene of Jehovah's last judgment have followed. This may be so, but then we should expect to find some trace of the existence of the name before the fourth century after Christ. It was certainly used as a burying place as early as the reign of Josiah (2Ki 23:6), but no inference can fairly be drawn from this.

But, whatever originated the tradition, it has held its ground most firmly, as is evinced by several local circumstances.

(a) In the valley itself, one of the four remarkable monuments which exist at the foot of Olivet was at a very early date connected with Jehoshaphat. At Arculf's visit (about 700) the name appears to have been borne by that now called “Absalom's tomb,” but then the “tower of Jehoshaphat” (Early  Travels, p. 4). In the time of Maundrell, the “tomb of Jehoshaphat” was what it still is — an excavation, with an architectural front, in the face of the rock behind “Absalom's tomb.” A tolerable view of this is given in plate 33 of Munk's Palestine; and a photograph by Salzmann, with a description, in the Texte (p. 31) to the same. The name may, as already observed, really point to Jehoshaphat himself, though not to his tomb, as he was buried, like the other kings, in the city of David (2Ch 21:1). SEE ABSALOMS TOMB.

(b) One of the gates of the city in the east wall, opening on the valley, bore the same name. This is plain from the Citez de Jherusalem, where the Porte de Iosafas is said to have been a “postern” close to the golden gate way (Portez Oiris), and to the south of that gate (pars devers midi, § 4). It was, therefore, at or near the small walled-up doorway, to which M. de Saulcy has restored the name of the Pôterne de Josaphat, and which is but a few feet to the south of the golden gateway. However this may be, this “postern” is evidently of later date than the wall in which it occurs, as some of the enormous stones of the wall have been cut through to admit it, and in so far, therefore, it is a witness to the date of the tradition being subsequent to the time of Herod, by whom this wall was built. It is probably the “little gate leading down by steps to the valley” of which Arculf speaks. Benjamin of Tudela (1163) also mentions the gate of Jehoshaphat, but without any nearer indication of its position than that it led to the valley and the monuments (Asher, 1:71). (c) Lastly, leading to this gate was a street called the street of Jehoshaphat (Citez de Jherusalem, § 7).

If the “king's dale” (or valley of Shaveh) of Gen 14:17, and of 2Sa 18:18, be the same, and if the commonly received location of them be correct, then we have the valley of Jehoshaphat identified with that of Melchizedek, and its history carries us back to Salem's earliest days. But at what time it became a cemetery we are not informed. SEE SHAVEH.

Cyril, in the 4th century, mentions it in a way which indicates that in his day tradition had altered, or that the valley was supposed to embrace a wider sweep of country than now, for he speaks of it as some furlongs east of Jerusalem — as bare, and fitted for equestrian exercises (Reland, Palaestina, p. 355). Some old travellers say that it was “three miles in length, reaching from the vale of Jehinnen to a place without the city which they call the sepulchres of the kings” (Travels of Two Englishmen two  centuries ago). Some of the old travellers — such as Felix Fabri, in the 15th century — call it Cele, from the Koilas of Eusebius and the Coelas of Jerome; and they call that part of the Kidron which is connected with it Crinarius or Krinarius the place of judgment (Evag. 1, 371). We may add that these old writers extend this valley considerably upwards, placing Gethsemane and the traditional tomb of the Virgin in it. They seem to have divided the Kidron bed into two parts: the lower, called the valley of Siloam or Siloe; the upper, the valley of Jehoshaphat, from which the eastern gate of the city in early times was called, not, as now, St. Stephen's, but “the gate of the valley of Jehoshaphat.”

The present valley of Jehoshaphat occupies the Kidron hollow and the adjoining activities on both sides. Its limits have not been defined, but it is supposed to begin a little above the fountain of the Virgin (Um ed-Deraj), and to extend to the bend of the Kidron, under Scopus. The acclivity to the eastern wall of Jerusalem is — at least towards the top — a Turkish burying ground; and the white tombs, with the Koran (in stone) at the one end, and a turban at the other, look picturesque as they dot for several hundred yards the upper part of the slope. The other acclivity, ascending the steep between Olivet and the Mount of Corruption, is crowded all over with flat Jewish tombs, each with the Hebrew inscription, and speckled here and there with bushy olive trees. Thus Moslems and Jews occupy the valley of Jehoshaphat between them, with their dead looking across the Kidron into each others' faces, and laid there in the common belief that it was no ordinary privilege to die in Jerusalem and be buried in such a spot. The valley of the present day presents nothing remarkable. It is rough to the feet and barren to the eye. It is still, moreover, frequently a solitude, with nothing to break the loneliness but perhaps a passing shepherd with a few sheep, or a traveller on his way to Anâta, or some inhabitant of Silwân or Bethany going into the city by the gate of St. Stephen. Tombs and olives and rough, verdureless steeps are all that meet the eye on either side. SEE JERUSALEM.

## Jehosheba[[@Headword:Jehosheba]]

             (Heb. Yehoshe'ba, יְהוֹשֶׁבִע, Jehovah swearing; Septuag. Ι᾿ωσαβεέ, Josephus Ι᾿ωσαβέδη), the daughter of Jehoram, sister of Ahaziah, and aunt of Joash. kings of Judah. The last of these owed his life to her, and his crown to her husband, the high priest Jehoiada (2Ki 11:2). In the parallel passage (2Ch 22:11) the name is written  JEHOSHABEATH (יְהוֹשִׁבְעִת, Yehoshabath'; Sept. Ι᾿ωσαβέδ). B.C. 882. SEE JEHOASH, 1. Her name thus exactly corresponds in meaning to that of the only two other wives of Jewish priests who are known to us, viz. ELISHEBA the wife of Aaron (Exo 6:23), and ELISABETH, the wife of Zechariah (Luk 1:7). As she is called (2Ki 11:2) the daughter of Joram, sister of Ahaziah, it has been conjectured that she was the daughter, not of Athaliah, but of Joram by another wife (comp. Josephus, Ant. 9:7, 1, Ο᾿χοζίᾷ ὁμοπάτριος ἀδελφή). She is the only recorded instance of the marriage of a princess of the royal house with a high priest. On this occasion it was a providential circumstance — “for she was the sister of Ahaziah” (2Ch 22:11) — as inducing and probably enabling her to rescue the infant Jehoash from the massacre of his brothers. By her he and his nurse were concealed in the palace, and afterwards in the Temple (2Ki 11:2-3; 2Ch 22:11), where he was brought up probably with her sons (2Ch 23:11), who assisted at his coronation. One of these was Zechariah, who succeeded her husband in his office, and was afterwards murdered (2Ch 24:20). — Smith. Needless doubt has been thrown upon her marriage with Jehoiada (Newman, Heb. Monarch. p. 195), which is not expressly mentioned in Kings, as “a fiction of the chronicler to glorify his greatness.” This, however, is certainly assumed in 2Ki 11:3, and is accepted by Ewald (Geschichte, 3, 575) as perfectly authentic. SEE JEHOIADA.

## Jehoshua[[@Headword:Jehoshua]]

             (Num 13:16), or Jehosh'uah (1Ch 7:27). SEE JOSHUA.

## Jehovah[[@Headword:Jehovah]]

             (יְהוָֹה, Yehovah', Sept. usually ὁ Κω῏/ριος, Auth. Vers. usually “the LORD”), the name by which God was pleased to make himself known, under the covenant, to the ancient Hebrews (Exo 6:2-3), although it was doubtless in use among the patriarchs, as it occurs even in the history of the creation (Gen 2:4). The theory of Schwind (Semitische Denkm. 1792), that the record is of later origin than the Mosaic age, is based upon the false assumption that the Hebrews had previously been polytheistic. SEE GENESIS; SEE GOD.

I. Modern Pronunciation of the Name. — Although ever since the time of Galatinus, a writer of the 16th century (De arcanis catholicae veritatis, lib. 3) — not, as according to others, since Raymund Martin (see Gusset. Lex. p. 383) — it has been the almost universal custom to pronounce the name יְהוָֹה (in those copies where it is furnished with vowels), Jehovah, yet, at the present day, most scholars agree that this pointing is not the original and genuine one, but that these vowels are derived from those of אֲדֹנָי, Adonai. For the later Hebrews, even before the time of the Sept. version, either following some old superstition (compare Herod. 2:86; Cicero, De nat. deor. 3, 56) or deceived by a false interpretation of a certain Mosaic precept (Lev 24:16), have always regarded this name as too sacred even to be pronounced (Philo, De vit. Mosis, 3, 519, 529, ed. Colon.; Joseph. Ant. 2 ,12, 4; Talmud, Sanhed. 2, 90, a; Maimonides in Jad. Chasaka, 14, 10; also in More Nebochim, 1, 61; Theodoret, Quoest. 13 in Exodus; Eusebius, Praep. Evangel. 2, 305). Wherever, therefore, this ineffable name is read in the sacred books, they pronounced אֲדֹנָי, “Adonay,” Lord, in its stead; and hence, when the Masoretic text came to be supplied with the vowels, the four letters יהוה were pointed with the vowels of this word, the initial taking, as usual, a simple instead of a compound Sheva. This derivation of the vowels is evident from the peculiar pointing after the prefixes, and from the use of the Dagesh after it, in both which particulars it exactly imitates the peculiarities of אֲדֹנָי, and likewise from the varied pointing when following אֲדֹנָי, in which case it is written יהֵוַֹה and pronounced אֵֹּלהַים, “Elohim,” God, the vowels of which it then borrows, to prevent the repetition of the sound Adonay. That a similar law or notion prevailed even before the Christian era may be inferred from the fact that the Septuag. renders יְהוָֹה by ὁ Κύριος, like אֲדֹנָי; and even the Samaritans observed the same custom, for they used to pronounce יהוה by the word שַׁימָא, Shima, i.e. THE NAME (Reland, De Samaritanis, p. 12; Huntington, Letters, p. 33). (See, on this subject generally, Hadr. Reland, Decas exercitationum philol. de vera pron. nominis Jehova [Traj. ad Rhen. 1707]).

II. True Pointing of the Word. — Maimonides (More Nebochim, 1, 62) gives an obscure account of the traditional and secret method of teaching its true pronunciation to the priests, but avers that it was unknown from its form. Many adduce the statements of Greek writers, as well profane as  Church fathers, that the deity of the Hebrews was called Jao, ΙΑΩ (a few Ιευω, Ιαου), Theodoret alone adding that the Samaritan pronunciation was IABE (Diod. Sic. 1, 94; Porphyry in Eusebius, Proep. Ev. 10, 11; Tzetzes, Chiliad. 7, 126; Hesychius often; Clemens Alex. Strom. 5, p. 666, Oxon.; Origen, in Dan. vol. 2, p. 45; Irenaeus, Hoeres. 2, 66; Jerome, in Psalms 8; Theodoret, Quoest. 15 in Exodus; Epiphanius, Hoer. 20). The Gnostics classed Ι᾿αω, as the Hebrew divinity, among their sacred emanations (Irenaeus, 1, 34; Epiph. Hoer. 26), along with several of his appellations (see Mather, Histoire du Gnosticisme, tab. 8-10; Bellermann, Ueber die Gemmen der Alten mit dem Abraxasbilde, fasc. 1, 2, Berlin, 1817, 1818); and that famous oracle of Apollo, quoted by Macrobius (Sat. 1, 18), ascribing this name (Ι᾿αώ) to the sun, appears to have been of Gnostic origin (Jablonski, Panth. AEgypt. 1, 250 sq.).

Hence many recent writers have followed the opinion of those who think that the word in question was originally pronounced יְהוָֹה, Yahvoh', corresponding to the Greek Ι᾿αώ. But this view, as well as that which maintains the correctness of the common pointing יהוה (Michaelis, Supplem. p. 524; Meyer, Blätter für höhere Wahrheit, 11, p. 306), is opposed to the fact that verbs, of the class (ל8ה) from which this word appears to be derived do not admit such a pointing (Cholem) with their second radical. Moreover, the simple letters in יהוה would naturally be pronounced Jao by a Greek without any special pointing. Those, therefore, appear to have the best reason who prefer the pointing יִהְוֶה, Yahveh' (not יִהֲוֶה, Yahaveh', for the first ה being a mappik-he [as seen in the form יָהּ, kindred sum, esse] does not take the compound Sheva), as being at once agreeable to the laws of Hebrew vocalization, and a form from which all the Greek modes of writing (including the Samaritan, as cited by Theodoret) may naturally have sprung (י=t, ו=o as a “mater lectionis,” and ה being silent; thus leaving a as the representative of the first vowel). From this, too, the apocapated forms יָהוּ and יָהּ may most readily be derived; and it is further corroborated by the etymology. Ewald was the first who used in all his writings, especially in his translations from the O.T. Scriptures, the form Jahve, although in his youth he had taken ground in favor of Jehovah (comp. his Ueber d. Composition der Genesis, Brunswick, 1823). Another defender of Jahveh was Hengstenberg (Beiträge zur Einleit. ins A. T. Berlin, 1831-39, vol. 2). Strongest in  defense of Jehovah is, among prominent German theologians, Hölemann, Bibelstudien (Leipzig, 1859-60), vol. 1.

III. Proper Signification of the Term. — A clue to the real import of this name appears to be designedly furnished in the passage where it is most distinctively ascribed to the God of the Hebrews, Exo 3:14 : “And God said to Moses, I shall be what I shall be (אֲשֶׁר אְֵהיֶה אְֵּהיֶה); and he said, Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, The I SHALL BE has sent me to you” (where the Sept. and later versions attempt to render the spirit of the Hebrew אְֵהיְה by ὁ ὤν,, the Venetian Greek barbarously ἡ ὀντώτης, Vulg. qui sum, A. Vers. “I am”). Here the Almighty makes known his unchangeable character, implied in his eternal self-existence, as the ground of confidence for the oppressed Israelites to trust in his promises of deliverance and care respecting them. The same idea is elsewhere alluded to in the Old Test., e.g. Mal 3:6, “I am Jehovah; change not;” Hos 12:6, “Jehovah is his memento.” The same attribute is referred to in the description of the divine Redeemer in the Apocalypse (Rev 1:4; Rev 1:8, ὁ ὣν καὶ ἠν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, a phrase used indeclinably, with designed identification with Jehovah, see Stuart, Commentary, ad loc.), with which has been aptly compared the famous inscription on the Saitic temple of Isis (Ε᾿γώ εἰμι τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ὃν καὶ ἐσόμενον, Plutarch, De Isid. et Osir. 9), and various parallel titles of heathen mythology, especially among Eastern nations. Those, however, who compare the Greek and Roman deities, Jupiter, Jove, Διός, etc., or who seek an Egyptian origin for the name, are entirely in error (see Tholuck's treatise transl. in the Bib. Repos. 1834. p. 89 sq.; Hengstenberg, Genuineness of the Pentateuch, 1, 213; for other Shemitic etymologies, see Fürst, s.v.). Nor are those (as A. M'Whorter, in the Bibliotheca Sacra, Jan. 1857, who appears to have borrowed his idea from the Journ. of Sac. Lit. Jan. 1854, p. 393 sq.; see Tyler, Jehovah the Redeemer, Lond. 1861) entirely correct (see Fürst's Heb. Wörterb. s.v.) who regard יִהְוֶהas= יִהֲוֶה, and this as the actual fut. Kal of the verb הָוָה= הָיָה, and so render it directly he shall be, i.e. He that shall be; since this form, if a verb at all, would be in the Hiphil (see Koppe ad Exod. loc., in Pottii Syll. 4, p. 59; Bohlen, ad Gen. p. 103; Vatke, Theolog. Bibl. p. 671) and would signify he that shall cause to be, i.e. the Creator; for the real fut. Kal is יַהְיֶה, Yihyeh', as frequently occurs. It is rather a denominative, i.e. noun or adj., formed by the prepositive יprefixed to the verb root, and pointed like  יִבְנֶהand other nouns of similar formation (Nordheimer's Hebr. Gram. § 512; Lee's Hebr. Gram. § 159). The word will thus signify the Existent, and designate one of the most important attributes of Deity, one that appears to include all other essential ideas.

IV. Application of the Title. — The supreme Deity and national God of the Hebrews is called in the O.T. by his own name Jehovah, and by the appellative ELOHIM, i.e. God, either promiscuously, or so that one or the other predominates according to the nature of the context or the custom of the writer. Jehovah Elohim, commonly rendered the “Lord God,” is used by apposition, and not, as some would have it, Jehovah of gods, i.e. chief or prince of gods. This is the customary appellation of Jehovah in Genesis 2, 3; Exo 9:30, etc. Far more frequent is the compounded form when followed by a genitive, as “Jehovah God of Israel” (Jos 7:13; Jos 8:30); “Jehovah God of thy fathers” (Deu 1:21; Deu 6:3); “Jehovah God, thy God” (Deu 1:31; Deu 2:7); “Jehovah of hosts,” i.e. of the celestial armies. SEE HOST.

It will be evident to the attentive reader that the term Lord, so frequently applied to Christ in the N.T., is generally synonymous with Jehovah in the Old Test. As Christ is called “The Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty;” and also, of him it is said, Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today, and forever; he must be Jehovah, the eternally existing and supreme God (Psa 102:25-27; Heb 1:10-12; Heb 13:8; Rev 1:4; Rev 1:8). See LOGOS. JAH (יָהּ, Yah, Sept. Κύριος, Auth. Vers. “Lord,” except in Psa 68:4) is a poetic form abbreviated from Jehovah, or perhaps from the more ancient pronunciation Jahveh. It is chiefly employed in certain customary formulas or refrains (as a proper title in Psa 89:9; Psa 94:7; Psa 94:12; Isa 38:11; Exo 15:2; Psa 118:4; Isa 12:2; Psa 68:5; Isa 26:4). This, as well as a modification of JEHOVAH, frequently occurs in proper names. SEE HALLELUJAH.

It should be remembered that the Hebrew name Jehovah is generally rendered, in the English version, by the word LORD (sometimes GOD), and printed in small capitals, to distinguish it from the rendering of אֲדֹנָי and Κύριος by the same word; it is rendered “Jehovah” only in Exo 6:3; Psa 83:18; Isa 12:2; Isa 26:4, and in the compound proper names following.

VI. Literature. — For a full discussion of the questions connected with this sacred name, see, in addition to the above-cited works, Gataker, De noms. Dei tetragram, in his Opp. Crit. (Traj. ad Rhen. 1698); Meier, Lectio nom. tetragram exam. (Viterbo, 1725); Capellus, Or. de nom. Jehova, in his Critica Sac. p. 690; Crusius, Comment. de nominis tetragran. signif. (Lips. 1758); Malani, De Dei nom. juxta Heb. comment. crit. (Luccae, 1767) ; Koppe, Interpretat. formuloe, etc. (Göttingen, 1783), and in Pott's Sylloge, 4, 50-66; Eichhorn, Biblioth. 5, 556-560; Wahl, D. Namen Gottes Jehova, excurs. 1 to his Habbakuk; J. D. Michaelis, De Jehova ab AEgyptüs culto, etc. in his Zerst. kl. Schrift. (Jena, 1795); Brendel, War Jehova bei den Heb. bloss ein Nationalgott? (Landsb. 1821) [see Theol. Annal. for 1822, p. 384]; R. Abr. ben-Ezra, Sepher Hasshem, mit Comm. by Lippmann (Fulda, 1834); Landauer, Jehova u. Elohim (Stuttg. 1836); Gambier, Titles of Jehovah (London, 1853); De Burgos, De nomine tetragrammato (Frankf. 1604; Amsterd. 1634); Fischer, id. (Tub. 1717); Jahn, De יהוה (Wittenb. 1755); Rafael ben-David, תִּעֲלוּמוֹת(Venice, 1662); Reineccius, De יהוה(Leipz. 1695- 6); Snoilshik, id. (Wittenb. 1621); Stephani, id. (Leips. 1677); Sylburg, De Jehova (Strasburg, 1643); Volkmar, De nominibus divinis (Wittenb. 1679); Kochler, De pronunciatione et vi יהוה(Erlangen, 1867); Kurtz, Hist. of the Old Covenant, 1, 18 sq.; 2, 98, 215. SEE ELOHIM.

## Jehovah-jireh[[@Headword:Jehovah-jireh]]

             (Hebrew Yehovah' Yireh', יַרְאֶה יְהוָה, Jehovah will see, i.e. provide; Sept. Κύριος ε‹δεν, Vulg. Dominus videt), the symbolical epithet given by Abraham to the scene of his offering of the ram providentially supplied in place of his son (Gen 22:14), evidently with allusion to his own reply to Isaac's inquiry (Gen 22:8). SEE MORIAH.

## Jehovah-nissi[[@Headword:Jehovah-nissi]]

             (Hebrew Yehovah' Nissi נַסַּי יְהוָֹה, Jehovah is my banner; Septuag. Κύριος καταφυγήμου, Vulg. Dominus exaltatio mea), the symbolical title bestowed by Moses upon the altar which he erected on the hill where his uplifted hands in prayer had caused Israel to prevail, stated in the text to have been intended as a memento of God's purpose to exterminate the Amalekites (Exo 17:15). SEE REPHIDIM. The phraseology in the original is peculiar: “For [the] hand [is] on [the] throne (כֵּס,  read נֵס,  banner) of Jah,” which the A.V. glosses, “Because the Lord hath sworn,” q.d. lifted up his hand. SEE OATH; SEE HAND. “The significance of the name is probably contained in the allusion to the staff which Moses held in his hand as a banner during the engagement, and the raising or lowering of which turned the fortune of battle in favor of the Israelites or their enemies. God is thus recognized in the memorial altar as the deliverer of his people, who leads them to victory, and is their rallying point in time of peril. On the figurative use of ‘banner,' see Psa 60:4; Isa 11:10. SEE BANNER.

## Jehovah-shalom[[@Headword:Jehovah-shalom]]

             (Hebrew Yehovah' Shalom', יְהוָֹה שָׁלוֹם, Jehovah gives peace, i.e. prosperity; Sept. Εἰρήνη κυρίου, Vulgate Domini pax), the appellation given by Gideon to an altar erected by him on the spot where the divine angel appeared to him and wrought the miracles which confirmed his mission; in commemoration of the success thus betokened to him (“Peace be unto thee”); stated to have been extant at a late day in Ophrah (Jdg 6:24). (See Critici Sacri, 2, 949; Balthasar, De Altari Gideonis, Gryph. 1746.) SEE GIDEON.

## Jehovah-shammah[[@Headword:Jehovah-shammah]]

             (Heb. Yehovah' Sham'mah, יְהוָֹה שָׁמָּה, Jehovah is there; Sept. Κύριος ἐκεῖ,Vulg. Dominus ibidem, Auth. Vers. “The Lord is there”), the symbolical title conferred by Ezekiel upon the spiritual representation of Jerusalam seen by him in his vision (Eze 48:35); under a figure evidently of like import with the description of the new Jerusalem in the Apocalypse (Rev 21:3; Rev 22:3). In the Old Test. prophecy it appears to have been a type of the Gospel Church, SEE IMMANUEL, probably through a primary reference to the restoration of the Jewish metropolis after the Exile, and perhaps of the recovery of the Jews to Christianity, whereas the N.T. seer carries forward the symbol to the heavenly abode of the saints (comp. Jer 33:16).

## Jehovah-tsidkenu[[@Headword:Jehovah-tsidkenu]]

             (Heb. Yehovah' Tsidke'nu, יְהוָֹה צַדְקֵנוּ, Jehovah is our righteousness, i.e. deliverer, see Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 1151, b; Sept. Κύριος δικαιοσύνη ἡμῶν, but κύριος Ι᾿ωσεδέκ in Jer 23:6; Vulg.  Dominus justus noster Auth. Vers. “The Lord our righteousness”), an epithet applied by the prophet to the Messiah (Jer 23:6), and likewise to Jerusalem (Jer 23:16), as symbolical of the spiritual prosperity of God's people in the Christian dispensation. (See Clarke's Comment. on the passages.) By some, the epithet in the former passage, at least, is regarded as ascribing to the Messiah the name Jehovah, and asserting that he is or brings righteousness to man (Smith's Scripture Testimony to the Messiah, 1, 271, 4th ed.; Henderson's note on the passage; Alexander's Connection and Harmony of the O.T. and N.T. p. 287, 2d ed.); while others think that the appellation here given to the Messiah is, like that given by Moses to the altar he erected, and which he called Jehovah-nissi, simply a concise utterance of the faith of Israel, that by means of the Messiah God will cause righteousness to flourish (Hengstenberg's Christology, 2, 417). The strongest argument in favor of the latter is derived from Jer 33:16, where the same name is given to the city of Jerusalem, and where it can only receive such an explanation.

## Jehozabad[[@Headword:Jehozabad]]

             (Heb. Yehozabad', יְהוֹזָבָד, Jehovah given; Sept. Ι᾿ωζαβάδ, but Ι᾿ωζαβέδ in 2 Chronicles 24, 26), the name of three men. SEE JOZABAD.

1. The second son of Obed-edom (q.v.), the Levitical gate keeper of the Temple (1Ch 26:4). B.C. 1014.

2. The last named of Jehoshaphat's generals (Josephus Ο᾿χόβατος, Ant. 8:15, 2) in command of (?) 180,000 troops (2Ch 17:18). B.C. cir. 910.

3. Son of Shomer (or Shimrith, a Moabitess), one of the two servants who assassinated king Jehoash of Judah in that part of the city of Jerusalem called Millo (2Ki 12:21; 2Ch 24:26). B.C. 837.

## Jehozadak[[@Headword:Jehozadak]]

             (Heb. Yehotsadak', יְהוֹצָדָק, Jehovah justified; Sept. Ι᾿ωσεδέκ; Auth. Vers. “Josedech” in Haggai and Zechariah), also in the contracted form JOZADAK (יוֹצָדָק, Yotsadak', in Ezra and Nehemiah; Sept. Ι᾿ωσεδἐκ), the son of the high priest Seraiah at the time of the Babylonian captivity (1Ch 6:14-15). Although he succeeded to the high priesthood after the slaughter of his father at Riblah (2Ki 25:18-21), he had no  opportunity of performing the functions of his office (Selden, De success. in Pont. in Opp. 2, 104). He was carried into captivity by Neduchadnezzar (1Ch 6:15), and evidently died in exile, as, on the return from the captivity, his son Joshua was the first high priest who officiated (Hag 1:1; Hag 1:12; Hag 1:14; Hag 2:2; Hag 2:4; Zec 6:11; Ezr 3:2; Ezr 3:8; Ezr 5:2; Ezr 10:18; Neh 12:26). B.C. 588. SEE HIGH PRIEST.

## Jehu[[@Headword:Jehu]]

             (Heb. Yehu', יֵהוּא, according to Gesenius for יְהֵיהוּא, i.q. יְהוֹהוּא, Jehovah is He; but according to Fürst from הָוָא= הָיה, to live, q.d. the living; Sept. Ι᾿ού, Ι᾿ηού but Ι᾿ούδα in Hos 1:4), the name of five men.

1. Son of Obed and father of Azariah, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 2:38). B.C. post. 1612.

2. An Antothite, one of the Benjamite slingers that joined David's band at Ziklag (1Ch 12:3). B.C. 1055.

3. The son of Hanani, a prophet (Josephus Ιηοῦς, Ant. 8, 12, 3) of Judah, but whose ministrations were chiefly directed to Israel. His father was probably the seer who suffered for having rebuked Asa (2Ch 16:7). He must have begun his career as a prophet when very young. He first denounced upon Baasha, king of Israel, and his house the same awful doom which had been already executed upon the house of Jeroboam (1Ki 16:1; 1Ki 16:7); a sentence which was literally fulfilled (Kings 16:12). The same prophet was, many years after, commissioned to reprove Jehoshaphat for his dangerous connection with the house of Ahab (2Ch 19:2). He appears to have been the public chronicler during the entire reign of Jehoshaphat and a volume of his records is expressly referred to (2Ch 20:34). B.C. 928-886.

4. The eleventh king of the separate throne of Israel (Josephus Ι᾿ηοῦς, Ant. 8, 13, 7), and founder of its fourth dynasty; he reigned twenty-eight years, B.C. 883-855 (2Ki 9:10; 2Ch 22:7-9). His history was told in the lost “Chronicles of the Kings of Israel” (2Ki 10:34). His father's name was Jehoshaphat (2Ki 9:2); his grandfather's (which, as being better known was sometimes affixed to his own — 2 Kings 9) was Nimshi. In his youth he had been one of the guards of Ahab. His first appearance in history is when, with a comrade in arms, Bidkar, or Bar- Dakar (Ephraem Syrus, Opp. 4, 540), he rode (either in a separate chariot,  Sept., or on the same seat, Josephus) behind Ahab on the fatal journey from Samaria to Jezreel, and heard, and laid up in his heart, the warning of Elijah against the murderer of Naboth (2Ki 9:25). But he had already, as it would seem, been known to Elijah as a youth of promise, and, accordingly, in the vision at Horeb he is mentioned as the future king of Israel, whom Elijah is to anoint as the minister of vengeance on Israel (1Ki 19:16-17). This injunction, for reasons unknown to us, Elijah never fulfilled. It was reserved long afterwards for his successor Elisha. SEE AHAB.

Jehu meantime, in the reigns of Ahaziah and Jehoram, had risen to importance. The same activity and vehemence which had fitted him for his earlier distinctions still continued and he was known far and wide as a charioteer whose rapid driving, as if of a madman (2Ki 9:21), could be distinguished even from a distance. Accordingly, in the reign of Jehoram, Jehu held a command in the Israelitish army posted at Ramoth- gilead to hold in check the Syrians, who of late years had made strenuous efforts to extend their frontier to the Jordan and had possessed themselves of much of the territory of the Israelites east of that river. The contest was, in fact, still carried on which had begun many years before in the reign of Ahab, Jehoram's father, who had lost his life in battle before this very Ramoth-gilead. Ahaziah, king of Judah, had taken part with Jehoram, king of Israel, in this war; and as the latter had been severely wounded in a recent action, and had gone to Jezreel to be healed of his wounds, Ahaziah had also gone thither on a visit of sympathy to him (2Ki 8:28-29). B.C. 883. According to Ephraem Syrus (who omits the words “saith the Lord” in 2Ki 9:26, and makes “I” refer to Jehu), he had, in a dream the night before, seen the blood of Naboth and his sons (Ephr. Syr. Opp. 4, 540). In this state of affairs, a council of war was held among the military commanders in camp, when, very unexpectedly, a youth of wild appearance (2Ki 9:11), known by his garb to be one of the disciples of the prophets, appeared at the door of the tent, and called forth Jehu, declaring that he had a message to deliver to him (2Ki 9:15).

They retired into a secret chamber. The youth uncovered a vial of the sacred oil (Josephus, Ant. 9, 6, 1) which he had brought with him, poured it over Jehu's head, and after announcing to him the message from Elisha, that he was appointed to be king of Israel and destroyer of the house of Ahab, rushed out of the house and disappeared (2Ki 9:7-8). Surprising as this message must have been, and awful the duty which it imposed, Jehu  was fully equal to the task and the occasion. He returned to the council, probably with an altered air, for he was asked what had been the communication of the young prophet to him. He tried at first to evade their questions, but then revealed the situation in which he had found himself placed by the prophetic call. In a moment the enthusiasm of the army took fire. They threw their garments — the large square beged similar to a wrapper or plaid — under his feet, so as to form a rough carpet of state, placed him on the top of the stairs (q.v.), as on an extempore throne, blew the royal salute on their trumpets, and thus ordained him king (2Ki 9:11-14). Jehu was not a man to lose any advantage through remissness. He immediately cut off all communication between Ramoth-gilead and Jezreel and then set off at full speed with his ancient comrade Bidkar, whom he made captain of the host in his place and a band of horsemen. From the tower of Jezreel a watchman saw the cloud of dust raised by the advancing party and announced his coming (2Ki 9:17). The messengers that were sent out to him he detained, on the same principle of secrecy which had guided all his movements. It was not till he had almost reached the city, and was identified by the watchman, that apprehension was felt. But even then it seems as if the two kings in Jezreel anticipated news from the Syrian war rather than a revolution at home. Jehoram went forth himself to meet him and was accompanied by the king of Judah. They met in the field of Naboth, so fatal to the house of Ahab. The king saluted him with the question, “Is it peace, Jehu?” and received the answer, “What peace, so long as the whoredoms (idolatries) of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many?” This completely opened the eyes of Jehoram, who exclaimed to the king of Judah, “There is treachery, O Ahaziah!” and turned to flee. But Jehu felt no infirmity of purpose, and knew that the slightest wavering might be fatal to him. He therefore seized his opportunity, and taking full aim at Jehoram, with the bow which, as captain of the host, was always with him, shot him through the heart (2Ki 9:24). Jehu caused the body to be thrown back into the field of Naboth, out of which he had passed in his attempt at flight, and grimly remarked to Bidkar, his captain, “Remember how that, when I and thou rode together after Ahab his father, the Lord laid this burden upon him.” The king of Judah endeavored to escape, but Jehu's soldiers pursued and inflicted upon him at Beth-gan (A.V. “the garden house”), probably Engannim, a wound of which he afterwards died at Megiddo. SEE AHAZIAH.

Jehu himself entered the city, whither the news of this transaction had already preceded him. As he passed under the walls of the palace, Jezebel herself, studiously  arrayed for effect, appeared at one of the windows and saluted him with a question such as might have shaken a man of weaker nerves, “Had Zimri peace, who slew his master?” But Jehu was unmoved, and, instead of answering her, called out, “Who is on my side — who?” when several eunuchs made their appearance at the window, to whom he cried, “Throw her down!” and immediately this proud and guilty woman lay a blood- stained corpse in the road and was trodden under foot by the horses. SEE JEZEBEL.

Jehu then went in and took possession of the palace (2Ki 9:16-37). He was now master of Jezreel, which was, next to Samaria, the chief town of the kingdom; but he could not feel secure while the capital itself was in the hands of the royal family, and of those who might be supposed to feel strong attachment to the house of Ahab. The force of the blow which he had struck was, however, felt even in Samaria. When, therefore, he wrote to the persons in authority there the somewhat ironical but designedly intimidating counsel, to set up one of the young princes in Samaria as king and fight out the matter which lay between them, they sent a very submissive answer, giving in their adhesion, and professing their readiness to obey in all things his commands. A second letter from Jehu tested this profession in a truly horrid and exceedingly Oriental manner, requiring them to appear before him on the morrow, bringing with them the heads of all the royal princes in Samaria. A fallen house meets with little pity in the East; and when the new king left his palace the next morning, he found seventy human heads piled up in two heaps at his gate. There, in the sight of these heaps, Jehu took occasion to explain his conduct, declaring that he must be regarded as the appointed minister of the divine decrees, pronounced long since against the house of Ahab by the prophets, not one of whose words should fall to the ground. He then continued his proscriptions by exterminating in Jezreel not only all in whose veins the blood of the condemned race flowed, but also — by a considerable stretch of his commission — those officers, ministers, and creatures of the late government who, if suffered to live, would most likely be disturbers of his own reign. He next proceeded to Samaria. So rapid had been these proceedings, that on his way, at “the shearinghouse” (or Betheked), he encountered forty-two sons or nephews (2Ch 20:8) of the late king of Judah, and therefore connected by marriage with Ahab, on a visit of compliment to their relatives, of whose fall, seemingly, they had not heard. These also were put to the sword at the fatal well, as, in the later history, of Mizpah, and, in our own days, of Cawnpore (2Ki 10:14). (See Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.) As he drove on he  encountered a strange figure, such as might have reminded him of the great Elijah. It was Jehonadab, the austere Arab sectary, the son of Rechab. In him his keen eye discovered a ready ally. The austere virtue and respected character of the Rechabite would, as he felt, go far to hallow his proceedings in the eyes of the multitude. He took him into his chariot, and they concocted their schemes as they entered Samaria (2Ki 10:15-16). SEE JEHONADAB.

In that capital Jehu continued the extirpation of the persons more intimately connected with the late government. This, far from being in any way singular, is a common circumstance in Eastern revolutions. But the great stroke was yet to come; and it was conceived and executed with that union of intrepid daring and profound secrecy which marks the whole career of Jehu. His main object was to exterminate the ministers and more devoted adherents of Baal, who had been so much encouraged by Jezebel. There was even a temple to this idol in Samaria; and Jehu, never scrupulous about the means of reaching objects which he believed to be good, laid a snare by which he hoped to cut off the main body of Baal's ministers at one blow. He professed to be a more zealous servant of Baal than Ahab had been, and proclaimed a great festival in his honor, at which none but his true servants were to be present. The prophets, priests, and officers of Baal assembled from all parts for this great sacrifice, and sacerdotal vestments were given to them, that none of Jehovah's worshippers might be taken for them. Soldiers were posted so that none might escape. The vast temple at Samaria raised by Ahab (1Ki 16:32; Josephus, Ant. 10, 7, 6) was crowded from end to end. The chief sacrifice was offered, as if in the excess of his zeal, by Jehu himself. Jehonadab joined in the deception. There was some apprehension lest worshippers of Jehovah might be found in the temple; such, it seems, had been the intermixture of the two religions. As soon, however, as it was ascertained that all, and none but the idolaters were there, the signal was given to eighty trusted guards, and a sweeping massacre removed at one blow the whole heathen population of the kingdom of Israel. The innermost sanctuary of the temple (translated in the A.V. “the city of the house of Baal”) was stormed, the great stone statue of Baal was demolished, the wooden figures of the inferior divinities sitting round him were torn from their places and burnt (Ewald, Gesch. 3, 526), and the site of the sanctuary itself became the public resort of the inhabitants of the city for the basest uses (2 Kings 10).  Notwithstanding this zeal of Jehu in exterminating the grosser idolatries which had grown up under his immediate predecessors, he was not prepared to subvert the policy which had led Jeroboam and his successors to maintain the schismatic establishment of the golden calves in Dan and Beth-el. SEE JEROBOAM.

This was, however, a crime in him — the worship rendered to the golden calves being plainly contrary to the law; and he should have felt that he who had appointed him to the throne would have maintained him in it, notwithstanding the apparent dangers which might seem likely to ensue from permitting his subjects to repair at the great festivals to the metropolis of the rival kingdom, which was the center of the theocratical worship and of sacerdotal service. Here Jehu fell short: and this very policy, apparently so prudent and farsighted, by which he hoped to secure the stability and independence of his kingdom, was that on account of which the term of rule granted to his dynasty was shortened. For this it was foretold that his dynasty should extend only to four generations; and for this the divine aid was withheld from him in his wars with the Syrians under Hazael on the eastern frontier. Hence the war was disastrous to him, and the Syrians were able to maintain themselves in the possession of a great part of his territories beyond the Jordan (2Ki 10:29-33). He died in quiet, and was buried in Samaria, leaving the throne to his son Jehoahaz (2Ki 10:34-36). B.C. 855. His name is thought to be the first of the Israelitish kings which appears in the Assyrian monuments. It seems to be found on the black obelisk discovered at Nimrûd (Layard, Nineveh, 1, 396), and now in the British Museum, among the names of kings who are bringing tribute (in this case gold and silver, and articles manufactured in gold) to Shalmaneser I. His name is given as “Jehu” (or “Yahua”), “the son of Khumri” (Omri). This substitution of the name of Omri for that of his own father may be accounted for either by the importance which Omri had assumed as the second founder of the northern kingdom, or by the name of “Beth-Khumri,” only given to Samaria in these monuments as “the House or Capital of Omri” (Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 643; Rawlinson's Herodot. 1, 465; Meth. Rev. 1888, p. 711).

There is nothing difficult to understand in the character of Jehu. He was one of those decisive, terrible, and ambitious, yet prudent calculating, and passionless men whom God from time to time raises up to change the fate of empires and execute his judgments on the earth. He boasted of his zeal — “Come and see my zeal for the Lord” — but at the bottom it was zeal for Jehu. His zeal was great so long as it led to acts which squared with his  own interests, but it cooled marvelously when required to take a direction in his judgment less favorable to them. Even his zeal in extirpating the idolatry of Baal is not free from suspicion. The altar of Baal was that which Ahab had associated with his throne, and in overturning the latter he could not prudently let the former stand, surrounded as it was by attached adherents of the house which he had extirpated. He must be regarded, like many others in history, as an instrument for accomplishing great purposes rather than as great or good in himself. In the long period during which his destiny — though known to others and perhaps to himself — lay dormant; in the suddenness of his rise to power; in the ruthlessness with which he carried out his purposes; in the union of profound silence and dissimulation with a stern, fanatic, wayward zeal, he has not been without his likenesses in modern times.

The Scripture narrative, although it fixes our attention on the services which he rendered to the cause of religion by the extermination of a worthless dynasty and a degrading worship, yet, on the whole, leaves the sense that it was a reign barren in great results. His dynasty, indeed, was firmly seated on the throne longer than any other royal house of Israel (2 Kings 10), and under Jeroboam II it acquired a high name among the Oriental nations. But Elisha, who had raised him to power, as far as we know, never saw him. In other respects it was a failure; the original sin of Jeroboam's worship continued; and in the prophet Hosea there seems to be a retribution exacted for the bloodshed by which he had mounted the throne: “I will avenge the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu” (Hos 1:4), as in the similar condemnation of Baasha (1Ki 16:2). See a striking poem to this effect on the character of Jehu in the Lyra Apostolica. SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

5. Son of Josibiah, apparently one of the chief Simeonites who migrated to the valley of Gedor in quest of pasturage during the reign of Hezekiah, and expelled the aboriginal Hagarites (1Ch 4:35). B.C. cir. 711.

## Jehubbah[[@Headword:Jehubbah]]

             (Heb. Yechubbah', יְהֻבָּה, for which the margin has וְחֻבָּה, ve-Chubbah', i.e. and Hubbah, as if the proper form were חֻבָּה, Chubbah', i.e. hidden; Sept. Ο᾿βά v.r. Ι᾿αβά,, Vulg. Haba), one of the sons of Shamer, or Shomer, of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:34). B.C. perhaps cir. 1618.

## Jehucal[[@Headword:Jehucal]]

             (Heb. Yehukal', יְהוּכִל, able; Sept. Ι᾿ωάχαλ), son of Shelemiah, one of two persons sent by king Zedekiah to the prophet Jeremiah to request his prayers on behalf of the kingdom; but who joined with his associates on his return in demanding the prophet's death on account of his unfavorable response (Jer 37:3). In Jer 38:1 his name is written in the contracted form JUCAL (יוּכִל, Yukal', Sept. Ι᾿ωάχαλ), and in Jer 38:4 he is styled one of “the princes.” B.C. 589.

## Jehud[[@Headword:Jehud]]

             (Heb. Yehud', יְהֻד, apocopated from JUDAH, as in Dan 2:25, etc.; Sept. Ι᾿ούδ v.r. Ι᾿ούθ and Α᾿ζώρ), a town on the border of Dan, named between Baalah and Bene-barak (Jos 19:45). It is perhaps the present village el-Yehudiyeh, seven and a half miles south of east from Jaffa (Robinson's Researches, 3, 45; new ed. 3, 140, 141, notes; Schwarz, Palest. p. 141).

## Jehud (2)[[@Headword:Jehud (2)]]

             The probable representative of this place el-Yehudiyeh, eight and a quarter miles south by east from Yafa, is described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (2:258) as "a large mud village, supplied by a pond, and surrounded by palm-trees. Mr. Drake states the population at 800 to 1000 souls. According to the Samaritans, Judah (Neby Huidah) was buried here.

## Jehuda Ben-Eliezer[[@Headword:Jehuda Ben-Eliezer]]

             a Jewish writer of the 14th century, is the author of מַנְחִת יְהוּדָח, or a commentary on the Pentateuch, in which he especially explains difficult passages of Rashi. This commentary, in which more than one hundred Jewish authorities are quoted, was published at Leghorn in 1783. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:34; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), page 141 (B.P)

## Jehuda Ben-Ilai[[@Headword:Jehuda Ben-Ilai]]

             a Tanaite of the 2d century, and teacher of the famous Judah hak-Kodesh (q.v.), was a cooper by trade. While he spent his days in manual labor, he spent his nights in persevering study. After attaining the degree of rabbi, he still labored at his trade. So far from being ashamed of this, he gloried in it, and used sometimes to have a tub or hogshead of his own workmanship brought into the lecture-room, which he used as a pulpit. His honest integrity procured him the title of ha-chasid, or "the Just." In the department of Scripture exposition he paid particular attention to the third book of Moses, or Leviticus, and it is considered that the book " Sifra" was first composed by him, though more fully elaborated afterwards. See Hamburger, Real-Encyklop. 2:452 sq.; Bacher, Die Agada der Tanaten (Strasburg, 1884), page 101, 128, 199, 235, 246, 267, 291, 441. (B.P.)

## Jehudah (Arje-Loeb) Ben-Zebi (Hirsh)[[@Headword:Jehudah (Arje-Loeb) Ben-Zebi (Hirsh)]]

             a Jewish writer of some note, was born at Krotoschin (Polish Prussia) about 1680. He afterwards became rabbi at Carpentras and Avignon. His works are:

(1) A Hebrew Lexicon, entitled אָהַלֵי יְהוּדָה (The Tents of Judah) (Jesnitz, 1719, 4to), consisting of two parts; the first part, שֵׁם עוֹלָם (the everlasting name), confines itself mainly to proper names; the second part, יָד ושֵׁם (place and name), supplies the words omitted in the first part. This work partakes of the nature of a concordance as well as of a lexicon, inasmuch as it gives the places in Scripture in which every word is to be found: —

(2) A Hebrew Grammar, called חֵלֶק יֵהוּדָה (The Portion of Judah); of this work, the introduction only, יסוד לשון הקודש (The Foundation of the Sacred Language), was ever published (Wilmersdorf, 1721, 4to); it contains fifteen canons and paradigms, with a German translation: — and

(3) a Concordance, entitled גֶּזִע יְהוּדָה (The Stem of Judah),which only goes as far as the root צנŠ(Offenbach, 1732, 4to). — Kitto, Biblic. Cyclop. s.v.; Steinschneider, Libri Hebroei in Biblioth. Bodleiana, col. 1378; Bibliogr. Handb. f. Hebr. Sprachkunde (Leipzig, 1859), p. 70; Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. 1, 145 sq.

## Jehudah (Ha-Levi) Ben-Samuel[[@Headword:Jehudah (Ha-Levi) Ben-Samuel]]

             (called in Arabic Abulhassan) a distinguished Spanish Jew, great alike as linguist, philosopher, and poet, one of the greatest lights in Jewish literature, was born in Castile about 1086 according to Grätz, or 1105 according to Rappoport. But little is known of the early history of his life; when a youth of fifteen he was already celebrated as a promising poetical genius. In the vigor of manhood we find Jehudah endeavoring to spread a  knowledge of Rabbinical and Arabian literature, both by poetical productions and by disciples whom he gathered about him at Toledo, where he founded a college. About 1141 he is supposed to have completed his Kozari (כוזרי), generally called Cusari, the best work ever written in defense of the Jewish religion, and aiming to refute the objections urged against Judaism by Christians, Mohammedans, philosophical infidels, and that sect of the Jews known to be bitterly opposed to the recognition of the authority of tradition — the Karaites. Many eminent critics, among whom ranks Bartolocci, have long discredited the supposition that it is the production of Jehudah, but of late all seem agreed that he was really the author of the work, which is entitled כתאב אלחג ה ואלדליל פי נצר אלדין אלדליל (The Book of Evidence and Argument in Apology for the despised Religion, i.e. Judaism). In style, this work is an imitation of Plato's dialogues on the immortality of the soul. According to Grätz (Geschichte der Juden, 5, 214 sq.; 6, 146 sq.), the Khozars, a tribe of the Finns, which was akin to the Bulgarians, Avarians, and Ugurians, or Hungarians, had settled on the borders of Asia and Europe and founded a dominion on the mouth of the Volga and the Caspian Sea, very near Astrachan. After the destruction of the Persian empire, this Finnish tribe invaded the Caucasus, made inroads into Armenia, conquered the Crimea, exacted tribute from the Byzantine emperors, made vassals of the Bulgarians, etc., and compelled the Russians to send annually to their kings a sword and a costly fur. Like their neighbors, the Bulgarians and Russians, they were idolaters, and gave themselves up to gross sensuality. and licentiousness, until they became acquainted with Christianity and Mohammedanism through commercial intercourse with the Greeks and Arabs, and with Judaism through the Greek Jews who fled from the religious persecutions of the Byzantine emperor Leo (A.D. 723). Of these strangers called Khozarians the Jews gained the greater admiration, as they especially distinguished themselves as merchants, physicians, and councillors of state; and the Khozars came to contrast the Jewish religion with the then corrupt Christianity and Mohammedanism. King Bulan, the officials of state, and the majority of the people, who had determined to forsake their idolatrous worship, embraced Judaism, A.D. 731. This important item of Jewish history, which is rigidly contended for as authentic by some of the best students of Oriental history (compare Vivien de St. Martin, Les Khazars, mémoire lu à l'Academie des Inscriptions et des Belles-Lettres [Paris, 1851]; Carmoly, Itinéraires de la Terre Sainte  [Bruxelles, 1847], p. 1-104; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 5, 210 sq.), throws light upon Eldad Ha-Dani's description of the lost tribes; the references in the Chaldee paraphrase on 1Ch 1:5; 1Ch 1:26; the allusion in Josippon ben-Gorion, ch. 10, ed. Breithaupt; and many other theories about the whereabouts of the ten tribes. SEE RESTORATION.

It is this item of Eastern history that furnished Jehudah a basis for his work. In his Kozari he represents Bulan as determined to forsake idolatry, and earnestly desirous to find the true religion. To this end he sends for two philosophers, a Christian and a Mohammedan, listens to the expositions of their respective creeds, and, as they all refer to the Jews as the fountainhead, he at last sends for an Israelite, one Rabbi Isaac of Sanger, probably a Bithynian, to propound his religious tenets, becomes convinced of their divine origin, and embraces the Jewish religion. The real importance of this work, however, rests on the discussions into which it enters on many subjects bearing upon the exposition of the Hebrew Scriptures, Jewish literature, history, philosophy, etc., all of which are in turn reviewed. Thus, for instance, synagogual service, feasts, fasts, sacrifices, the Sanhedrim, the development of the Talmud, the Masorah, the vowel points, the Karaites, etc., are all minutely discussed in this work, which De Sacy (see Biographie Universelle, 22, 101 sq.) has pronounced to be one of the most valuable and beautiful productions of the Jewish pen. Aben-Ezra and David Kimchi frequently refer to it, the former in his Commentary, the latter in his Lexicon. A Hebrew translation of Kozari was prepared by Jehudah Ibn-Tibbon, who named it הכוזרי ספר (The Book of Kozari), after the heroes of it, and it was first published at Fano in 1506, then at Venice in 1547, with an introduction and commentary by Muscato (Venice, 1594); with a Latin translation and dissertations by Jo. Buxtorf, fil. (Basle, 1660); a Spanish translation of it was made by Abendana without the Hebrew text (Amsterd. 1663). The work has more lately been published with a commentary by Satorow, (Berl. 1795); with a commentary, various readings, index, etc. by G. Brecher (Prague, 1838- 40); and the very latest, with a German translation, explanatory notes, etc. by Dr. David Cassel (Leipzig, 1853), which is generally considered the most useful edition. Jehudah, like many other eminent Jewish literati of his day, seems to have practiced medicine to secure to himself a sufficient income, which his literary labors evidently failed to provide for him. After the completion of his Kozari he determined to emigrate to the Holy Land and die and be buried in the land of his forefathers. Tradition says that he was murdered by an Arab (about 1142) while he was lying on his face  under the walls of Jerusalem, overcome by his contemplations at the ruins of Zion, of “the depopulation of a region once so densely inhabited, the wilderness and desolation of a land formerly teeming with luxuriance” a gift which God had given unto his forefathers, who had failed to appreciate the goodness of their Lord. He is said to be buried at Kephar Kabul. See Geiger, Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, 1, 158 sq.; 2, 367 sq.; Cassel, Das Buch Kusari (Leipzig, 1853), p. 35; Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, 6, 140- 167; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 1338-1342; Sachs, Relig. Poesie der Juden in Spanien, p. 287; Turner, Jewish Rabbis, p. 22 sq.; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. s.v.; Rule. Karaites (London, 1870), p. 80 sq.; Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. 2, 35 sq.

## Jehudah (Ha-Levi) De Modena[[@Headword:Jehudah (Ha-Levi) De Modena]]

             SEE MODENA.

## Jehudah Ben-Balaam[[@Headword:Jehudah Ben-Balaam]]

             SEE IBN-BALAAM.

## Jehudah Ben-David[[@Headword:Jehudah Ben-David]]

             SEE CHAJUG.

## Jehudah Ben-Koreish[[@Headword:Jehudah Ben-Koreish]]

             SEE IBN-KOREISH.

## Jehudah, Ha-Kodesh[[@Headword:Jehudah, Ha-Kodesh]]

             etc. SEE JUDAH, etc.

## Jehudi[[@Headword:Jehudi]]

             (Hebrew Yehudi', יְהוּדַי, a Jew, as often; (Sept. Ι᾿ουδείν v.r. Ι᾿ουδίν, Ι᾿ουδί, Ι᾿ουδεί) son of Nethaniah, sent by the princes to invite Baruch to read Jeremiah's roll to them, and who afterwards read it to the king himself (Jer 36:14; Jer 36:21). B.C. 605.

## Jehudijah[[@Headword:Jehudijah]]

             (Heb. Yehudiyah', יְהוּדַיָּה, [with the art., the], Jewess, as in the Engl. margin; Sept. Ι᾿δία v. Αδία,Vulg. Judaja), a female named as the second wife, apparently of Mered, and mother of several founders of cities in Judah (1Ch 4:18); probably the same with HODIAH in the ensuing verse, mentioned as the sister of Naham, etc. The latter name is possibly by a corruption of ha-Yehudiyah. SEE MERED. B.C. cir. 1612.

## Jehul[[@Headword:Jehul]]

             according to the Talmud, is the supreme genius of the genii ruling the fire. Subordinate to him are Seraphiel, Gabriel, Nuriel, Tamael, Shimshiel, Hadarniel, and Sarniel.

## Jehush [[@Headword:Jehush ]]

             (Chronicles 8:39). SEE JEUSH.

## Jeiel [[@Headword:Jeiel ]]

             (Heb. Yeiel', יְעַיאֵל, snatched away by God), the name of several men. SEE JEHIEL; SEE JEUEL.

1. (Text יְעַואֵל[ i.e. Jeuel], Sept. Ι᾿ειήλ v.r. Ι᾿εήλ, Vulg. Jehiel, Auth. Version “Jehiel.”) A descendant of Benjamin, apparently named as the founder of and resident at Gibeon, the husband of Maachah, and the father of a large family (1Ch 9:35; comp. 8:29). B.C. prob. cir. 1618.

2. (Text יְעַוֹאֵל[i.e. Jeuel], Sept. Ι᾿εϊήλ or Ι᾿ειήλ, Vulg. Jediel, Auth. Vers. “Jehiel.”) An Aroerite, son of Hothan, and brother of Shama, one of David's supplementary heroes (1Ch 11:44). B.C. 1046.

3. (Sept. Ι᾿εϊήλ,Vulg. Jehiel, but Jahiel in the first occurrence in 1Ch 16:5.) One of the Levites appointed by David to celebrate the divine praises before the ark on its removal to Jerusalem (1Ch 16:5); apparently the same mentioned again in the latter part of the same verse as a performer on “psalteries and harps;” named elsewhere in like connection with Obededom, either as a gate warden of the Temple (1Ch 15:18; 1Ch 15:21), or as one of the sacred musicians “with harps on the Sheminith to excel” (1Ch 15:21). B.C. 1043. SEE JEHIEL, 1.

4. (Sept. Ε᾿λεήλ v.r. Ε᾿λεϊήλ, Ε᾿λειήλ, also Ι᾿ειήλ, Vulg. Jehiel.) A Levite, son of Mattaniah and father of Benaiah, great grandfather of Jahaziel, who  predicted success to Jehoshaphat against the Ammonites and Moabites (2Ch 20:14). B.C. considerably ante 890.

5. (Text יְעַואֵל[i.e. Jeuel], Sept. Ι᾿εϊήλ, Vulg. Jehiel.) A scribe charged, in connection with others, with keeping the account of Uzziah's troops (2Ch 26:11). B.C. 803.

6. (Sept. Ι᾿ωήλ,,Vulg. Jehiel.) A chief Reubenite at the time of the taking of some census, apparently on the deportation of the trans-Jordanic tribes by Tilgath-pilneser (1Ch 5:7). B.C. 782.

7. (Text יְעַואֵל[i.e. Jeuel], Sept. Ι᾿εϊήλ,Vulg. Jahiel.) A Levite of the “sons” of Elizaphan, one of those who assisted in expurgating the Temple in the reign of Hezekiah (2Ch 29:13). B.C. 726.

8. (Sept. Ι᾿εϊήλ,Vulg. Jehiel.) One of the chief Levites who made an offering for the restoration of the Passover by Josiah (2Ch 35:9). B.C. 623.

9. (Text יְעַואֵל[i.e. Jeuel], Sept. Ι᾿εήλ v.r. Ε᾿ϊήλ, Vulg. Jehiel.) One of the “last sons” of Adonikam, a leading Israelite, who, with seventy males, returned from Babylon with Ezra (Ezr 8:13). B.C. 459.

10. (Sept. Ι᾿εεήλ v.r. Ι᾿αήλ,Vulg. Jehiel.) An Israelite, one of the “sons” of Nebo, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Exile (Ezr 10:43). B.C. 459.

## Jeins[[@Headword:Jeins]]

             SEE JAINS.

## Jeish[[@Headword:Jeish]]

             SEE JEUSH.

## Jeithro[[@Headword:Jeithro]]

             (Heb. Yithro', יַתְרוֹ, i.q. יַתְרוֹן, excellence or gain, as often in Eccles.; occurs in Exo 3:1; Exo 4:18; Exo 18:1-2; Exo 18:5-6; Exo 18:9-10; Exo 18:12; Sept. Ι᾿οθόρ) or JETHER (יֶתֶר, abundance, as often; occurs with reference to this person, Exo 4:18, where it is Anglicized “Jethro” in the Auth. Vers., though  in the Heb.-Samuel text and Samuel version the reading is יתרו, as in the Syriac and Targ. Jon., one of Kennicott's MSS., and a MS. of Targ. Onk., No. 16 in De Rossi's collection; Sept. Ι᾿οθόρ), a “priest or prince (for the word כּהֵןcarries both significations, and both these offices were united in the patriarchal sheiks) of Midian, a tract of country in Arabia Petrea, on the eastern border of the Red Sea, at no great distance from Mount Sinai, where Moses spent his exile from the Egyptian court, B.C. 1698. The family of this individual seems, in the sequel at least, to have observed the worship of the true God in common with the Hebrews (Exo 18:11-12), and from this circumstance some suppose it to have been a branch of the posterity of Midian, fourth son of Abraham, by Keturah, while others, on the contrary, maintain that the aspersion cast upon Moses for having married a Cushite is inconsistent with the idea of its genealogical descent from that patriarch (Calmet). SEE MIDIAN.

“Considerable difficulty has been felt in determining who this person was, as well as his exact relation to Moses; for the word חֹתְן, which, in Exo 3:1; Num 10:29; Jdg 4:11, is translated father-in- law, and in Gen 19:14, son-in-law, is a term of indeterminate signification, denoting simply relationship by marriage; and besides, the transaction which in one place (Exo 18:27) is related of Jethro, seems to be in another related of Hobab (Num 10:28). Hence some have concluded that, as forty years had elapsed since Moses' connection with this family was formed, his father-in-law (Exo 2:18), Reuel or Raguel (the same word in the original is used in both places), was dead, or confined to his tent by the infirmities of age, and that the person who visited Moses at the foot of Sinai was his brother-in-law, called Hobab in Num 10:29; Jdg 4:11; Jethro in Exo 3:1; and in Jdg 1:16, Keni (קֵינַי, which there, as well as in 4:11, is rendered ‘the Kenite')” (Kitto). Against this explanation, however, there lies this serious objection, that in Num 10:29 Hobab is expressly called the son of Raguel (or Reuel), who in Exo 2:16-21 is evidently made the father-in-law of Moses, and in 3:1 is clearly the same as Jethro. Nor will the interpretation of the Targum avail, which makes Reuel the grandfather of Moses' wife (by a frequent Hebraism of “daughter” for granddaughter, etc.); for then Moses' real father-in-law would be nowhere named; and it is clearly Jethro whose flocks he kept, and to whom he “made obeisance” (Exo 18:7); which, with other incidental allusions, are all natural on the supposition that Moses was his son-in-law, but are out of place in a  brother-in-law.

Besides, it is Jethro who is called the sacerdotal and tribal head of the clan, which could not, under the patriarchal domestic constitution, have been the case had his father Reuel been still alive. If, indeed, we could accept the ingenious conjecture of Ewald (Gesch. des Isr. sec. 2:33) that, by an ancient clerical error, the words יתרו בן, “Jethro, son of,” had dropped out before the name of Reuel, it would then be easy, with the Targum Jonathan, Aben-Ezra, Rosenmüller, etc., to assume that Jethro was Reuel's son; but there is no trace of such an error. All those methods of adjusting these accounts must therefore be abandoned which maintain the identity of Jethro and Hobab, in whatever way they seek (see Winer's Realworterbuch, s.v. Raguel) to reconcile the discrepancies; and the whole of the statements maybe cleared up by understanding, with Von Lengerke (Kenaan, 1, 393), Bertheau (Gesch. Isra. sec. 242), Kalisch (Exodus p. 35), and others, that Jethro and Raguel were but different names of Moses' father-in-law, and that the son Hobab was his brother-in- law (referring חֹתֵןin Num 10:29 to Raguel, and in Jdg 4:11 taking it in the general sense of affinis, relative by marriage).

Josephus, in speaking of Raguel, remarks once (Ant. 2, 12, 1) that he “had Iothor (Ι᾿οθόρ, i.e. Jethro) for a surname” (Ι᾿εθεγλαῖος ην ἐπίκλημα τῷ ῾Ραγοοήλ). “The abbreviated form of his name (Jether or Jethro, for Jethron) is enumerated by the Midrash as the first of the seven (or, according to another version, eight) names by which this Midianitish priest was known [viz. Jether or Jethro, because he heaped up (הותיר) good deeds, or because ‘he added a Parasha to the Torah;' Cheber (חבר), because he was a friend of the Lord; Chobeb (חבב), because he was beloved by the Lord, or because ‘he loved the Torah;' Reuel, because he was a companion (רע) to the Lord; Petuel, because he freed himself (פטר) from idolatry]. Indeed, Jether is considered his original name, to which, when he became a believer and a convert to the faith, an additional letter (ו) was affixed. According to the Midrash (fol. 53, 54), he had been one of Pharaoh's musicians, and had got possession of Adam's staff, which had belonged to Joseph; but he was driven from Egypt because he opposed the decree for drowning the Israelitish infants.” SEE HOBAB; SEE RAGUEL.

“The hospitality, free hearted and unsought, which Jethro at once extended to the unknown, homeless wanderer, on the relation of his daughters that he had watered their flock, is a picture of Eastern manners no less true than lovely. We may perhaps suppose that Jethro, before his acquaintance with  Moses, was not a worshipper of the true God. Traces of this appear in the delay which Moses had suffered to take place with respect to the circumcision of his son (Exo 4:24-26): indeed, it is even possible that Zipporah had afterwards been subjected to a kind of divorce (Exo 18:2, שַׁלּוּחֶיה), on account of her attachment to an alien creed, but that growing convictions were at work in the mind of Jethro, from the circumstance of Israel's continued prosperity, till at last, acting upon these, he brought back his daughter, and declared that his impressions were confirmed, for now he knew that the Lord was greater than all gods, for in the thing wherein they dealt proudly, he was above them: consequently. we are told that ‘Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, took a burnt- offering and sacrifices for God: and Aaron came and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with Moses' father-in-law before God.' as if to celebrate the event of his conversion” SEE MOSES.

“Shortly after the Exodus (B.C. 1658), Jethro paid a visit to Moses, while the Hebrew camp was lying in the environs of Sinai, bringing with him Zipporah, Moses' wife, who, together with her two sons, had been left with her family while her husband was absent on his embassy to Pharaoh. The interview was on both sides affectionate, and was celebrated first by the solemn rites of religion, and afterwards by festivities, of which Aaron and the elders of Israel were invited to partake. On the following day, observing Moses incessantly occupied in deciding causes that were submitted to him for judgment, his experienced kinsman remonstrated with him on the speedy exhaustion which a perseverance in such arduous labors would superinduce; and in order to relieve himself, as well as secure a due attention to every case, he urged Moses to appoint a number of subordinate officers to divide with him the duty of the judicial tribunals, with power to decide in all common affairs, while the weightier and more serious matters were reserved to himself. This wise suggestion the Hebrew legislator adopted (Exodus 18).

As the Hebrews were shortly afterwards about preparing to decamp from Sinai, the kinsmen of Moses announced their intention to return to their own territory,” and Moses interposed no special objection to the purpose on the part of his father-in-law, whose presence was doubtless essential at home, and who accordingly took his departure (Exo 18:27). His brother-in-law Hobab naturally purposed to accompany his father back to Midian, and at first expressed a refusal to the invitation of Moses to accompany the Israelites to Canaan (Num 10:29-30). It is not stated whether he actually returned with  his father, “but if he did carry that purpose into execution, it was in opposition to the urgent solicitations of the Jewish leader, who entreated him, for his own advantage, to cast in his lot with the people of God; at all events to continue with them, and afford them the benefit of his thorough acquaintance with the wilderness. ‘Leave us not, I pray thee,' said Moses, ‘forasmuch as thou knowest how we are to encamp in the wilderness, and thou mayest be to us instead of eyes;' which the Sept. has rendered ‘and thou shalt be an elder among us.' But there can be little doubt that the true meaning is that Hobab might perform the office of a hyber or guide (see Bruce's Travels, 4, 586)-his influence as an Arab chief, his knowledge of the routes, the situation of the wells, the places for fuel, the prognostics of the weather, and the most eligible stations for encamping, rendering him peculiarly qualified to act in that important capacity. SEE CARAVAN.

It is true that God was their leader, by the pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, the advancement or the halting of which regulated their journeys and fixed their encampments. But beyond these general directions the tokens of their heavenly guide did not extend. As smaller parties were frequently sallying forth from the main body in quest of forage and other necessaries, which human observation or enterprise were sufficient to provide, so Moses discovered his wisdom and good sense in enlisting the aid of the son of a native sheik, who, from his family connection with himself, his powerful influence, and his long experience, promised to render the Israelites most important services.” To these solicitations we may infer, from the absence of any further refusal, that Hobab finally yielded; a conclusion that, indeed, seems to be explicitly referred to in Jdg 1:16; Jdg 4:11. SEE KENITE; SEE ITHRITE.

No other particulars of the life of Jethro are known, but the Arabs, who call him Shoaib, have a variety of traditions concerning him. They say that Michael, the son of Taskir, and grandson of Midian, was his father; this last was the immediate son of Ishmael, according to the author of Leb-Tarik, but Moses makes no mention of Midian among the sons of Ishmael (Gen 25:13-14). Jethro gave his son-in-law Moses the miraculous rod; it had once been the rod of Adam, and was of the myrtle of Paradise, etc. (Lane's Koran, p. 190; Weil's Bibl. Legends, p. 107-109). Although blind (Lane, p.180, note), he was favored with the gift of prophecy, and God sent him to the Midianites to preach the unity of God, and to withdraw them from idolatry. A commentator on the Koran affirms that whenever Jethro performed his devotions on the top of a certain mountain,  the mountain became lower, in order to render his ascent more easy. Another Arabian commentator says that Jethro took pains to reform the bad customs of the Midianites, such as stealing, having two sorts of weights and measures, for buying by the larger and selling by the smaller. Besides these frauds of the Midianites in their trading, they offered violence to travelers, and robbed them on the highways. They threatened even Jethro for his remonstrances. This insolence obliged God to manifest his wrath: he sent the angel Gabriel, who, with a voice of thunder, made the earth to tremble, which destroyed them all except Jethro, and those who, like him, believed' the unity of God (Lane, p. 179-181). After this punishment Jethro went to Moses, as related in Exo 18:1-3. The Mohammedans term him, from the advice he gave to Moses, “The preacher of the prophets” (D'Herbelot, Bibl. Orient. 3, 273 sq.; comp. J. C. Maier, De Jethrone, Helmst. 1715). -- “The name of Sho'eib still remains attached to one of the wadys on the east side of the Jordan, opposite Jericho, through which, according to the tradition of the locality (Seetzen, Reisen, 1854, 2, 319, 376), the children of Israel descended to the Jordan. Other places bearing his name and those of his two daughters are shown at Sinai and on the Gulf of Akaba (Stanley, Syr. and Pal. p. 33)”

## Jeitteles, Juda Low[[@Headword:Jeitteles, Juda Low]]

             a Jewish author, born in 1773, and died at Vienna, June 6, 1838, is the author of מְבוֹא לָשׁוֹן אֲרָמַית, or a grammar of the Aramaean language (Prague, 1813); besides, he translated into German, Job (Vienna, 1834), the Twelve Minor Prophets (1835), Chronicles (eod.), Samuel (1833), Ezekiel (1835), Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah (eod.), which he published with his own comments. See Farst, Bibl. Jud. 1:52. (B.P.)

## Jejeebhoy, Sir Jamsetjee[[@Headword:Jejeebhoy, Sir Jamsetjee]]

             a Parsee philanthropist, was born in Bombay, July 15, 1783. He made voyages between India and China, and amassed a large fortune, possessing at his death about $4,000,000. As early as 1822 he released the debtors confined in the jail by paying their debts; and his donations to public objects were estimated at about $1,500,000. He received the honor of knighthood from Queen Victoria in 1842, and a gold medal in 1843. He endowed hospitals, schools, medical institutions, and other benevolent establishments. A school at Bombay for the education and support of poor Parsee children he endowed at an expense of $250,000. He built comfortable places of refuge for the convenience of travellers in various parts of the country, the causeway which unites the islands of Bombay and Salsette, the water-works at Poonah, the bridges at Earla, Parta, and Bartba, and many other public works. In 1857 he was advanced to the dignity of a baronet. He died at Bombay, April 14, 1859. A statue was erected to his memory in the town-hall of Bombay, and exposed to view August 1, 1859. See Appleton's Amer. Cyclop. s.v.

## Jejumi (Figure-Treading)[[@Headword:Jejumi (Figure-Treading)]]

             is a ceremony observed annually among the Japanese, of trampling upon the crucifix, and images of the Virgin Mary and other saints. It was designed to express the abhorrence of the Japanese for the religion which the Jesuits had tried to introduce into their empire. The images were about a foot long, cast in brass, and kept in a particular box for the purpose. The ceremony took place in presence of the street officers. Each house was entered by turns, two messengers carrying the box. The images were laid upon the bare floor, and the list of the household being called, they were required in turn to tread upon them. Young children, not yet able to walk, were held in their mothers' arms, so as to touch the images with their feet.

## Jejunia quatuor temporum[[@Headword:Jejunia quatuor temporum]]

             is the original name for the fasts of the four seasons of the year, which are now commonly called Ember Weeks (q.v.). SEE BINGHAM, Antiq. of the Christian Church, p. 155, 1190.

## Jejunium[[@Headword:Jejunium]]

             SEE FASTING.

## Jekabzeel[[@Headword:Jekabzeel]]

             (Heb. Yekabtseël', יְקִבְצְאֵל, gathered by God; Sept. Καβσεήλ,Vulg. Cabseel), the name of a place in the tribe of Judah (Neh 11:25); elsewhere (Jos 15:21) called by the equivalent but shorter name KABZEEL SEE KABZEEL (q.v.).

## Jekameam[[@Headword:Jekameam]]

             (Heb. Yekamam', יְקִמְעָם, gatherer of the people; Sept. Ι᾿εκεμίας), the fourth in rank of the “sons” of Hebron in the Levitical arrangement established by David (1Ch 23:19; 1Ch 24:23). B.C. 1014.

## Jekamiah[[@Headword:Jekamiah]]

             (Heb. Yekamryah', יְקִמְיָה, gathered by Jehovah), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿εκεμίας v.r. Ι᾿εχεμίας, Vulg. Icamia.) Son of Shallum, and father of Elishama, of the descendants of Sheshan of Judah (1Ch 2:41). B.C. prob. cir. 588.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿εκενία v.r. Ι᾿εκεμία,Vulg. Jecemia, Auth. Version “Jecamiah.”) The fifth named of the sons of king Jeconiah (1Ch 3:18), born to him during the Babylonian exile, and, according to tradition, by Susanna. SEE JEHOIACHIN. B.C. post 598.

## Jekire[[@Headword:Jekire]]

             an evil spirit among the Japanese, which they expel by exorcism.

## Jekuthiel[[@Headword:Jekuthiel]]

             (Heb. Yekuthiël', יְקוּתַיאֵל, reverence of God; Sept. Ι᾿εκθηήλ v.r. ὁ Χετιήλ), “father” of Zanoah and one of the sons apparently of Mered by his second wife Hodiah, or Jehudijah (1Ch 4:18). B.C. cir. 1618. SEE MERED.

“In the comment of Rabbi Joseph, Jered is interpreted to mean Moses and each of the names following are taken as titles borne by him. Jekuthiel — ‘trust in God' — is so applied ‘because in his days the Israelites trusted in the God of heaven for forty years in the wilderness.' In a remarkable prayer used by the Spanish and Portuguese Jews in the concluding service of the Sabbath, Elijah is invoked as having had ‘tidings of peace delivered to him by the hand of Jekuthiel.' This is explained to refer to some transaction in the life of Phineas, with whom Elijah is, in the traditions of the Jews, believed to be identical (see Allen, Modern Judaism, p. 229).”

## Jekuthiel (2)[[@Headword:Jekuthiel (2)]]

             SEE LUZATTO.

## Jekuthiel Ben-Jehudah Cohen[[@Headword:Jekuthiel Ben-Jehudah Cohen]]

             (also called SALMAN NAKDON, i.e. the Punctuator, and by contraction IEHABI), a distinguished Masorite and editor of the Hebrew Scriptures, flourished in Prague in the latter half of the 13th century. He edited a very correct text of the Pentateuch (published for the first time by Heidenheim in his edition of the Pentateuch called עינים מאיר [Rödelheim, 1818-21]) and the book of Esther (also published by Heidenheim in his סדר ימי הפורים [Rödelheim, 1825]), with the vowels and accents, for the preparation of which he consulted six old Spanish codices, which he denominates תא, אק, אח, אמס,אז, אט, and which Heidenheim explains to mean any אחד, תיקון, קדמון, השוב, מסוריות, תקן, טוב, the prefix א denoting Spain (comp. עין הקוראon Num 34:28). The results of his critical labors he further embodied in a work entitled עין קירא (The Eye of the Reader), and makes frequent quotations from the writings of many distinguished Jewish commentators of his and the preceding age. An appendix to the work contains a grammatical treatise entitled כללי הנקוד דרכי הנקוד (The Laws of the Vowel Points). Comp. Zunz, Zur  Geschichte und Literatur (Berl. 1845), p. 115; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 2, 53; Geiger, Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift f. Jüdische Theologie, 5, 418- 420; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Heb. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 1381.

## Jekuthiel ben-Isaac, Blitz[[@Headword:Jekuthiel ben-Isaac, Blitz]]

             also called by his father's name, Isaac Blitz, was corrector of the press at the printing establishment of Uri Febes Levi at Amsterdam, and was the first Jew who translated the whole O.T. into German (in Hebrew type). It was published under the title תנ ִבלשון אשכנז(The four-and-twenty Books translated into German), with (הרלב8ג בלשון אשכנז תועליות) Ralbag's תועליות, or Usus on Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, and a threefold introduction, viz. a Hebrew introduction by the translator, a Latin diploma from the Polish king, John Sobieski III, a Judaeo-German introduction by the publisher, and a German introduction by the translator (Amsterd. 1676-78). A specimen of this translation is given by Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebroea, 4, 183-187. Comp. also 2, 454 of the same work; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 175; Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, 10, 329 sq.; Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. 1, 120 sq.

## Jelf, Richard William[[@Headword:Jelf, Richard William]]

             an English clergyman, was born in London in 1798, and educated at Oxford, where he graduated in 1820, and became a fellow of Oriel College and a tutor. In 1826 he became preceptor in the royal family. He was made canon of Christ Church in 1831, Bampton lecturer and principal of King's College, London, in 1844. He died in Oxford, September 19, 1871. Among his published works are, Sermons, Doctrinal and Practical (1835): — The Means of Grace (Bampton Lectures, 1844): — and a new edition of the Works of Bishop Jewel (1847-48, 8 volumes).

## Jemima[[@Headword:Jemima]]

             (Heb. Yenzinzah', יְמַימָה, dove, from the Arab.; Sept. ῾Ημέρα,Vulg. Dies, both mistaking the derivation as if from יוֹם, day), the name of the first of Job's three daughters born after his trial (Job 42:14). B.C. cir. 2200. “The Rev. C. Forster (Historical Geography of Arabia, 2:67), in tracing the posterity of Job in Arabia, thinks that the name of Jemima survives in Jemama, the central province of the Arabian peninsula, which, according to an Arabian tradition (see Bochart, Phaleg, 2, § 26), was called after Jemama, an ancient queen of the Arabians” (Smith).

Jemini.

SEE BENJAMIN.

## Jemma[[@Headword:Jemma]]

             the judge of the wicked after death, among the Japanese, who beholds in a large mirror all the most secret transactions of mankind. Intercession by the priests with Amidas in behalf of the sinner, and liberal presents on the part of his relatives, are sure to release him before the expiration of the allotted time for punishment. The figure of Jemma, the king of the devils, is monstrous; and on each side of him are two large devils, one acting as his secretary, and registering in a book all the sins of mankind, while the other dictates what the secretary is to record. This idol is situated in a temple of Jemma, a short distance from Miaco, in a delightful grotto. The walls are covered with frightful pictures of tortures which the wicked are supposed to undergo. This temple is resorted to by crowds of people from all parts of the country, with oblations and money in their hands, to redeem the souls from dreaded punishments. SEE JAMA.

## Jemnaan[[@Headword:Jemnaan]]

             (Ι᾿εμναάν, Vulg. omits), a place mentioned in the Apocrypha (Jdt 2:20) among those on the sea coast of Palestine to which the panic of the incursion of Holofernes extended, no doubt JABNEEL SEE JABNEEL or JAMNIA SEE JAMNIA (q.v.).

## Jemshid[[@Headword:Jemshid]]

             in Iranian history, the mythical hero who led the Aryan tribes in their first emigration to Asia, and who taught them the arts of civilization. He is said, however, to have taught them idolatry also. His real name was Yima- Khacta.

## Jemuel[[@Headword:Jemuel]]

             (Heb. Yenmuël', יְמוּאֵל, day-light of God, Sept. Ι᾿εμουήλ, Vulg. Jamuel), the first named of the sons of Simeon (Gen 46:10; Exo 6:15); elsewhere (Num 26:12) called NEMUEL (נְמוּאֵל, Nemuël'; Sept. Ναμουήλ, Vulg. Namuel), apparently by an error of copyists, and his descendants NEMUELITES (Hebrew Nemuëli, נְמוּאֵלַי, Sept. Ναμουηλί, Vulg. Namuelitoe, Num 26:12). B.C. 1856.

## Jenichen, Gottlob Friedrich[[@Headword:Jenichen, Gottlob Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 26, 1680, and died at Leipsic, September 17, 1735, professor of ethics. He is the author of  Historia et Examen Bullae Clementis XI contra Quesneliums Emissae (Leipsic, 1714). See Winer, Handbuchsder theol. Lit. 1:652. (B.P.)

## Jenings, Samuel[[@Headword:Jenings, Samuel]]

             a distinguished minister of the Society of Friends, was born at Coleshill, Buckinghamshire, England, about 1650, and emigrated to New Jersey in 1680, having for some time been an approved minister in his denomination. Soon after his arrival he was appointed by governor Bylliige, of New Jersey, as his deputy, This position he occupied until 1683, when the Provincial Assembly chose him governor of the colony for one year. Up. to the time of his removal to Philadelphia, in 1692, he occupied the highest offices in the province. In Pennsylvania his abilities were highly appreciated, and he was nominated to the commission of the peace. When the controversy arose with George Keith (q.v.) he became one of his most zealous and active opponents, and in the early part of 1694 sailed for London as respondent in the appeal of Keith to the London Yearly Meeting, where he ably vindicated the cause of his American brethren from the aspersions of their detractor. On returning from England lie removed from Philadelphia to Burlington, his former home in New Jersey. In 1702 he was appointed a member of the Provincial Council, and in 1707 was elected speaker of the assembly, "in which station he. distinguished himself by a bold and fearless opposition to the arbitrary misrule of the bigoted lord Cornbury."' In his spiritual vocation we are told that he was "an able minister of the gospel, and labored much, therein, to the comfort and edification of many people, both in the province of New Jersey and other places. He was one of those rare individuals in whom was concentrated a variety of qualifications and mental endowments, by which, under the sanctifying power of truth, he was made eminently useful to his fellow- men, both in his ministerial and civil capacity." He died at Burlington in 1708. See Bowden, Hist. of Friends in America, 2:254. (J.C.S.)

## Jenisch, Daniel[[@Headword:Jenisch, Daniel]]

             a German theologian of some note, was born at Heiligenbeil, in East Prussia, April 2, 1762, and educated at the University of Königsberg. In 1786 he became pastor at the Mary Church, and afterwards at the Nicholas Church. Endowed with great natural abilities, and a very earnest worker,  Jenisch, soon secured for himself one of the foremost places as a theologian and a philosophical writer. But too close application to study resulted in a derangement of his mental powers and he is supposed to have violently ended his life Feb. 9, 1804. His works of interest to us are Ueber Grund u. Werth d. Entdeckungen Kant's in der Metaphysik, Moral, u. Aesthetik (Berl. 1796, large 8vo): — Sollte Religion dem Menschen jemals entbehrlich werden: (ibid. 1797, 8vo). Besides these, he published, after his mind began to be seriously affected, Ueber Gottesverehrung u. Kirchliche Reformen (ibid. 1802, 8vo), rather the work of a skeptical Christian, if we may use the expression, though it contains also many just criticisms on the liturgy and homiletics of the Lutheran Church of his day; and Kritik des dogmatisch-idealischen u. hyperidealischen Religions u. Moralsystems (Lpz. 1804, 8vo), which was the last work of Jenisch. See Döring, Gelehrte Theologen Deutschlands, 2, 20 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Jenkin, Robert[[@Headword:Jenkin, Robert]]

             an English theologian, was born at Minster, Thanet, in 1656. He studied at Canterbury and Cambridge, of which he became fellow. He was successively appointed rector of St. John's College, professor of theology, and chaplain to Dr. Lake, bishop of Chichester. In 1688 he refused to take the oath required of all holding benefices and retired to private life. He died in 1727. His principal work is The Reasonableness of the Christian Religion (six editions; the best 1734, 2 vols. 8vo). He wrote also Examination of the Authority of General Councils (Lond. 1688, 4to): — Defensio sancti Augustini versus J. Phereponum (London, 1707, 8vo): — Remarks upon four Books just published (on Basnage's History of the Jews, Lake's Paraphrase of St. Paul's Epistle, Le Clerc's Bibliotheque choisie, etc.). He also translated into English Tillemont's Life of Apollonius of Tyana. See Gorton, General Biograph. Dict. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, 26, 650; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 962. (J.N.P.)

## Jenkin, William[[@Headword:Jenkin, William]]

             SEE JENKYN.

## Jenks, Benjamin[[@Headword:Jenks, Benjamin]]

             an English divine, was borne in 1646. Of his early history but little is known. He was at first rector at Harley, then at Kenley, and afterwards  chaplain to the earl of Bradford. He died at Harley in 1724. He published Prayers and Offices of Devotion for Families, and for particular Persons upon most Occasions (London, 1697, 8vo; of which the 27th edition was published in 1810 by the Rev. Charles Simeon, fellow of King's College, Cambridge, with alterations and amendments in style; there is also an edition by Barnes, 12mo, and an abridgment, 12mo): — Submission to the Righteousness of God (1700, 8vo; 4th ed. 1755, 12mo): — Meditations, with short Prayers annexed (1701, 8vo; 2d edit. 1756, 2 vols. 8vo. with a recommendatory Preface by Mr. Hervey): — Ouranography, or Heaven Opened (1710, 8vo): — The Poor Man's Companion, a lesser Prayer book for Families on common Days and other Occasions (Lond. 1713, 8vo), besides a number of sermons on various topics. See Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 963.

## Jenks, Hervey[[@Headword:Jenks, Hervey]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Brookfield, Mass. June 16, 1787, and was educated at Brown University. After teaching a short time at the academy at that time connected with the university, he entered the ministry and was successively pastor at West Stockbridge, Mass. and Hudson, N.Y.; then at Hudson alone; next at Beverly, Mass. whence he again returned to Hudson. He died July 15, 1814. He was a young man of great promise, and, though he was only twenty-eight years old when he died, his abilities had already been generally recognized. — Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, 6, 587 sq.

## Jenks, William[[@Headword:Jenks, William]]

             D.D., a Congregational minister of great ability and distinction, was born at Newton, Mass. in 1778, but when only four years of age his father removed to Boston. He was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1797. He was first settled in the ministry over the Congregational Church in Bath, Me. where he remained twelve years; he next filled the professorship of Oriental and English literature in Bowdoin College three years; then he went to Boston and was very active in originating plans to secure religious and social privileges for seamen, till that time a neglected class of men. Some of the more prominent institutions for the benefit of sailors now existing in that city owe their origin to him. He was pastor at the same time of the Green Street church, which he served for twenty-five years. He died Nov. 13,  1866. Dr. Jenks was one of the chief founders of the American Oriental Society and a prominent member of the Massachusetts Historical Society. He was particularly distinguished as an Orientalist and edited the Comprehensive Commentary on the Holy Bible (Brattleborough, 1834, 5 vols. roy. 8vo; Supplem. 1 vol. roy. 8vo), which “still stands without a rival for the purpose for which it was intended.” He also published an Explanatory Bible Atlas and Scripture Gazetteer (1819, 4to). See Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 963; Appleton, Amer. Annual Cyclop. 1866, p. 420. (J.H.W.)

## Jenkyn, Robert[[@Headword:Jenkyn, Robert]]

             SEE JENKIN.

## Jenkyn, T. Wo, D.D[[@Headword:Jenkyn, T. Wo, D.D]]

             a Welsh Congregational minister, was born in South Wales in 1796. He gave early evidence of earnest piety; began to preach while in his youth, studied at Homerton College, and settled first at Oswestry in 1823. While in that border-town of his native country he published The Extent of the Atonement, by which he acquired both literary and theological celebrity, and which led to his being appointed to the theological chair, eventually to  the presidency, of Coward College. Meanwhile he removed to Stafford, and there wrote and published On the Union of the Holy Spirit and the Church in the Conversion of the World. In 1837 he relinquished his charge in Stafford, and, proceeding to Germany, formed friendships with the distinguished theologians of that country. When Coward College was amalgamated with Highbury and Homerton colleges, in 1850, Dr. Jenkyn's services were no longer required. Being anxious to do good, he went to Rochester, to establish a new interest in that town, and after a short visit to America returned and labored there to his dying day, May 26, 1858. Dr. Jenkyn was social in his habits, an impassioned lover of music, and no less enthusiastic in his devotion to theological science. See (Lond.) Cong. Year- book, 1859, page 203.

## Jenkyn, William[[@Headword:Jenkyn, William]]

             an English Nonconformist divine, was born at Sudbury, Suffolk, in 1612, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. He first became lecturer of St. Nicholas Acons, London, and in 1641 minister of Christ Church, Newgate Street, and lecturer of St. Ann's, Blackfriars. Refusing to observe (in 1662) the public thanksgiving appointed by Parliament on occasion of the destruction of the monarchy, he was ejected for nonconformity. Soon after he was sent to the Tower for participation in Love's plot, but, upon petition, was pardoned, and restored to the ministry. Mr. Feak, who had in the interim become minister of Christ Church, was removed, and Mr. Jenkyn reinstated. Upon this he devoted himself with zeal to his work. On the passage of the Oxford Act he refused to take the oath and retired from London to Hertfordshire, where he preached privately. After the Act of Indulgence in 1671, he returned again to London; but when, in 1682, the tempest broke out against the Nonconformists, he fell into the hands of his enemies, and was sent to Newgate under the Conventicle Act, where he died, from the air and infection of the prison, in 1685. Jenkyn enjoyed a very enviable reputation among his contemporaries for Christian piety and great ability. Richard Baxter pronounced him “a sententious and elegant preacher.” He published An Exposition of the Epistle of Jude (London, 1652-54, 4to; another ed. revised by the Rev. James Sherman, with memoir of the author, London, 1839, imp. 8vo, and often). See Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 963; Nonconformists' Memorial; Calamy, Ministers ejected (1728); Hoefer, Nouv. Biograph. Générale, 26, 649.

## Jennings, David[[@Headword:Jennings, David]]

             D.D., an eminent Independent minister, was born at Kibworth, Leicestershire, in 1691. In 1718 he became pastor of a congregation in Old Gravel Lane, Wapping, where he remained for forty- four years. In 1744 he went as divinity tutor to Coward's Academy and died Sept. 16, 1762. His principal works are, Jewish Antiquities, with a Dissertation on the Hebrew Language (London, 1766; 10th edition, 1839, 8vo); a work which “has long held a distinguished character for its accuracy and learning,” and certainly one of the best works of the kind in the English language: — The Beauty and Benefit of early Piety (Lond. 1731, 18mo): — A Vindication of the Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin [Anonym.] (London, 1740, 8vo): — An Appeal to Reason and Common Sense (1755, 12mo): — Sermons to the Young (1743, 12mo), etc. See Orton, Life of Doddridge, p. 16, 243; Protestant Dissent. Mag. vol. 5; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, 26, 660; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 964.

## Jennings, John[[@Headword:Jennings, John]]

             an English dissenting minister, brother of David Jennings (see above), became, after preaching for some time, a theological tutor at Kibworth. He was also tutor to Dr. Doddridge. He died in 1723. He wrote Two Discourses on Preaching (London, 1754, 12mo; also in E. Williams's Preacher's Assistant), etc. See Wilson, Hist. of Dissenters; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 26, 660; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, 1, 964.

## Jennings, Obadiah, D.D[[@Headword:Jennings, Obadiah, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Baskengridge, N.J., December 13, 1778, He was educated at Jefferson College, Cannonsburg, Pennsylvania. He studied law for some years, and was admitted to the bar in 1800. He joined the Presbyterian Church in 1811, was licensed to preach in 1816, by the Presbytery of Ohio, and soon afterwards accepted a call to the Presbyterian Church in Steubenville, Ohio, where he labored with great fidelity and success for six years. and then accepted a call to Washington, Pa. In 1828 he removed to Nashville, Tenn., where he remained till the close of his life, January 12, 1832. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:549.

## Jennings, Samuel Kennedy[[@Headword:Jennings, Samuel Kennedy]]

             a Protestant Methodist lay minister of great ability and distinction, was born in Essex County, N. J. June 6, 1771. He was educated at Rutgers (then Queens) College. After the completion of his collegiate course he studied medicine and for a time even practiced as a physician. In his youth he was a decided infidel, although he sprang from a family of ministers and zealous Christian workers. In 1794 he was converted, and two years after he entered the lay ministry, and served his Church very ably. In 1805 bishop Asbury ordained him a deacon, and in 1814 bishop M'Kendree made him an elder. In 1817 he took up his residence at Baltimore, after having filled in various places the position of physician and minister, and in this city also he made many friends by his Christian kindness and liberality. He was one of the prime movers for the introduction of lay representation in the Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was one of  those who were expelled from the Methodist Episcopal Church, and finally organized the “Methodist Protestant Church.” SEE LAY DELEGATION. He died Oct. 19, 1854. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7, 279; Stevens, Hist. Meth. Episc. Church. (J.H.W.)

## Jenny, Robert, LL.D[[@Headword:Jenny, Robert, LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, son of archdeacon Jenny of Waneytown, in the north of Ireland, arrived in America in 1715, as a missionary of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, having been appointed assistant to the Reverend William Vesey, rector of Trinity Church, New York city. In 1722 he was transferred to Rye, and remained there until 1728, when he assumed charge of the church in Hempstead, L.I. In November 1742, by license of the bishop of London, he became rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia, which post he held until the close of his life. His ministry covered fifty-two years. He died in January 1762, aged seventy-five years. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:16.

## Jenyns, Soame[[@Headword:Jenyns, Soame]]

             an English politician, and a writer on theological subjects, born at London in 1704, was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. He was in his early years a well-known infidel, but extended Biblical studies caused his conversion and he at once entered the lists in active defense of the Gospel truths. His ablest work, and one which has given rise to the supposition on the part of some that Jenyns published it only with intent to injure the Christian cause, now generally refuted on good grounds, is, View of the Internal Evidence of the Christian Religion (1776, 12mo; 10th. ed. 1798, 8vo, and often since). Baxter (Ch. History, p. 659) says that the work “brought out the internal evidence to the truth of Christianity arising from its peculiar and exalted morality,” and points to it as one of the efforts by which “infidelity, if not convinced, was silenced.” (See, for the pamphlets on the controversy which this work elicited, Chalmers, Biog. Dict. 18, 520, note 8). He also wrote A free Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Evil (1756, 8vo, and often), which was rather a failure as a theological treatise, and was very severely criticized by Dr. Johnson (see Boswell's Johnson, year 1756). The entire writings of Jenyns are collected in 4 vols. 8vo (Lond. 1790-93), together with his biography by Charles Nelson Cole. Jenyns died Dec. 18, 1787. See Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 965; English Cyclopoedia, s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Jephthae[[@Headword:Jephthae]]

             (Heb 11:32). SEE JEPHTHAH.

## Jephthah[[@Headword:Jephthah]]

             (Heb. Yiphtach', יַפְתָּח, opened or opener), the name of a man and also of a place. SEE JIPHTHAH-EL.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿εφθά v.r. Ι᾿εφθαέ and Ι᾿εφθάε, Josephus Ι᾿εφθής, Vulg. Jephte, N.T. Ι᾿εφθάε, “Jephthaë”), the ninth judge of the Israelites for a period of six years, B.C. 1256-1250. He belonged to the tribe of Manasseh east, and was the son of a person named Gilead by a concubine, or perhaps harlot.  After the death of his father he was expelled from his home by the envy of his brothers, who, taunting him with illegitimacy, refused him any share of the heritage, and he withdrew to the land of Tob, beyond the frontier of the Hebrew territories. It is clear that he had before this distinguished himself by his daring character and skill in arms; for no sooner was his withdrawal known than a great number of men of desperate fortunes repaired to him and he became their chief. His position was now very similar to that of David when he withdrew from the court of Saul. To maintain the people who had thus linked their fortunes with his, there was no other resource than that sort of brigandage, which is accounted honorable in the East, so long as it is exercised against public or private enemies and is not marked by needless cruelty or outrage. So Jephthah confined his aggressions to the borders of the small neighboring nations, who were in some sort regarded as the natural enemies of Israel, even when there was no actual war between them (Jdg 11:1-3).

The tribes beyond the Jordan having resolved to oppose the Ammonites, to whom the Israelites had fallen under subjection after the death of Jair, in consequence of relapsing into idolatry, Jephthah seems to have occurred to every one as the most fitting leader. A deputation was accordingly sent to invite him to take the command. After some demur, on account of the treatment he had formerly received, he consented to become their captain on the condition — solemnly ratified before the Lord in Mizpeh — that, in the event of his success against Ammon, he should still remain as their acknowledged head. The rude hero commenced his operations with a degree of diplomatic consideration and dignity for which we are not prepared. The Ammonites being assembled in force for one of those ravaging incursions by which they had repeatedly desolated the land, he sent to their camp a formal complaint of the invasion and a demand of the ground of their proceeding. This is highly interesting, because it shows that, even in that age, a cause for war was judged necessary, no one being supposed to war without provocation; and, in this case, Jephthah demanded what cause the Ammonites alleged to justify their aggressive operations. Their answer was, that the land of the Israelites beyond the Jordan was theirs. It had originally belonged to them, from whom it had been taken by the Amorites, who had been dispossessed by the Israelites, and on this ground they claimed the restitution of these lands. Jephthah's reply laid down the just principle which has been followed out in the practice of civilized nations and is maintained by all the great writers on the  law of nations. The land belonged to the Israelites by right of conquest from the actual possessors, and they could not be expected to recognize any antecedent claim of former possessors, for whom they had not acted, who had rendered them no assistance, and who had themselves displayed hostility against the Israelites. It was not to be expected that they would conquer the country from the powerful kings who had it in possession, for the mere purpose of restoring it to the ancient occupants, of whom they had no favorable knowledge, and of whose previous claims they were scarcely cognizant. But the Ammonites reasserted their former views, and on this issue they took the field. Animated by a consciousness of divine aid, Jephthah hastened to meet them, defeated them in several pitched battles, followed them with great slaughter, and utterly broke their dominion over the eastern Israelites (Jdg 11:4-33). See Pagenstecher, Jephtes (Lemgo, 1746).

The victory over the Ammonites was followed by a quarrel with the proud and powerful Ephraimites on the west side of the Jordan. This tribe was displeased at having had no share in the glory of the recent victory, and a large body of men belonging to it, who had crossed the river to share in the action, used very high and threatening language when they found their services were not required. Jephthah, finding his remonstrances had no effect, reassembled some of his disbanded troops and gave the Ephraimites battle, when they were defeated with immense loss. The victors seized the fords of the Jordan, and, when anyone came to pass over, they made him pronounce the word “Shibboleth” (an ear of corn); but if he could not give the aspiration, and pronounced the word as “Sibboleth,” they knew him for an Ephraimite and slew him on the spot (Jdg 12:1-6).

The remainder of Jephthah's rule was peaceful, and, at his death, he left the country quiet to his successor Ibzan. He was buried in his native region, in one of the cities of Gilead (Jdg 12:7).

JEPHTHAH'S VOW. — When Jephthah set forth against the Ammonites, he solemnly vowed to the Lord, “If thou shalt without fail deliver the children of Ammon into my hands, then it shall be that whatsoever cometh forth [i.e. first] of the doors of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, shall surely be the Lord's, and I will offer it up for a burnt offering” (Jdg 11:30-31). He was victorious: the Ammonites sustained a terrible overthrow. He did return in peace to his house in Mizpeh. As he drew nigh his house, the one that came forth to  meet him was his own daughter, his only child, in whom his heart was bound up. She, with her fair companions, came to greet the triumphant hero “with timbrels and with dances.” But he no sooner saw her than he rent his robes and cried, “Alas! my daughter, thou hast brought me very low... for I have opened my mouth unto the Lord, and cannot go back.” Nor did she ask it. She replied, “My father, if thou hast opened thy mouth unto the Lord, do to me according to that which has proceeded out of thy mouth, forasmuch as the Lord hath taken vengeance for thee of thine enemies, the children of Ammon.” But, after a pause, she added, “Let this thing be done for me: let me alone two months, that I may go up and down upon the mountains and bewail my virginity, I and my fellows.” Her father, of course, assented, and when the time expired she returned, and, we are told, “he did with her according to his vow.” It is then added that it became “a custom in Israel that the daughters of Israel went yearly to lament the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite three days in the year” (Jdg 11:34-40).

Volumes have been written on the subject of “Jephthah's rash vow,” the question being whether, in doing to his daughter “according to his vow,” he really did offer her in sacrifice, or whether she was merely doomed to perpetual celibacy.

That the daughter of Jephthah was really offered up to God in sacrifice — slain by the hand of her father and then burned — is a horrible conclusion, but one which it seems impossible to avoid. This was understood to be the meaning of the text by Jonathan the paraphrast, and Rashi, by Josephus (Ant. 5, 7, 10), and by perhaps all the early Christian fathers, as Origen (in Joannem, tom. 6, cap. 36), Chrysostom (Hom. ad pop. Antiochus, 14, 3; Opp. 2, 145), Theodoret (Quoestiones in Judices, 20), Jerome (Ep. ad Jul. 118; Opp. 1, 791, etc.), Augustine (Quoestiones in Jud. 8, 49; Opp. 3, 1, 610); so also in the Talmud (Tanchuma to Bechu-Kothai, p. 171) and Midrash (R. 1, § 71), in both of which great astonishment is expressed with the dealings of the high priest. For the first eleven centuries of the Christian era this was the current, perhaps the universal opinion of Jews and Christians. Yet none of them extenuates the act of Jephthah. Josephus calls it neither lawful nor pleasing to God. Jewish writers say that he ought to have referred it to the high priest, but either he failed to do so, or the high priest culpably omitted to prevent the rash act. Origen strictly confines his praise to the heroism of Jephthah's daughter.  The other interpretation was suggested by Joseph Kimchi. He supposed that, instead of being sacrificed, she was shut up in a house which her father built for the purpose and that she was there visited by the daughters of Israel four days in each year as long as she lived. This interpretation has been adopted by many eminent men — as by Levi ben-Gerson and Bechai amongst the Jews, and by Drusius, Grotius, Estius, De Dieu, bishop Hall, Waterland, Dr. Hales, and others. More names of the same period, and of not less authority, might, however, be adduced on the other side. Lightfoot once thought (Erubhin, § 16) that Jephthah did not slay his daughter, but, upon more mature reflection, he came to the opposite conclusion (Harmony, etc.; Judges 11 : Works, 1, 51).

1. The advocates for the actual death of the maiden contend that to live unmarried was required by no law, custom, or devotement amongst the Jews: no one had a right to impose so odious a condition on another, nor is any such condition implied or expressed in the vow which Jephthah uttered. It is certain that human sacrifice was deemed meritorious and propitiatory by the neighboring nations, SEE SACRIFICE; and, considering the manner of life the hero had led, the recent idolatries in which the people had been plunged, and the peculiarly vague notions of the tribes beyond the Jordan, it is highly probable that he contemplated from the first a human sacrifice, as the most costly offering to God known to him (comp. the well- known story of the immolation of Iphigenia, Iliad, 9, 144 sq.). It is difficult to conceive that he could expect any other creature than a human being to come forth out of the door of his house to meet him on his return. His affliction when his daughter actually came forth is quite compatible with the idea that he had not even exempted her from the sacredness of his promise, and the depth of that affliction is scarcely reconcilable with any other alternative than the actual sacrifice. In that case, the circumstance that she “knew no man” is added as setting in a stronger light the rashness of Jephthah and the heroism of his daughter. If we look at the text, Jephthah vows that whatsoever came forth from the door of his house to meet him “shall surely be the Lord's, and [Kimchi's rendering ‘or' is a rare and harsh one] I will offer it up for a burnt offering,” which, in fact, was the regular way of making a thing wholly the Lord's. Afterwards we are told that “he did with her according to his vow,” that is, according to the plain meaning of plain words, offered her for a burnt offering. (This circumlocutory phrase, and the omission of any direct term expressive of death, are attributed to euphemistic motives.)

Then follows the intimation  that the daughters of Israel lamented her four days every year. People lament the dead, not the living. The whole story is consistent and intelligible while the sacrifice is understood to have taken place, but becomes perplexed and difficult as soon as we begin to turn aside from this obvious meaning in search of recondite explanations. The Jewish commentators themselves generally admit that Jephthah really sacrificed his daughter, and even go so far as to allege that the change in the pontifical dynasty from the house of Eleazar to that of Ithamar was caused by the high priest of the time having suffered this transaction to take place. It is true, human sacrifices were forbidden by the law; but in the rude and unsettled age in which the judges lived, when the Israelites had adopted a vast number of erroneous notions and practices from their heathen neighbors (see 2Ki 3:27), many things were done, even by good men, which the law forbade quite as positively as human sacrifice. Such, for instance, was the setting up of the altar by Gideon at his native Ophrah (Jdg 8:27), in direct but undesigned opposition to one of the most stringent enactments (Deuteronomy 7) of the Mosaical code. (See Kitto's Daily Bible Illustrations, ad loc.)

2. On the other hand, it has been well replied that the text expressly, and in varied terms, alludes to the obligation of the girl to lead a life of perpetual virginity (Deuteronomy 7:37, 38, 39).

Such a state was generally considered a calamity by the Israelitish women, probably on account of the early prophecy of the incarnation (Gen 3:15). SEE BARRENNESS.

But, besides this, the celibacy of Jephthah's daughter involved the extinction of his whole house as well as dynasty, and removed from him his only child, the sole prop and solace of his declining years. For it was her duty, as the Lord's property, to dwell separately at Shiloh, in constant attendance on the service of the sanctuary (compare Luk 3:37; 1Co 7:34), far from her father, the companions of her youth, and the beloved haunts of her childhood; all this was sufficient cause for lamentation. But the idea that she was put to death by her father as a consequence of his vow shocks all the feelings of humanity, could only have horrified her as well as all other parties concerned, is inconsistent with the first principles of the Mosaic law, and was impossible from the very nature of its requisitions in several points. For instance, human sacrifices were among the abominations for which the idolatrous nations of Canaan  were devoted to destruction (Deu 18:9-14); and the Israelites were expressly forbidden to act like them in sacrificing their sons and daughters by fire (Deu 12:29-31). Again, for the redemption of any person devoted to God (Exo 13:11-13), and even for the very case of Jephthah's singular vow, if understood to refer to his daughter's immolation, provision was expressly made (Lev 27:2-5), so that he might, with a safe conscience, have redeemed her from death by a small payment of money. It must be remembered, too, that by the law he could not offer any victim as a burnt sacrifice except where the Lord had chosen to place his name (Deu 16:2; Deu 16:6; Deu 16:11; Deu 16:16, compare with Lev 1:2-13; Lev 17:3-9), that is, in the tabernacle at Shiloh: moreover, none but a Levite could kill, and none but a priest could offer any victim; and the statement of the Chaldee paraphrast (ad loc.) that the sacrifice took place through a neglect to consult Phinehas, the high priest, besides involving an anachronism, is utterly at variance with all the known conditions of the case. Moreover, none but a male victim could be presented in sacrifice in any case. It is true that if Jephthah had been an idolater he might have offered his daughter in any of the high places to a false god; but he was evidently made the deliverer of his people from the yoke of Ammon because he was not an idolater (see Jdg 11:29-36; comp. Lev 20:1-5); and his whole conduct is commended by an inspired apostle (Heb 11:32 : comp. 1Sa 12:11) as an act of faith in the true God. Such sanction is very different from the express condemnation of the irregular and mischievous proceeding on the part of Gideon (Jdg 8:27), for there is nowhere the least intimation that Jephthah's conduct was other than entirely praiseworthy, although his vow is evidently recorded as a warning against inconsiderate oaths (Jarvis's Church of the Redeemed, p. 115-117). Indeed, it is very doubtful whether he had the power to sacrifice his daughter, and it is incredible that she should have been the first to claim the fulfilment of such a vow, as well as inconceivable how she should have so readily inferred so unusual an import from the brief terms in which he first intimated to her his fatal pledge (ver. 35, 36); whereas it is altogether likely that (with her prompt consent) he had the right of dooming her to perpetual singleness of life and religious seclusion (compare 1Co 7:36-38). SEE NAZARITE.

It is also worthy of note that the term employed to express his promise of devotement in this case is נֶדֶר, ne'der, a consecration, and not חֵרֶם che'rem, destruction. SEE VOW; SEE ANATHEMA. Nor can we suppose (with Prof. Bush, ad loc.) that during the two months' respite he obtained  better information, in consequence of which the immolation was avoided by a ransom price; for it is stated that he literally fulfilled his vow, whatever it was (1Co 7:39). The word rendered “lament” in 1Co 7:40 is not the common one (בכה) translated “bewail” in 1Co 7:37-38, but the rare expression (תנה) rendered “rehearse” in ch. 5:11, and meaning to celebrate, as implying joy rather than grief.

For a full discussion of the question, see the notes of the Pictorial Bible, and Bush's Notes on Judges, ad loc.; comp. Calmet's Dissertation sur le Voeu de Jephte, in his Comment. Littéral, tom. 2; Dresde, Votum Jephthoe ex Antiq. Judaica illustr. (Lips. 1767, 1778); Randolf, Erklärung d. Gelübdes Jephtha, in Eichhorn's Repertorium, 8, 13, Lightfoot's Harmony, under Judges 11, Erubhin, cap. 16, Sermon on Jdg 11:39; Bp. Russell's Connection of Sacred and Profane History, 1, 479-492; Hales's Analysis of Chronology, 2, 288-292; Gleig's edition of Stackhouse, 2, 97; Clarke's Commentary, ad loc.; Rosenmüller, ad loc.; Hengstenberg's Pentat. 2, 129; Markii Dissert. phil. theol. p. 530; Michaelis, Mos. Recht, 3, 30; Ziegler, Theolog. Abhandl. 1, 337; Paulus, Conservat. 2, 197; Vatke, Bibl. Theolog. p. 275; Capellus, De voto Jeph. (Salmur. 1683); Dathe in Doderlein's Theolog. Bibl. 3, 327; Jahn, Einleit. 2, 198; Eckermann, Theolog. Beitr. 5, 1, 62; Reland, Antiq. sacr. 3, 10, 6, p. 363; Vogel in Biedermann's Act. scholast. 2, 250; Georgi, De voto Jephtoe (Viteb. 1751); Heumann, Nov. sylloge dissert. 2, 476; Bernhold, De voto per Jiphtach. nuncupato (Altd. 1740); Schudt, Vita Jepht. (Groning. 1753), 2, 77; Bruno in Eichhorn's Repertor. 8, 43; Buddaei Hist. V.T. 1, 893; Hess, Gesch. Jos. u. der Heerführer, 2, 156; Niemeyer, Charakt. 3, 496; Ewald, Isr. Geschichte, 2, 397; Selden, Jus nat. et gent. 1, 11; Anton, Comparat. libror. V.T. cet. pt. 2, 3; F. Spanheim, De voto Jephthoe, in his Dissert. theol. hist. p. 135-211; H. Benzel, De voto Jepth. incruento (Lond. 1732); Rathlef's Theol. for 1755, p. 414; Seiler, Gemeinnütz. Beitr. 1779, p. 386; Hasche, Ueber Jeph. u. s. Gelübde (Dresd. 1778; see in the Dresden Anzeig. 1787); Pfeiffer, De voto Jephthoe, in his Opp. p. 591; Tieroff, id. (Jena, 1657); Munch, id. (Altd. 1740); Bib. Repos. Jan. 1843, p. 143 sq.; Meth. Quart. Rev. October, 1855, p. 558 sq.; Universalist Review, Jan. 1861; Evangelical Rev. July 1861; Cassel, in Herzog's Encykl. s.v.; also the works cited by Darling, Cyclop. col. 284.

2. SEE JIPHTAH.  Jephunne (‘Ιεφοννῆ), a Graecized form (Sirach 46, 7) for the Hebrew name JEPHUNNEH SEE JEPHUNNEH (q.v.).

## Jephunneh[[@Headword:Jephunneh]]

             (Heb. Yephunneh', יְפֻבֶּה, nimble), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿εφοννή, also Ι᾿εφονῆ and Ι᾿εφοννῆ.) The father of Caleb (q.v.), the faithful fellow explorer of Canaan with Joshua, in which paternal connection alone his name occurs (Num 13:6; Num 14:6; Num 14:30; Num 14:38; Num 26:65; Num 32:12; Num 34:19; Deu 1:36; Jos 14:6; Jos 14:13-14; Jos 15:13; Jos 21:12; 1Ch 4:15; 1Ch 6:56). B.C. 1698.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿εφινά.) One of the sons of Jether or Ithran, of the descendants of Asher (1Ch 7:38). B.C. prob. ante 1017.

## Jerah[[@Headword:Jerah]]

             (Heb. Ye'rach, יֶרִח, in pause י רִח, Ya'rach, the moon, as often; Sept. Ι᾿αράχ, but omits in 1Ch 1:20, where, however, some copies have ‘Iaeip; Vulg. Jare), the fourth in order of the sons of Joktan, apparently the founder of an Arab tribe, who probably had their settlement near Hazarmaveth and Hadoram, between which the name occurs (Gen 10:26), the general location of all the Joktanidae being given in Gen 10:30 as extending from Mesha eastward to Mount Sephar. Bochart (Phaleg, 2, 19) thinks the word is Hebrew, but a translation of an equivalent Arabic name, and understands the Alaloei to be meant, a tribe inhabiting the auriferous region on the Red Sea (Agatharch. 49; Strabo, 16, p. 277 Diod. Sic. 3, 44), and conjectures that their true name was Benay Haila, “Sons of the Moon,” on account of their worship of that luminary under the title Alilat (Herodotus, 3, 8). He also observes that a tribe exists near Mecca with the title sons of the moon, probably the Hilalites mentioned by Niebuhr (Description of Arabia, p. 270). That the Alilaei, however, were worshippers of Alilat is an assumption unsupported by facts; but, whatever may be said in its favor, the people in question are not the Bene-Hilál, who take their name from a kinsman of Mohammed, in the fifth generation before him, of the well-known stock of Keys (Caussin, Essai, Tab. X A; Abu-l-Fidá, Hist. anteisl. ed.. Fleischer, p. 194). The connection renders the opinion of J.D. Michaelis more probable, who (Spicileg. 2, 60, 161) refers the name to the Moon coast, or Mount of the Moon, in the neighborhood of Hadramaut (Hazarmaveth), not far from  Shorma (Edrisi, p. 26, 27). Pococke has some remarks on the subject of El-Látt, which the reader may consult (Spec. Hist. Arab. p. 90); and also Sir G. Wilkinson, in his notes to Herodotus (ed. Rawlinson, 2, 402, footnote, and Essay 1 to bk. 3): he seems to be wrong, however, in saying that the Arabic “‘awel,'” “‘first'” [correctly, “awwal”], is “related to” אל, or Allah, etc. and that Alitta and Mylitta are Shemitic names derived from “weled, walada, ‘to bear children'” (Essay 1, p. 537). The comparison of Alitta and Mylitta is also extremely doubtful; and probably Herodotus assimilated the former name to the latter. Indeed, Jerah has not been satisfactorily identified with the name of any Arabian place or tribe, though a fortress (and probably an old town, like the numerous fortified places in the Yemen, of the old Himyerite kingdom) named Yerákh is mentioned as belonging to the district of the Nijjád (Marásid, s.v. Yerákh), which is in Mahreh, at the extremity of the Yemen (Kámûs). See ARABIA.

## Jerahmeel[[@Headword:Jerahmeel]]

             (Heb. Yerachmeël', יְרִחְמְאֵל, loving God or beloved by God), the name of three men.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿ραμεήλ and Ι᾿ερεμεήλ v.r. Ι᾿εραμεήλ.) First born of Hezron, brother of Caleb, and father of Ram (not Aram), of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 2:9; 1Ch 25:26). B.C. ante 1658. His descendants were called JERAHMLEELITES (Hebrew Yeracnheëli', יְרִחְמְאֵלַי, Sept. Ι᾿εριμιήλ and ῾Ιεριμιήλ v.r. ῾Ιερεμεήλ, 1Sa 27:10; 1Sa 30:29).

2. (Sept. Ι᾿ραμαήλ v.r. ῾Ιεραμεήλ.) Son of Kish, a Levite whose relationship is undefined otherwise (2 Chronicles 24:29). B.C. apparently 1014.

3. (Sept. ῾Ιερεμιήλ v.r. Ι᾿ερεμεήλa.) Son of Hammelech (q.v.), one of the two persons commanded by Jehoiakim to apprehend Jeremiah and Baruch, who providentially escaped (Jer 36:26). B.C. 605.

## Jerahmeelite [[@Headword:Jerahmeelite ]]

             (1Sa 27:10; 1Sa 30:29). SEE JERAHMEEL, 1.

## Jerechus [[@Headword:Jerechus ]]

             (Ι᾿έρεχος), a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 5, 22) of the name of the city of JERICHO (q.v.).

## Jered [[@Headword:Jered ]]

             (a, 1Ch 1:2; b, 1Ch 4:18). SEE JARED.

## Jeremai [[@Headword:Jeremai ]]

             (Hebrew Yeremay', יְרֵמִי, dwelling in heights; Sept. Ι᾿ερεμί v.r. ῾Ιεραμί),), one of the “sons” of Hashum, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:33). B.C. 459.

## Jeremiah [[@Headword:Jeremiah ]]

             (Heb. Yirmeyah', יַרְמְיָה, often in the paragogic form יַרְמְיָהוּ, Yirmeya'hu, especially in the book of Jeremiah; raised up [i.e. appointed] by Jehovah; Sept. and N.T. Ι᾿ερεμίας; “Jeremias,” Mat 16:14; “Jeremy,” Mat 2:17; Mat 27:9; but in this last passage it probably occurs only by error of copyists; see Zec 11:12-13), the name of eight or nine men.

1. The fifth in rank of the Gadite braves who joined David's troop in the wilderness (1Ch 12:10). B.C. 1061.

2. The tenth of the same band of adventurers (1Ch 12:13). B.C. 1061.

3. One of the Benjamite bowmen and slingers who repaired to David while at Ziklag (1Ch 12:4). B.C. 1053.

4. A chief of the tribe of Manasseh east, apparently about the time of the deportation by the Assyrians (1Ch 5:24). B.C. 782.

5. A native of Libnah, the father of Hamutal, wife of Josiah, and mother of Jehoahaz and Zedekiah (2Ki 23:31; 2Ki 24:18). B.C. ante 632.

6. Son of Habaziniah, and father of Jaazaniah, which last was one of the Rechabites whom the prophet tested with the offer of wine (Jer 35:3). B.C. ante 606.

7. The second of the “greater prophets” of the O.T., a son of Hilkiah, a priest of Anathoth, in the tribe of Benjamin (Jer 1:1; comp. 32:6). The following brief account of the prophet's career, which is fully detailed in his own book, is chiefly from Kitto's Cyclopoedia.  I. Relatives of Jeremiah. — Many (among ancient writers, Clement. Alex., Jerome; among moderns, Eichhorn, Calovius, Maldonatus, Von Bohlen, etc.) have supposed that his father was the high priest of the same name (2Ki 22:8), who found the book of the law in the eighteenth year of Josiah (Umbreit, Praktischer Commentar über den Jeremia, p. 10). This, however, seems improbable on several grounds (see Carpzov, Introd. 3, 130; also Keil, Ewald, etc.): first, there is nothing in the writings of Jeremiah to lead us to think that his father was more than an ordinary priest (“Hilkiah [one] of the priests,” Jer 1:1); again, the name Hilkiah was common among the Jews (see 2Ki 18:13; 1Ch 6:45; 1Ch 26:11; Neh 8:4; Jer 29:3); and, lastly, his residence at Anathoth is evidence that he belonged to the line of Abiathar (1Ki 2:26-35), who was deposed from the high priest's office by Solomon: after which time the office appears to have remained in the line of Zadok.

II. History. — Jeremiah was very young when the word of the Lord first came to him (Jer 1:6). This event took place in the thirteenth year of Josiah (B.C. 628), while the youthful prophet still lived at Anathoth. It would seem that he remained in his native city several years; but at length, in order to escape the persecution of his fellow townsmen (Jer 11:21), and even of his own family (Jer 12:6), as well as to have a wider field for his exertions, he left Anathoth and took up his residence at Jerusalem. The finding of the book of the Law, five years after the commencement of his predictions, must have produced a powerful influence on the mind of Jeremiah, and king Josiah no doubt found him an important ally in carrying into effect the reformation of religious worship (2Ki 23:1-25), B.C. 623. During the reign of this monarch, we may readily believe that Jeremiah would be in no way molested in his work; and that from the time of his quitting Anathoth to the eighteenth year of his ministry, he probably uttered his warnings without interruption, though with little success (see Jeremiah 11). Indeed, the reformation itself was nothing more than the forcible repression of idolatrous and heathen rites, and the reestablishment of the external service of God, by the command of the king. No sooner, therefore, was the influence of the court on behalf of the true religion withdrawn, than it was evident that no real improvement had taken place in the minds of the people. Jeremiah, who hitherto was at least protected by the influence of the pious king Josiah, soon became the object of attack, as he must doubtless have long been the object of dislike  to those whose interests were identified with the corruptions of religion. The death of this prince was bewailed by the prophet as the precursor of the divine judgments for the national sins (2Ch 35:25). B.C. 609. SEE LAMENTATIONS.

We hear nothing of the prophet during the three months which constituted the short reign of Jehoahaz; but “in the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim” (B.C. 607) the prophet was interrupted in his ministry by “the priests and the prophets,” who, with the populace, brought him before the civil authorities, urging that capital punishment should be inflicted on him for his threatenings of evil on the city unless the people amended their ways (Jeremiah 26). The princes seem to have been in some degree aware of the results which the general corruption was bringing on the state, and if they did not themselves yield to the exhortations of the prophet, they acknowledged that he spoke in the name of the Lord, and were quite averse from so openly renouncing his authority as to put his messenger to death. It appears, however, that it was rather owing to the personal influence of one or two, especially Ahikam, than to any general feeling favorable to Jeremiah, that his life was preserved; and it would seem that he was then either placed under restraint, or else was in so much danger from the animosity of his adversaries as to make it prudent for him not to appear in public. In the fourth year of Jehoiakim (B.C. 605) he was commanded to write the predictions which had been given through him, and to read them to the people. From the cause, probably, which we have intimated above, he was, as he says, “shut up,” and could not himself go into the house of the Lord (Jer 36:5). He therefore deputed Baruch to write the predictions after him, and to read them publicly on the fast day. These threatenings being thus anew made public, Baruch was summoned before the princes to give an account of the manner in which the roll containing them had come into his possession.

The princes, who, without strength of principle to oppose the wickedness of the king, had sufficient respect for religion, as well as sagacity enough to discern the importance of listening to the voice of God's prophet, advised both Baruch and Jeremiah to conceal themselves, while they endeavored to influence the mind of the king by reading the roll to him. The result showed that their precautions were not needless. In his bold self will and reckless daring the monarch refused to listen to any advice, even though coming with the professed sanction of the Most High. Having read three or four leaves, “he cut the roll with the penknife and cast it into the fire that was on the hearth,  until all the roll was consumed,” and gave immediate orders for the apprehension of Jeremiah and Baruch, who, however, were both preserved from the vindictive monarch. At the command of God the prophet procured another roll, in which he wrote all that was in the roll destroyed by the king, “and added besides unto them many like words” (Jer 36:32). SEE BARUCH.

Near the close of the reign of Jehoiakim (B.C. 599), and during the short reign of his successor Jehoiachin or Jeconiah (B.C. 598), we find him still uttering his voice of warning (see Jer 13:18; comp. 2Ki 24:12, and Jer 22:24-30), though without effect; and, after witnessing the downfall of the monarchs which he had himself predicted, he sent a letter of condolence and hope to those who shared the captivity of the royal family (Jeremiah 29-31). It was not till the latter part of the reign of Zedekiah that he was put in confinement, as we find that “they had not put him into prison” when the army of Nebuchadnezzar commenced the siege of Jerusalem (Jer 37:4-5) (B.C. 589). On the investment of the city, the prophet had sent a message to the king declaring what would be the fatal issue, but this had so little effect that the slaves who had been liberated were again reduced to bondage by their fellow citizens (Jeremiah 34). Jeremiah himself was incarcerated in the court of the prison adjoining the palace, where he predicted the certain return from the impending captivity (Jer 32:33). The Chaldaeans drew off their army for a time on the report of help coming from Egypt to the besieged city, and now, feeling the danger to be imminent, and yet a ray of hope brightening their prospects, the king entreated Jeremiah to pray to the Lord for them. The hopes of the king were not responded to in the message which Jeremiah received from God. He was assured that the Egyptian army would return to their own land, that the Chaldaeans would come again, and that they would take the city and burn it with fire (Jer 37:7-8).

The princes, apparently irritated by a message so contrary to their wishes, made the departure of Jeremiah from the city (for he appears to have been at this time released from confinement), during the short respite, the pretext for accusing him of deserting to the Chaldaeans, and he was forthwith cast into prison, where he might have perished but for the humanity of one of the royal eunuchs (Jer 37:12 to Jer 38:13). The king seems to have been throughout inclined to favor the prophet, and sought to know from him the word of the Lord; but he was wholly under the influence of the princes, and dared not communicate with him except in  secret (Jer 38:14-28), much less could he follow advice so obnoxious to their views as that which the prophet gave. Jeremiah, therefore, more from the hostility of the princes than the inclination of the king, was still in confinement when the city was taken, B.C. 588. Nebuchadnezzar formed a more just estimate of his character and of the value of his counsels and gave a special charge to his captain, Nebuzar- adan, not only to provide for him, but to follow his advice (Jer 39:12). He was accordingly taken from the prison and allowed free choice either to go to Babylon, where doubtless he would have been held in honor in the royal court, or to remain with his own people (B.C. 587). With characteristic patriotism he went to Mizpah with Gedaliah, whom the Babylonian monarch had appointed governor of Judea, and, after his murder, sought to persuade Johanan, who was then the recognized leader of the people, to remain in the land, assuring him and the people, by a message from God in answer to their inquiries, that, if they did so, the Lord would build them up, but if they went to Egypt, the evils which they sought to escape should come upon them there (Jeremiah 42). The people refused to attend to the divine message, and, under the command of Johanan, went into Egypt. taking Jeremiah and Baruch along with them (Jer 43:6). In Egypt the prophet still sought to turn the people to the Lord, from whom they had so long and so deeply revolted (Jeremiah 44), but his writings give us no subsequent information respecting his personal history. Ancient traditions assert that he spent the remainder of his life in Egypt. According to the pseudo-Epiphanius, he was stoned by the people at Taphnae (ἐν Τάφναις), the same as Tahpanhes, where the Jews were settled (De Vitis Prophet. 2, 239, quoted by Fabricius, Codex Pseudepigraphus V.T. 1, 1110). It is said that his bones were removed by Alexander the Great to Alexandria (Carpzov, Introd. pt. 3, p. 138, where other traditions respecting him may be found).

## Jeremiah II, Patriarch Of Constantinople[[@Headword:Jeremiah II, Patriarch Of Constantinople]]

             was born in 1536. He was elected patriarch May 5, 1572; in 1579 he was driven from his see, but after the death of Metrophanes (1580) he regained his position. Shortly after he was imprisoned by order of the sultan on a charge of high treason. Liberated through the intervention of the ambassadors of France and Venice, he was again exiled to Rhodes in 1585. Finally, in 1587, he was again reinstated in the patriarchate by paying 500 ducats yearly to the party who had held it during his exile. The Church funds had been so reduced in consequence of all these struggles that there  was no money to meet the expenses for worship. Under these circumstances, Jeremiah was obliged to seek help from the czar, in return for which he was obliged to create the metropolitan of Moscow a patriarch. This was accordingly done; but, Jeremiah having stopped at Kief on his return to Moscow. a number of bishops, who had accompanied him on his journey, and who had vehemently opposed his course, left him, and joined the Church of Rome. Some writers say that Jeremiah was persecuted for attempting to unite the Greek and the Latin churches. He was the patriarch with whom the Tübingen theologians entered into a correspondence in 1573, with the intention to bring over the Greek Church to the Reformers, and which resulted, as is well known, in the rejection of Luther's doctrines by the Greek Church. (See Chr. F. Schnurrer, Orationes acad. historiam liter. illustrantes, ed. H.E.G. Paulus, Tüb. 1828, p. 113 sq.). Jeremiah II died in 1594. See Acta et Scripta Theologorum Wirtembergensium et Patriarchoe Constantinopolitani D. Hieremsioe (Wirtemberg, 1584); Acta Orientalis Ecclesioe contra Lutheri heresim, monumentis, notis ac dissertationibus illustrata (Rome, 1739). See also Sobranie Gosoudarst. Gramot, vol. 2; Haigold, Beilagen zum neuveränderten Russland (Riga, 1769), vol. 1; Levesque, Hist. de Russie, 3, 117; Vicissitudes de l'Église des deuxcrites en Pologne et en Russie, 1, 47); Document relatif au Patriarcat Moscovite (Paris, 1857); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 26, 668. SEE GREEK CHURCH.

## Jeremiah, Archbishop Of Sens[[@Headword:Jeremiah, Archbishop Of Sens]]

             flourished in the latter half of the 8th and the early part of the 9th century. But little is known of his personal history. He was the successor of Magnus in 818 to the ecclesiastical office and is supposed to have died in 827. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 25, 667.

## Jeremiah, Book Of[[@Headword:Jeremiah, Book Of]]

             Jeremiah was contemporary with Zephaniah, Habakkuk, Ezekiel, and Daniel. No one who compares them can fail to perceive that the mind of Jeremiah was of a softer and more delicate texture than that of his illustrious contemporary Ezekiel, with whose writings his are most nearly parallel. His whole history convinces us that he was by nature mild and retiring (Ewald, Propheten des Alt. Bund. p. 2), highly susceptible and sensitive, especially to sorrowful emotions, and rather inclined, as we should imagine, to shrink from danger than to brave it. Yet, with this acute  perception of injury, and natural repugnance from being “a man of strife,” he never in the least degree shrinks from publicity; nor is he at all intimidated by reproach or insult, or even by actual punishment and threatened death, when he has the message of God to deliver.

1. The style of Jeremiah corresponds with this view of the character of his mind: though not deficient in power, it is peculiarly marked by pathos. He delights in the expression of the tender emotions, and employs all the resources of his imagination to excite corresponding feelings in his readers. He has an irresistible sympathy with the miserable, which finds utterance in the most touching descriptions of their condition.

The style of Jeremiah is marked by the peculiarities which belong to the later Hebrew and by the introduction of Aramaic forms (Eichhorn, Einleitung, 3, 122; Gesenius, Geschichte der Heb. Spreche, p. 35). It was, we imagine, on this account that Jerome complained of a certain rusticity in Jeremiah's style. Lowth, however, says he can discover no traces of it, and regards Jeremiah as nearly equal in sublimity in many parts to Isaiah (De Sacra Poesi Heb. p. 426).

2. The canonicity of the writings of Jeremiah in general are established both by the testimony of ancient writers and by quotations and references which occur in the New Testament. Thus the son of Sirach refers to him as a prophet consecrated from the womb, and quotes from Jer 1:10 the commission with which he was intrusted (Sir 49:7). In 2Ma 2:1-8, there is a tradition respecting his hiding the tabernacle and the ark in a rock, in which he is called “Jeremiah the prophet.” Philo speaks of him under similar titles, as προφήτης, μύστης, ἱεροφάντης, and calls a passage which he quotes from Jer 3:4 an oracle — χρησμόν (Eichhorn, Einleitung, 1, 95). Josephus refers to him by name as the prophet who predicted the evils which were coming on the city and speaks of him as the author of Lamentations (μέλος θρηνητικόν) which are still existing (Ant. 10, 5, 1). His writings are included. in the list of canonical books given by Melito, Origen (whose words are remarkable: ῾Ιερεμίας σὺν θρήνοις καὶ τῇ ἐν ἑνι), Jerome, and the Talmud (Eichhorn, Einleitung, 3, 184). In the New Testament Jeremiah is referred to by name in Mat 2:17, where a passage is quoted from Jer 31:15, and in Mat 16:14; in Heb 8:8-12, a passage is quoted from Jer 31:31-34. There is one other place in which the name of Jeremiah occurs — Mat 27:9 — which has occasioned  considerable difficulty, because the passage there quoted is not found in the extant writings of the prophet (see Kuinöl, Com. ad loc.). Jerome affirms that he found the exact passage in a Hebrew apocryphal book (Fabricius, Codex Pseudepigraphus, 1, 1103), but there is no proof that that book was in existence before the time of Christ. It is probable that the passage intended by Matthew is Zec 11:12-13, which in part corresponds with the quotation he gives, and that the name is a gloss which has found its way into the text (see Olshausen, Commentar über d. N. Test. 2, 493).

3. The genuineness of some portions of the book has of late been disputed by German critics. Movers, whose views have been adopted by De Wette and Hitzig, attributes Jer 10:1-16, and Jeremiah 30, 31, , 32 to the author of the concluding portion of the book of Isaiah. His fundamental argument against the last-named portion is, that the prophet Zechariah (Zec 8:7-8) quotes from Jer 31:7-8; Jer 31:33, and in Jer 31:9 speaks of the author as one who lived “in the day that the foundation of the house of the Lord of hosts was laid.” But there is nothing in Jer 31:7-8 of Zechariah to prove that it is intended to be a quotation from any written prophecy, much less from this portion of Jeremiah. Hence Hitzig (Jeremia, p. 230) gives up the external evidence on which Movers had relied. The internal evidence arising from the examination of particular words and phrases is so slight, especially when the authenticity of the latter portion of Isaiah is maintained, that even Ewald agrees that the chapters in question, as well as the other passage mentioned (Jer 10:1-16), are the work of Jeremiah. It seems, however, not improbable that the Chaldee of Jer 10:11 is a gloss which has crept into the text, both because it is (apparently without reason) in another language and because it seems to interrupt the progress of thought. The predictions against Babylon in Jeremiah 50, 51 are objected to by Hovers, De Wette, and others on the ground that they contain many interpolations. Ewald attributes them to some unknown prophet, who imitated the style of Jeremiah. Their authenticity is maintained by Hitzig (p. 391) and by Umbreit (p. 290-293), to whom we must refer for an answer to the objections made against them. The last chapter is generally regarded as an appendix added by some later author. It is almost verbally the same as the account in 2Ki 24:18; 2Ki 25:30, and it carries the history down to a later period, probably, than that of the death of Jeremiah. That it is not his work seems to be indicated in the last verse of Jeremiah 51. (See generally Hävernick's Einleitung, 2, 232, etc.)

4. Much difficulty has arisen with respect to the writings of Jeremiah from the apparent disorder in which they stand in our present copies, and from the many disagreements between the Hebrew text and that found in the Septuagint version, and many conjectures have been hazarded respecting the occasion of this disorder. The following are the principal diversities between the two texts:

(a.) The chapters containing prophecies against foreign nations are placed in a different part of the book and the prophecies themselves arranged in a different order, as in the following table:

(b.) Various passages which exist in the Hebrew are not found in the Greek copies (e.g. Jer 27:19-22; Jer 33:14-26; Jer 39:4-14; Jer 48:45-47). Besides these discrepancies, there are numerous omissions and frequent variations of single words and phrases (Movers, De utriusque Vaticiniorum Jeremioe recensionis indole et origine, p. 8-32). To explain these diversities, recourse has been had to the hypothesis of a double recension, a hypothesis which, with various modifications, is held by most modern critics (Movers, ut supra; De Wette, Lehrbuch der Hist.-Crit. Einleit. in d. Alt. Test. p. 303; Ewald, Propheten des Alt. Bund. 2, 23; Keil, Einleit. p. 300 sq.; Wichelhaus, De Jeremioe vers. Alex. Hal. 1847).

Various attempts have been made to account for the present (apparently) disordered arrangement of Jeremiah's predictions. Rejecting those that proceed upon the assumption of accident (Blayney, Notes, p. 3) or the caprice of an amanuensis (Eichhorn, Einl. 3, 134), we notice that of Ewald (with which Umbreit substantially agrees, Praktisch. Comment. über den Jeremia, p. 27), who finds that various portions are prefaced by the same formula, “The word which came to Jeremiah from the Lord” (Jer 7:2; Jer 11:1; Jer 18:1; Jer 21:1; Jer 25:1; Jer 30:1; Jer 32:1; Jer 34:1; Jer 34:8; Jer 35:1; Jer 40:1; Jer 44:1), or by the very similar expression, “The word of the Lord which came to Jeremiah” (Jer 14:1; Jer 46:1; Jer 47:1; Jer 49:34). The notices of time distinctly mark some other divisions which are more or less historical (Jer 26:1; Jer 27:1; Jer 36:1; Jer 37:1). Two other portions are in themselves sufficiently distinct without such indication (Jer 29:1; Jer 45:1), while the general introduction to the book serves for the section contained in Jeremiah 1. There are left two sections (Jeremiah 2, 3), the former of which has only the shorter introduction, which generally designates the  commencement of a strophe; while the latter, as it now stands, seems to be imperfect, having as an introduction merely the word “saying.” Thus the book is divided into twenty-three separate and independent sections, which, in the poetical parts, are again divided into strophes of from seven to nine verses, frequently distinguished by such a phrase as “The Lord said also unto me.” These separate sections are arranged by Ewald so as to form five distinct books:

I. The introduction, Jeremiah 1.

II. Reproofs of the sins of the Jews, Jeremiah 2-24, consisting of seven sections, viz.

1. Jeremiah 2;

2. Jeremiah 3-6; Jeremiah 3. Jeremiah 7-10; Jeremiah

4. Jeremiah 11-13; Jeremiah

5. Jeremiah 14-17, 18; Jeremiah

6. Jer 17:19-20; Jeremiah

7. Jeremiah 21-24.

III. A general review of all nations, the heathen as well as the people of Israel, consisting of two sections:

1. Jeremiah 46-49 (in which he thinks have been transposed);

2. Jeremiah 25,

and a historical appendix of three sections:

1. Jeremiah 26;

2. Jeremiah 27;

3. Jeremiah 28, 29.

IV. Two sections picturing the hopes of brighter times:

1. Jeremiah 30, 31;

2. Jeremiah 32, 33;

to which, as in the last book, is added a historical appendix in three sections

1. Jer 34:1-7;

2. Jer 34:8-22;

3. Jeremiah 35.

V. The conclusion, in two sections; 1. Jeremiah 36; Jeremiah 2. Jeremiah 45. All this, he supposes, was arranged in Palestine during the short interval of rest between the taking of the city and the departure of Jeremiah with the remnant of the Jews to Egypt. In Egypt, after some interval, Jeremiah added three sections, viz. Jeremiah 37, 39, 40-43, , 44. At the same time, probably, he added, Jeremiah 46, 13-26, to the previous prophecy respecting Egypt, and, perhaps, made some additions to other parts previously written.

For a purely topical analysis of the book, see Dr. Davidson, in Horne's Introd. new ed. 2, 870 sq. The exact chronological position of some of the prophecies is exceedingly difficult to determine. The principal predictions relating to the Messiah are found in Jer 23:1-8; Jeremiah 30:31-40; Jer 33:14-26 (Hengstenberg's Christologie, 3, 495-619).

5. The following are the special exegetical works on the whole of Jeremiah's prophecies, to a few of the most important of which we prefix an asterisk [\*]: Origen, Homilioe (in Opp. 3, 125); also Selecta (ibid. 3, 287); Ephraem Syrus, Explanatio (Syriac and Lat. in Opp. 5, 98); Jerome, In Jeremiah (in Opp. 4, 833); Theodoret, Interpretatio (Greek, in Opp. 2, 1); Rabanus Maurus, Commentarii (in Opp.); Rupertus Tuitiensis, In Hierem. (in. Opp. 1, 466); Thomas Aquinas, Commentarii (in Opp. 2);. Melancthon, Argumentum (in Opp. 2); Arama, אוּרַים, etc. [includ. Isaiah] (Ven. 1608, 4to; also in Frankfürter's Rabb. Bible); Zuingle, Complanatio (Tiguri, 1531, fol.; also in Opp. 3); (OEcolampadius, Commentarii [includ. Lam.] (Argent. 1533, 4to); Bugenhagen, Adnotationes (Vitemb. 1546, 4to); De Castro, Commentarius [includ. Lam. and Baruch] (Par. 1559, Mogunt. 1616, fol.); Zichemius, Enarrationes (Colon. 1559, 8vo); Pintus, Commentarius [includ. Isaiah and Lam.] (Lugdun. 1561, 1584, 1590, Salmant. 1581, fol.); Calvin, Proelectiones (Genev. 1563, 1576, 1589, fol.; in French, ib. 1565, fol.; trans. in English by Owen, Edinburgh, 1850, 5 vols. 8vo); Strigel, Conciones (Lips. 1566, 8vo); Selnecker, Auslegung (Lpz. 1566, 4to); Bullinger, Conciones (Tigurini, 1575, folio);. Taillepied, Commentarius (Par. 1583, 4to); Heilbrunner, Quoestiones (Lauing. 1586, 8vo); Capella, Commentaria: (Tarracon. 1586, 4to); Figuiero, Paraphrasis (Lugdun. 1596, 8vo); Brenz, Commentaria (in Opp. 4); Broughton,  Commentarius [includ. Lam.] (Geneva, 1606, 4to); Polan, Commentarius [includ. Lam.] (Basil. 1608, 8vo) Sanctius, Commentarius [includ. Lam.] (Lugdun. 1618, fol.); A Lapide, In Jerem. etc. (Antw. 1621. fol.); Ghisler, Commentarius (Lugd. 1633, 3 vols. fol.); De Beira, Considerationes (Olyssip. 1633, fol.); Hulsemann, Commentarius [includ. Lam.] (Rudolphop. 1663, Lips. 1696, 4to); Forster, Commentarius (Vitemb. 1672, 1699, 4to); Alting, Commentarius (Amst. 1688, folio; also in Opp. 1, 649); \*Seb. Schmidt, Commentarius (Argent. 1685, Fr. ad M. 1697, 1705, 2 vols. 4to); De Sacy, Explication (in French, Paris, 1691, 12mo); Noordbeek, Vitligginge (Franck. 1701, 4to); \*Lowth, Commentary [includ. Lam.] (Lond. 1718, 4to; also in the “Commentary of Patrick,” etc.); Petersen, Zeugniss (Francf. 1719, 4to); Rapel, Predigten (Lunenb. 1720, 1755, 2 vols. 4to); Ittig, Predigten (Dresden, 1722, 4to); Michaelis, Observationes [on parts, includ. Lam.] (Gotting. 1743, 4to); Burscher, Erläuterung (Leipzig, 1756, 8vo); Venema, Commnentarius (Leov. 1765, 2 vols. 4to); \*Blayney, Notes includ. Lam.] (Oxf. 1784, 4to; 3d ed. Lond. 1836, 8vo); Schnurrer, Observationes [on parts] (Tub. 1793-4, 4 pts. 4to; also in Velthusen et cet. Commment. 2-4); Leiste, Observationes [on parts] (Gotting. 1794, 8vo, and also in Pott. et cet. Comment. 2); Spohn, Notoe (Lips. 1794-1824. 2 vols. 8vo); Volborth, Anmerkungen (Celle, 1795, 8vo); Uhrich, De Vatib. sacris (Dresden, 1797, 4to); Schulz, Scholia (Norimburg, 1797, 8vo); Hensler, Bemerkungen [on parts] (Lpz. 1805, 8vo); Dereser, Erklärung [includ. Lam. and Baruch] (F. ad M. 1809, 8vo); Shalom-Kohen, Uebersetzung [with Hebrew commentary] (Fürth, 1810, 8vo); \*Horsley, Notes [including Lam.] (in Bibl. Crit. 2,1); Gaab, Erklärung [on parts] (Tüb. 1824, 8vo); Roorda, Conmmentaria [on parts] (Groning. 1824, 8vo); \*Dahler, Notes (in French, Strasb. 1825-30, 2 vols. 8vo); \*Rosenmüller, Scholia [including Lam.] (Lips. 1826-7, 2 vols. 8vo); Movers, Recensiones Jerem. (Hamb. 1827, 8vo); Knobel, De Jerem. Chaldaizante (Vratislav. 1831, 4to); Küper, Jeremioe interpres (Berlin, 1837, 8vo); \*Hitzig, Erklärung (Leipzig, 1841, 8vo); \*Umbreit, Commentar (Hamb. 1842, 8vo); \*Henderson, Commentary [includ. Lam.] (London, 1851, 12mo); Neumann, Auslegung [including Lam.] (Lpz. 1856, 8vo); Graf, Erklärung (Lpz. 1862, 2 vols. 8vo); Cowles, Notes (N. York, 1869, 12mo). SEE PROPHETS.

## Jeremiah, Epistle Of[[@Headword:Jeremiah, Epistle Of]]

             one of the apocryphal writings, purporting to proceed from the pen of the prophet Jeremiah (q.v.).

1. Title and Position. — This apocryphal piece, which derives its title, ἐπιστολὴ ῾Ιερεμίου (Sept., Vulg., Syriac, etc.), from purporting to be an epistle sent by the prophet Jeremiah “to them which were to be led captive to Babylon,” has different positions in the different MSS. It is placed after the Lamentations in Origen's Hexaplas, according to the Syriac Hexapla codex in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, in the Cod. Alex., the Arabic versions, etc.; in some editions of the Sept., in the Latin, and the Syriac, which was followed by Luther, the Zurich Bible, and the A. Vers. (“Epistle of Jeremy”), it constitutes the sixth chapter of the apocryphal book of Baruch, while Theodoret, Hilary of Poitiers, and several MSS. of the Sept. entirely omit it. It is, however, an independent production, and has nothing to do with Baruch. SEE BARUCH, BOOK OF.

2. Design and Contents. — The design of this epistle is to admonish the Jews who were going into captivity with the king to beware of the idolatry which they would see in Babylon. It tells the people of God not to become idolaters like the strangers, but to serve their own God, whose angel is with them (ver. 1-7), and it exposes in a rhetorical declamation the folly of idolatry (ver. 8-26), concluding every group of verses, which contains a fresh proof of its folly, with the reiterated remarks, “Seeing that they are no gods, fear them not” (ver. 16, 23, 29, 66), “How can a man think that they are gods?” (ver. 40, 44, 56, 64, 69), “How can a man not see that they are not gods?” (ver. 49, 53).

3. Author, Date, original Language, Canonicity, etc. — The inscription claims the authorship of this epistle for Jeremiah, who, it is said, wrote it just as the Jews were going to Babylon, which is generally reckoned to be the first year of Nebuchadnezzar the Great, or B.C. 606. This is the general opinion of the Roman Church, which, as a matter of course, regards it as canonical. But modern critics, both Jewish and Christian, who deny the power to any Church to override internal evidence, and defy the laws of criticism, have shown satisfactorily that its original language is Greek, and that it was written by Hellenistic Jews in imitation of Jeremiah, ch. 10 and 29. This is corroborated by the fact that this epistle does not exist in the Hebrew, was never included in the Jewish canon, is designated by Jerome, who knew more than any father what the Jewish canon contained, as Ψσευδεπίγραφος (Proem. Commentar. in Hierom.), was marked with obeli by Origen in his Hexapla, as is evident from the note of Cod. Chislianus (Βαροὺχ ὅλοςὠβὲλισται κατὰ τοὺς ό), and was passed over by Theodoret, though he explained the book of Baruch. The date of this  epistle cannot be definitely settled. It is generally supposed that 2Ma 2:2 alludes to this epistle, and that it must, therefore, be older than this book of Maccabees. Herzfeld (Geschichte d. V. Israel vor der Zerstörung des ersten Tempels, Brunswick, 1847, p. 316) infers from it the very reverse, namely, that this epistle was written after the passage in 2 Macc., while Fritzsche and Davidson are utterly unable to see the appropriateness of the supposed reference. It is most probable that the writer lived towards the end of the Maccabaean period.

4. Literature. — Arnald, A Critical Commentary on the Apocryphal Books, being a Continuation of Patrick and Lowth; Eichhorn, Einleitung in die apokryph. Schriften des Alten Testaments (Lpz. 1795), p. 390 sq.; De Wette, Einleit. in d. Alte Testament, sec. 324; Fritzsche, Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch z. d. Apokr. d. Alten Testamentes, part 1 (Lpzg. 1851), p. 205 sq.; Keil, Einleitung in das Alte Testament (1859), p. 731 sq.; Davidson, The Text of the Old Testament considered (London, 1856), p. 1038; also in Horne's Introduction (London, 1856), 2, 1038, 1039. SEE APOCRYPHA.

## Jeremiah, Lamentations Of[[@Headword:Jeremiah, Lamentations Of]]

             SEE LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH

8. A priest who accompanied Zerubbabel from Babylon to Jerusalem (Neh 12:1). B.C. 536.

9. One of those who followed the princes in the circuit of the newly- repaired walls with the sound of trumpets (Neh 12:34); apparently the same with one of the priests who subscribed the sacred covenant along with Nehemiah (Neh 10:2). B.C. 446 cir. 410. He was possibly identical with No. 8.

## Jeremias[[@Headword:Jeremias]]

             (Ι᾿ερεμίας), a Graecized form of the name of two men.

1. JEREMIAH SEE JEREMIAH (q.v.) the prophet (Sir 49:6; 2Ma 15:14; Mat 16:14).

2. (1Es 9:34.) SEE JEREIAI.

## Jeremoth[[@Headword:Jeremoth]]

             (Heb. Yereymoth', יְרֵימוֹת, or Yeremoth', יְרֵמוֹת, heights), the name of several men. SEE JERINIORH.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿αριμώθ)) The last named of the three sons of Mushi, grandson of Levi (1Ch 23:23); called JERIMOTH in 1Ch 24:30. B.C. post 1856.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿εριμώθ v.r. Ι᾿εριμούθ, Vulg. Jerimoth, A.V. “Jerimoth.”) One of the “sons” of Becher, son of Benjamin (1Ch 7:8). B.C. apparently 1017.

3. (Sept. Ι᾿εριμώθ)) A Levite, chief of the fifteenth division of Temple musicians as arranged by David (1Ch 25:22); probably the same called JERIMOTH in 1Ch 25:4. B.C. 1014.

4. (Sept. Ι᾿αριμώθ v.r. Α᾿ριμώθ.) One of the “sons” of Beriah, a Benjamite (1Ch 8:14). B.C. appar. cir. 588. Probably the same with JEROHAM in 1Ch 8:27.

5. (Sept. Ι᾿εριμώθ v.r. Ι᾿αριμώθ) An Israelite, one of the “sons” (? inhabitants) of Elam, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:26). B.C. 459.

6. (Ι᾿αρμώθ v.r. Α᾿ρμώθ,, a Vulg. Jerimuth.) Another Israelite, one of the “sons” (? inhabitants) of Zattu, who likewise divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity (Ezr 10:27). B.C. 459.

7. (Ezr 10:29, “and Ramoth.”) SEE RAMOTH.

## Jeremy[[@Headword:Jeremy]]

             a familiar form (1Es 1:28; 1Es 1:32; 1Es 1:47; 1Es 1:57; 1Es 2:1; 2Es 2:18; Baruch 6 :title; 2Ma 2:1; 2Ma 2:5; 2Ma 2:7; Mat 2:17; Mat 27:9) of the name of the prophet JEREMIAH SEE JEREMIAH (q.v.).

## Jeremy, Epistle Of[[@Headword:Jeremy, Epistle Of]]

             SEE JEREMIAH, EPISTLE OF.

## Jeriah[[@Headword:Jeriah]]

             (Heb. Yeriyah', יְרַיָּה, founded by Jehovah, otherwise fearer of Jehovah, 1Ch 26:31; Sept. Ι᾿ωρίας v.r. Ι᾿ουρίας, Vulg. Jeria, A. Vers. “Jerijah;” also in the paragogic form Yeriya'hu, יְרַיָּהוּ; Sept. ῾Ιεριά in 1Ch 23:19, but Ι᾿εδιοῦ in 1Ch 24:23; Vulgate Jeriau, Auth. Vers. “Jeriah”), the first in rank of the “sons” of Hebron in the Levitical arrangements instituted by David (1 Chronicles ut sup.). B.C. 1014.

## Jeribai[[@Headword:Jeribai]]

             (Heb. Yeribay', יְרַיבִי, contentious; Sept. Ι᾿αριβαϊv v.r. Ι᾿αριβί, a son of Elnaam and (together with his brother Joshaviah) one of David's famous bodyguard (1Ch 11:46). B.C. 1046.

## Jericho[[@Headword:Jericho]]

             (Heb. Yericho', יְרַיחוֹ, place of fragrance, prob. from balsamous herbs growing there; Jos 2:1-3; Jos 3:16; Jos 4:13; Jos 4:19; Jos 5:10; Jos 5:13; Jos 6:1-2; Jos 6:25-26; Jos 7:2; Jos 8:2; Jos 9:3; Jos 10:1; Jos 10:28; Jos 10:30; Jos 12:9; Jos 13:32; Jos 16:1; Jos 16:7; Jos 18:12; Jos 18:21; Jos 20:8; Jos 24:11; 2Ki 2:4; 2Ki 2:15; 2Ki 2:18; also written יְרֵחוֹ, Yerecho', Num 22:1; Num 26:3; Num 26:63; Num 31:12; Num 33:48; Num 33:50; Num 34:15; Num 35:1; Num 36:13; Deu 32:49; Deu 34:1; Deu 34:3; 2Sa 10:5; 2Ki 25:5; 1Ch 6:78; 1Ch 19:5; 2Ch 28:15; Ezr 2:34; Neh 3:2; Neh 7:36; Jer 39:5; Jeremiah 52, 8; once יְרַיחה, Yerichoh', 1Ki 16:34; Sept. and N.T. Ι᾿εριχώ, Josephus Ι᾿εριχοῦς [Genesis οῦντος]; Strabo, 16, 2, 41, ῾Ιερικοῦς; Ptolem. 5, 16, 7; ῾Ιερεικοῦς; Vulg. Jericho; Justin. Hierichus), a city situated in a plain traversed by the Jordan and exactly over against where that river was crossed by the Israelites under Joshua (Jos 3:16). It is first mentioned in connection with their approach to Palestine; they “pitched in the plains of Moab, on this side Jordan by Jericho” (Num 22:1). It was then a large and strong city and must have existed for a long period. The probability is that on the destruction of the cities of the plain by fire from heaven Jericho was founded, and perhaps by some who had resided nearer the scene of the catastrophe, but who abandoned their houses in fear. Had the city existed in the time of Abraham and Lot, it would scarcely have escaped notice when the latter looked down on the plain of Jordan from the heights of Bethel (Genesis 13). From  the manner in which it is referred to, and the frequency with which it is mentioned, it was evidently the most important city in the Jordan valley at the time of the Exodus (Num 34:15; Num 31:12; Num 35:1, etc.).

Such was either its vicinity or the extent of its territory that Gilgal, which formed their primary encampment, stood in its east border (Jos 4:19). That it had a king is a very secondary consideration, for almost every small town had one (Jos 12:9-24); in fact, monarchy was the only form of government known to those primitive times the government of the people of God presenting a marked exception to prevailing usage. But Jericho was further enclosed by walls — a fenced city — its walls were so considerable that at least one person (Rahab) had a house upon them (Jos 2:15), and its gates were shut, as throughout the East still, “when it was dark” (Jos 5:5). Again, the spoil that was found in it betokened its affluence — Ai, Makkedah, Libnah, Lachish, Eglon, Hebron, Debir, and even Hazor, evidently contained nothing worth mentioning in comparison — besides sheep, oxen, and asses, we hear of vessels of brass and iron. These possibly may have been the first fruits of those brass foundries “in the plain of Jordan” of which Solomon afterwards so largely availed himself (2Ch 4:17).

Silver and gold were found in such abundance that one man (Achan) could appropriate stealthily 200 shekels (100 oz. avoird.; see Lewis, Heb. Rep. 6, 57) of the former, and “a wedge of gold of 50 shekels (25 oz.) weight;” “a goodly Babylonish garment,” purloined in the same dishonesty, may be adduced as evidence of a then- existing commerce between Jericho and the far East (Jos 6:24; Jos 7:21). In fact, its situation alone — in so noble a plain and contiguous to so prolific a river — would bespeak its importance in a country where these natural advantages have always been so highly prized and in an age when people depended so much more upon the indigenous resources of nature than they are compelled to do now. Jericho was the city to which the two spies were sent by Joshua from Shittim they were lodged in the house of Rahab the harlot upon the wall, and departed, having first promised to save her and all that were found in her house from destruction (Jos 2:1-21). The account which the spies received from their hostess tended much to encourage the subsequent operations of the Israelites, as it showed that the inhabitants of the country were greatly alarmed at their advance, and the signal miracles which had marked their course from the Nile to the Jordan.

The strange manner in which Jericho itself was taken (see Hacks, De ruina murorum Hierichuntiorun, Jena, 1690) must have strengthened this impression in the country, and appears, indeed, to have been designed  for that effect. The town was utterly destroyed by the Israelites, who pronounced an awful curse upon whoever should rebuild it; and all the inhabitants were put to the sword, except Rahab and her family (Joshua 6). Her house was recognized by the scarlet line bound in the window from which the spies were let down, and she and her relatives were taken out of it, and “lodged without the camp;” but it is nowhere said or implied that her house escaped the general conflagration. That she “dwelt in Israel” for the future; that she married Salmon son of Naas-aon. “prince of the children of Judah,” and had by him Boaz, the husband of Ruth and progenitor of David and of our Lord; and, lastly, that hers is the first and only Gentile name that appears in the list of the faithful of the O.T. given by Paul (Jos 6:25; 1Ch 2:10; Mat 1:5; Heb 11:31) all these facts surely indicate that she did not continue to inhabit the accursed site; and, if so, and in the absence of all direct evidence from Scripture, how could it ever have been inferred that her house was left standing? (See Hoffmann, Rahabs Erettung, Berl. 1861.) SEE RAHAB.

Such as it had been left by Joshua, such it was bestowed by him upon the tribe of Benjamin (Jos 18:21; it lay also on the border of Ephraim [Jos 16:7]), and from this time a long interval elapses before Jericho appears again upon the scene. It is only incidentally mentioned in the life of David in connection with his embassy to the Ammonitish king (2Sa 10:5). The solemn manner in which its second foundation under Hiel the Bethelite is recorded — upon whom the curse of Joshua is said to have descended in full force (1Ki 16:34) — would certainly seem to imply that up to that time its site had been uninhabited. It is true, mention is made of “a city of palm trees” (Jdg 1:16; Jdg 3:13) in existence apparently at the time when spoken of, and Jericho is twice — once before its first overthrow — and once after its second foundation — designated by that name (see Deu 34:3, and 2Ch 28:15); but these designations must be understood to apply only to the site, in whatever condition at the time. (On the presence of these trees, see below.) However, once actually rebuilt, Jericho rose again slowly in importance.

In its immediate vicinity the sons of the prophets sought retirement from the world and Elisha “healed the spring of the waters;” and over and against it, beyond Jordan, Elijah “went up by a whirlwind into heaven” (2Ki 2:1-22). In its plains Zedekiah fell into the hands of the Chaldaeans (2Ki 25:5; Jer 39:5). By what may be called a retrospective  account of it, we may infer that Hiel's restoration had not utterly failed, for in the return under Zerubbabel the “children of Jericho,” 345 in number are comprised (Ezra 3:34; Neh 7:36); and it is even implied that they removed thither again, for the men of Jericho assisted Nehemiah in rebuilding that part of the wall of Jerusalem which was next to the sheep gate (Neh 3:2). It was eventually fortified by the Syrian general Bacchides (1Ma 9:50; Josephus, Ant. 13, 1, 3).

The Jericho of the days of Josephus was distant 150 stadia from Jerusalem and sixty from the Jordan. It lay in a plain overhung by a barren mountain, whose roots ran northward towards Scythopolis and southward in the direction of Sodom and the Dead Sea. These formed the western boundaries of the plain. Eastward, its barriers were the mountains of Moab, which ran parallel to the former. In the midst of the plain — the great plain, as it was called — flowed the Jordan, and at the top and bottom of it were two lakes: Tiberias, proverbial for its sweetness, and Asphaltites for its bitterness. Away from the Jordan, it was parched and unhealthy during summer; but during winter, even when it snowed at Jerusalem, the inhabitants here wore linen garments. Hard by Jericho, bursting forth close to the site of the old city which Joshua took on his entrance into Canaan, was a most exuberant fountain, whose waters, before noted for their contrary properties, had received (proceeds Josephus) through Elisha's prayers their then wonderfully salutary and prolific efficacy. Within its range — seventy stadia (Strabo says 100) by twenty — the fertility of the soil was unexampled. Palms of various names and properties some that produced honey scarcely inferior to that of the neighborhood; opobalsamum, the choicest of indigenous fruits; cyprus (Arabic “el- henna”), and myrobalanum (“zukkum”) throve there beautifully and thickly dotted about the pleasure grounds (War, 4, 8, 3). These and other aromatic shrubs were here of peculiar fragrance (Justin. 36:3; Josephus, Ant. 4, 6, 1; 14, 4, 1; 15, 4, 2; War, 1, 6, 6; 1, 18, 5). Wisdom herself did not disdain comparison with “the rose plants of Jericho” (Sir 24:14). Well might Strabo (Geog. 16, 2, § 41, ed. Muller) conclude that its revenues were considerable. The peculiar productions mentioned, in addition to those noticed above, were honey (Cedren. p. 104) and, in later times, the sugar cane (see Robinson's Researches, 2, 290 sq.). SEE ROSE OF JERICHO.

By the Romans, Jericho was first visited under Pompey. He encamped there for a single night and subsequently destroyed two forts — Threx and Taurus — that commanded its approaches (Strabo, Geogr. § 40). Dagon  (Josephus, War, 1, 2, 3) or Docus (1Ma 16:15; comp. 9:50), where Ptolemy assassinated his father-in-law, Simon the Maccabee, may have been one of these strongholds, which were afterwards infested by bandits. Gabinius, in his resettlement of Judaea, made Jericho one of the five seats of assembly (Josephus, War, 1, 8, 5). With Herod the Great it rose to still greater prominence: it had been found full of treasure of all kinds; as in. the time of Joshua, so by his Roman allies who sacked it (ibid. 1, 15, 6); and its revenues were eagerly sought and rented by the wily tyrant from Cleopatra, to whom Antony had assigned them (Ant. 15, 4, 2). Not long afterwards he built a fort there, which he called “Cyprus,” in honor of his mother (ibid. 16, 5); a tower, which he called, in honor of his brother, “Phasaelis;” and a number of new palaces, superior in their construction to those which had existed there previously, which he named after his friends. He even founded a new town higher up the plain, which he called, like the tower, Phasaelis ( War, 1, 21, 9).

If he did not make Jericho his habitual residence, he at least retired thither to die and to be mourned, if he could have got his plan carried out; and it was in the amphitheater of Jericho that the news of his death was announced to the assembled soldiers and people by Salome (War, 1, 38, 8). Soon afterwards the place was burned and the town plundered by one Simon, a revolutionary that had been slave to Herod (Ant. 17, 10, 6); but Archelaus rebuilt the former sumptuously, founded a new town in the plain, that bore his own name, and, most important of all, diverted water from a village called Neaera to irrigate the plain, which he had planted with palms (Ant. 17, 13, 1). Thus Jericho was once more “a city of palms” when our Lord visited it. As the city that had so exceptionally contributed to his own ancestry as the city which had been the first to fall, amidst so much ceremony, before “the captain of the Lord's host and his servant Joshua” we may well suppose that his eyes surveyed it with unwonted interest. It is supposed to have been on the rocky heights overhanging it (hence called by tradition the Quarentana) that he was assailed by the tempter; and over against it, according to tradition likewise, he had been previously baptized in the Jordan. Here he restored sight to the blind (two certainly, perhaps three [Mat 20:30; Mar 10:46]: this was in leaving Jericho; Luke says “as he was come nigh unto Jericho,” etc. [Luk 18:35]).

Here the descendant of Rahab did not disdain the hospitality of Zacchaeus the publican — an office which was likely to be lucrative enough in so rich a city. Finally, between Jerusalem and Jericho was laid the scene of his story of the good Samaritan, which, if it is not to be regarded as a real occurrence throughout, at least derives interest from  the fact that robbers have ever been the terror of that precipitous road (comp. Phocas, ch. 20; see Schubert, 3, 72); and so formidable had they proved only just before the Christian era that Pompey had been induced to undertake the destruction of their strongholds (Strabo, as before, 16, 2, § 40; comp. Joseph. Ant. 20:6, 1 sq.). The way from Jerusalem to Jericho is still described by travellers as the most dangerous about Palestine. (See Hackett's Illustra. of Script. p. 206.) As lately as 1820, an English traveller, Sir Frederick Henniker, was attacked on this road by the Arabs with firearms, who stripped him naked and left him severely wounded.

Posterior to the Gospels, Vespasian found it one of the toparchies of Judaea (War, 3, 3, 5), but deserted by its inhabitants in a great measure when he encamped there (ibid. 4, 8, 2). He left a garrison on his departure (not necessarily the 10th legion, which is only stated to have marched through Jericho) which was still there when Titus advanced upon Jerusalem. Is it asked how Jericho was destroyed? Evidently by Vespasian; for Josephus, rightly understood, is not so silent as Dr. Robinson (Bibl. Res. 1, 566, 2d ed.) thinks. The city pillaged and burnt in Josephus (War 4, 9, 1) was clearly Jericho, with its adjacent villages, and not Gerasa, as may be seen at once by comparing the language there with that of 8, 2, and the agent was Vespasian. Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s.v.) say that it was destroyed when Jerusalem was besieged by the Romans. They further add that it was afterwards rebuilt — they do not say by whom — and still existed in their day; nor had the ruins of the two preceding cities been obliterated. Could Hadrian possibly have planted a colony there when he passed through Judaea and founded Ælia? (Dion Cass. Hist. 669, c. 11, ed. Sturz; more at large Chronicles Paschal. p. 254, ed. Da Fresne.) The discovery which Origen made there of a version of the O.T. (the 5th in his Hexapla), together with sundry MSS. Greek and Hebrew, suggests that it could not have been wholly without inhabitants (Euseb. E. H. 6, 16; Epiphan. Lib. de Pond. et Menesur. circa med.); or again, as is perhaps more probable, did a Christian settlement arise there under Constantine, when baptisms in the Jordan began to be the rage? That Jericho became an episcopal see about that time under Jerusalem appears from more than one ancient Notitia (Geograph. S. a Carolo Paulo, p. 306, and the Parergon appended to it; comp. William of Tyre, Hist. lib. 23, ad f.). Its bishops subscribed to various councils in the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries (ibid. and Le Quien's Oriens Christian. 3, 654).

Justinian, we are told, restored a hospice there, and likewise a church dedicated to the Virgin (Procop. De  oedif. 5, 9). As early as A.D. 337, when the Bordeaux pilgrim (ed. Wesseling) visited it, a house existed there which was pointed out, after the manner of those days, as the house of Rahab. This was roofless when Arculfts saw it; and not only so, but the third city was likewise in ruins (Adamn. De Locis S. ap. Migane, Patrolog. C. 88, 799). Had Jericho been visited by an earthquake, as Antoninus reports (ap. Ugoilini Thesaur. 7, p. 1213, and note to c. 3), and as Syria certainly was, in the 27th year of Justinian, A.D. 553? If so, we can well understand the restorations already referred to; and when Antoninus adds that the house of Rahab had now become a hospice and oratory, we might almost pronounce that this was the very hospice which had been restored by that emperor. Again, it may be asked, did Christian Jericho receive no injury from the Persian Romizan, the ferocious general of Chosroes II, A.D. 614? (Bar-Hebraei Chron. p. 99, Lat. 5, ed. Kirsch).

It would rather seem that there were more religious edifices in the 7th than in the 6th century round about it. According to Arculfus, one church marked the site of Gilgal; another the spot where our Lord was supposed to have deposited his garments previously to his baptism; a third within the precincts of a vast monastery dedicated to John, situated upon some rising ground overlooking the Jordan. Jericho meanwhile had disappeared as a town to rise no more. Churches and monasteries sprung up around it on all sides, but only to smoulder away in their turn. The anchorite caves in the rocky flanks of the Quarentana are the most striking memorial that remains of early or mediaeval enthusiasm. Arculfus speaks of a diminutive race — Canaanites he calls them — that inhabited the plain in great numbers in his day. They have retained possession of those fairy meadowlands ever since and have made their headquarters for some centuries round the “square tower or castle” first mentioned by Willebrand (ap. Leon. Allat. Συμμικτ. p. 151) in A.D. 1211, when it was inhabited by the Saracens, whose work it may be supposed to have been, though it has since been dignified by the name of the house of Zacchaeus. Their village is by Brocardus (ap. Canis. Thesaur. 4, 16), in A.D. 1230, styled “a vile place;” by Sir J. Maundeville, in A.D. 1322, “a little village;” and by Henry Maundrell, in A.D. 1697, “a poor, nasty village;” in which verdict all modern travellers that have ever visited it must concur. (See Early Travels in Pal. by Wright, p. 177 and 451.) They are looked upon by the Arabs as a debased race and are probably nothing more or less than veritable Gypsies, who are still to be met with in the neighborhood of the Frank mountain near Jerusalem and on the heights round the village and convent of St. John in the desert and are still called  “Scomunicati” by the native Christians one of the names applied to them when they first attracted notice in Europe in the 15th century (i.e. from feigning themselves “penitents” and under censure of the pope. See Hoyland's Historical Survey of the Gipsies, p. 18; also The Gipsy, a poem by A.P. Stanley).

Jericho does not seem to have ever been restored as a town by the Crusaders; but its plains had not ceased to be prolific and were extensively cultivated and laid out in vineyards and gardens by the monks (Phocas ap. Leon. Allat. Συμμικτ. [c. 20], p. 31). They seem to have been included in the domains of the patriarchate of Jerusalem, and, as such, were bestowed by Arnulf upon his niece as a dowry (William of Tyre, Hist. 11, 15). Twenty-five years afterwards we find Melisendis, wife of king Fulco, assigning them to the convent of Bethany, which she had founded A.D. 1137.

The site of ancient (the first) Jericho is with reason placed by Dr. Robinson (Bibl. Res. 1, 552-568) in the immediate neighborhood of the fountain of Elisha; and that of the second (the city of the New Test. and of Josephus) at the opening of the wady Kelt (Cherith), half an hour from the fountain. The ancient, and, indeed, the only practicable road from Jerusalem zigzags down the rugged and bare mountain side, close to the south bank of wady el-Kelt, one of the most sublime ravines in Palestine. In the plain, half a mile from the foot of the pass, and a short distance south of the present road, is an immense reservoir, now dry, and round it are extensive ruins, consisting of mounds of rubbish and ancient foundations. Riding northward, similar remains were seen on both sides of wady el-Kelt. Half a mile farther north we enter cultivated ground, interspersed with clumps of thorny nubk (“lote-tree”) and other shrubs; another half mile brings us to Ain es-Sultân, a large fountain bursting forth from the foot of a mound. The water, though warm, is sweet, and is extensively used in the irrigation of the surrounding plain. The whole plain immediately around the fountain is strewn with ancient ruins and heaps of rubbish.

The village traditionally identified with Jericho now bears the name of Riha (in Arabic er-Riha) and is situated about the middle of the plain, six miles west from the Jordan; in N. lat. 34° 57', and E. long. 35° 33'. Dr. Olin describes the present village as “the meanest and foulest of Palestine.” It may perhaps contain forty dwellings, with some two hundred inhabitants. The houses consist of rough walls of old building stones, roofed with straw  and brushwood. Each has in front of it an inclosure for cattle, fenced with branches of the thorny nubk; and a stronger fence of the same material surrounds the whole village, forming a rude barrier against the raids of the Bedawin. Not far from the village is a little square castle or tower, evidently of Saracenic origin, but now dignified by the title of “the house of Zacchaeus,” This village, though it bears the name of Jericho, is about a mile and a half distant both from the Jericho of the prophets and that of the evangelists. Very probably it may occupy the site of Gilgal (q.v.). The ruinous state of the modern houses is in part owing to a comparatively recent event. Ibrahim Pasha, on his retreat from Damascus, near the close of 1840, having been attacked by the Arabs in crossing the Jordan, sent a detachment of his army and razed Jericho to the ground.

The soil of the plain is unsurpassed in fertility; there is abundance of water for irrigation, and many of the old aqueducts are almost perfect; yet nearly the whole plain is waste and desolate. The grove supplied by the fountain is in the distance. The few fields of wheat and Indian corn, and the few orchards of figs, are enough to show what the place might become under proper cultivation. But the people are now few in number, indolent, and licentious. The palms which gave the ancient city a distinctive appellation are gone; even that “single solitary palm” which Dr. Robinson saw exists no more. The climate of Jericho is exceedingly hot and unhealthy. This is accounted for by the depression of the plain, which is about 1200 feet below the level of the sea. The reflection of the sun's rays from the bare white cliffs and mountain ranges which shut in the plain, and the noisome exhalations from the lake and from the numerous salt springs around it, are enough to poison the atmosphere.

For further details respecting Jericho, see Reland's Paloest. p. 383, 829 sq.; Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. p. 85 sq.; Otho's Lex. Rabb. p. 298 sq.; Bachiene, 2, 3, § 224 sq.; Hamesveld, 2, 291 sq.; Cellar. Notit. 2, 552 sq.; Robinson's Researches, 2, 267 sq.; Olin's Travels, 2, 195 sq.; Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 439 sq.

## Jericho (2)[[@Headword:Jericho (2)]]

             For a description of Tell es-Sultan, supposed to be the site of the ancient city, see the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (3:222). The following account of the locality in general is from Conder, Tent Work, 2:2 sq.:

"Reaching Jericho we were again disappointed. The long groves, which appear so charming at a distance, are entirely complosed of thorny shrubs. The dom or zizyphus grows into a tree, with small green leaves and formidable prickles; the nebk, another species, forms long hedges of brier, of which it is said the cruel 'crown of thorns' was woven, for which reason it is called spina Christi. The zakkion, or balsam-tree (balanites), is equally thorny, and beneath these grow poisonous nightshade and other noxious plants. The distant beauty of the groves is only a mockery, and the environs of Jericho, when reached, are as stony and unlovely as any other part of the country.

"Yet, in some respects, the place is still charming. Here, late in autumn, the sound of running water and the song of birds greeted our ears. Among the high mounds, or tellul, bare and dusty, a fresh, beautiful stream was flowing from ‘Ain es-Sultan, the site of the first Jericho. The great spring wells up in a stony pool, under a high hillock, and opposite to this tell is a jungle crowned by a very large castor-oil tree and other thick foliage. In this grateful shade the birds have found a retreat. The great gray shrikes (Abu Zereik) sit on the top branches, and the queer 'hopping thrushes,' with their tails stuck up like rapiers, bound about beneath.

The bulbul also sings in the groves — a gray bird with a black head and a curionus yellow patch at the root of the tail. Still more beautiful are the great Smymrna kingfishers (Abu Nukr), in their blue coats and chocolate- colored nwaistcoats, white-throated, with bills like red sealingwax; and the gray African species (Abu Kubeia), which also flutters above the stream. Last, but not least, come the lovely sun-birds (Suweid), peculiar to the Jordan valley, darting about like little black wrens, but resplendent, when seen close, with all the colors of the prism.  "There is only one natural position for a large town in the plains of Jericho, namely, the neighborhood of the beautiful fountain called 'the Sultan's Spring,' near the foot of the Quarantania precipice. Nothing can well explain the choice of a new position, but the fact that Jericho was cursed by Jashua, and that the curse was fulfilled. Thus it is by the spring that we naturally place the Jericho of Joshua's time, and this view receives confirmation from the acconnt of the flight of the spies 'to the mountain;' for if situated in the immediate vicinity of the great crag of Kuruntul, the city was so near that the fugitives might easily have crept through the cane jungle and thorn-groves to the shelter of one of the innumerable caverns in the face of its precipices.

"Of ancient Jericho nothing now remains but the bright spring, and the shapeless mound above it. We can hardly wonder at this when we find that even the Jericho of Herod has disappeared, and that only a vague conjecture can be made as to the position of Thrax and Taurus, the great towers which once defended it. It seems probable that this second town stood south of ancient Jericho, and even closer to the hills, for the great aqueduct which brought water, a distance of four miles, from the fine spring at the head of the wild Kelt chasm, leads just to the opening of the plain, and seems to be the only one of the numerous aqueducts which dates back to Roman times. At the mouth of the pass, also, is the rock fort called Jubr or Chubr, in which title we may recognize, as my companion, Mr. Drake, pointed out, a relic of the name Cupros, which was given to a tower above Herod's Jericho.

"Jerome tells us that there were in his day two Jerichos, and in A.D. 333, the anonymous pilgrim of Bordeaux found a town at the foot of the pass. Here also we have remains of a bridge which has the opus reticulatum of Roman-masonry, and this, with a few strewn fragments and with two great mounds of sun-dried brick, seems all that is left of the second Jericho. The Byzantine, or 4th-century town, mentioned by Jerome as the second Jericho, is no doubt represented by the foundations and fragments of cornice and capital, over which the rider stumbles among the thorn groves east of the 'Ain es-Sultan.  "By A.D. 700 Jericho had again disappeared, and thus, in the 12th- century, we find the site once more moved. The modern Ertha then springs into existence near a square tower, such as the Crusaders erected along their pilgrim roads, and a tradition of the Garden of Abraham' comes into existence as early as the time of Snewulf (A.D. 1102). In the 14th century sir John Maundeville finds Jericho a little village, and Abiraham's gardel is then stated to be at the foot of the Quarantania. Fetellus makes the distance between Jericho and the latter mountain two miles, and thus it is pretty clear that the modern Ertha represents the site which was created in the Crusading period."

## Jeriel[[@Headword:Jeriel]]

             (Heb. Yeriël', יְרַיאֵל, fearer of God, or i.q. Jeruel; Sept. Ι᾿εριήλ), one of the sons of Tola, the son of Issachar, mentioned as a valiant chief of his tribe, which were enrolled in the time of David (1Ch 7:2). B.C. post 1856.

## Jerijah[[@Headword:Jerijah]]

             (1Ch 26:31). SEE JERIAH.

## Jerimoth[[@Headword:Jerimoth]]

             (Heb. Yerimoth', יְרַימוֹת, heights, i.q. Jeremoth), the name of several men. SEE JEREMOTH.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿εριμούθ) One of the five sons of Bela, son of Benjamin, a valiant chief of his tribe (1Ch 7:7). B.C. post 1856.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿εριμώθ) The last named of the three sons of Mushi, grandson of Levi (1Ch 24:30); elsewhere (1Ch 23:23) called JEREMOTH SEE JEREMOTH (q.v.).

3. (Sept. Ι᾿αριμούθ v.r. Α᾿ριμώθ)) One of the famous Benjamite archers and slingers that joined David's band at Ziklag (1Ch 12:5). B.C. 1055.

4. (Sept. Ι᾿εριμούθ v.r. Ι᾿εριμώθ)) One of the fourteen sons of Heman, and appointed a Levitical musician under his father in the arrangement of the sacred services by David (1Ch 25:4); probably the same elsewhere (1Ch 25:22) called JEREMOTH.

5. (Sept. Ι᾿εριμούθ v.r. Ι᾿εριμώθ)) Son of Azriel, and “captain” of Naphtali under David and Solomon (1Ch 27:19). B.C. 1014.

6. (Sept. Ε᾿ρμούθ v.r. Ι᾿εριμώθ.) A son of David, whose daughter Mahalath was Rehoboam's first wife (2Ch 11:18). B.C. ante 973. He appears to have been different from any of David's sons elsewhere enumerated (2Sa 3:2-5; 1Ch 14:4-7), having, perhaps, been born of a concubine (compare 2Sa 16:21). SEE DAVID. “This, in fact, is the Jewish tradition respecting his maternity (Jerome, Quoestiones, ad loc.). It is, however, somewhat questionable whether Rehoboam would have married the grandchild of a concubine even of the great David. The passage 2Ch 11:18 is not quite clear, since the word ‘daughter' is a correction of the Keri: the original text had בן, i.e. ‘son.'”

7. (Sept. Ι᾿εριμώθ.) A Levite, one of the overseers of the Temple offerings in the time of Hezekiah (2Ch 31:13). B.C. 726.

## Jerioth[[@Headword:Jerioth]]

             (Heb. Yerioth', יְרַיעוֹת, timidity, otherwise curtains; Ι᾿εριώθ), a person apparently named as the latter of the first two wives of Caleb, son of Hezron, several children being mentioned as the fruit of the marriage with one or the other (1Ch 2:18). B.C. post 1856. The Vulgate renders this as the son of Caleb by the first-mentioned wife, and father of the sons named but contrary to the Heb. text, which is closely followed by the Sept. There is probably some corruption; possibly the name in question is an interpolation: compare 1Ch 2:19; or perhaps we should render the connective by even, thus making Jerioth but another name for Azubah.

## Jerment, George, D.D.[[@Headword:Jerment, George, D.D.]]

             a minister of the Secession Church of Scotland, was born in 1759 at Peebles. Scotland, where his father was at the time pastor of a church of that branch of the Secession Church denominated before their union in 1819 as Anti-burgher. On the completion of his collegiate course he entered the divinity hall of his denomination, situated at Alloa and, while a student there, took a high standing in his class. After preaching a short time in Scotland he went to London, to become the colleague of Mr. Wilson, at the Secession Church in Bow Lane, Cheapside and was ordained in the last week of Sept. 1782. In the English metropolis Jerment was well received and he labored there for the space of thirty-five years, his preaching attracting large and respectable congregations from the Scottish residents of London. He died May 23, 1819. “His character stood very high in the estimate of all who knew him, as a man of sense, learning, prudence, and exalted piety.” He was one of the first directors: of the London Missionary Society and greatly encouraged the enterprise. The writings of Jermey intrusted to the press are mainly public lectures and sermons: (London, 1791-1813). Among these his Early Piety, illustrated and recommended in several Discourses; and Religion, a Monitor to the Middle-aged and the Glory of old Men, deserve to occupy a conspicuous place. See Morison, Fathers and Founders of Lond. Miss. Society, p. 506 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Jeroboam[[@Headword:Jeroboam]]

             (Heb. Yarobam', י רָבְעָם, increase of the people; Sept. Ι᾿εροβοάμ, Josephus ῾Ιεροβόαμος), the name of two of the kings of the separate kingdom of Israel.

1. The son of Nebat (by which title he is usually distinguished in the record of his infamy) by a woman named Zeruah, of the tribe of Ephraim (1Ki 11:26). He was the founder of the schismatical northern kingdom, consisting of the ten tribes, over which he reigned twenty-two (current) years, B.C. 973-951. At the time he first appears in the sacred history his mother was a widow and he had already been noticed by Solomon as a clever and active young man and appointed one of the superintendents of the works which that magnificent king was carrying on at Jerusalem, having special charge of the services required of the leading tribe of Ephraim (1Ki 11:26-28; comp. Josephus, Ant. 8, 7, 7). B.C. 1010- 998. This appointment, the reward of his merits, might have satisfied his ambition had not the declaration of the prophet Ahijah given him higher hopes. When informed that, by the divine appointment, he was to become king over the ten tribes about to be rent from the house of David, he was not content to wait patiently for the death of Solomon, but began to form plots and conspiracies, the discovery of which constrained him to flee to Egypt to escape condign punishment, B.C. cir. 980. The king of that country was but too ready to encourage one whose success must necessarily weaken the kingdom which had become great and formidable under David and Solomon, and which had already pushed its frontier to the Red Sea (1Ki 11:29-40).

When Solomon died, the ten tribes sent to call Jeroboam from Egypt; and he appears to have headed the deputation that came before the son of Solomon with a demand of new securities for the rights which the measures of the late king had compromised. It may somewhat excuse the harsh answer of Rehoboam that the demand was urged by a body of men headed by one whose pretensions were so well known and so odious to the house of David. It cannot be denied that, in making their applications thus offensively, they struck the first blow, although it is possible that they, in the first instance, intended to use the presence of Jeroboam for no other purpose than to frighten the king into compliance. The imprudent answer of Rehoboam rendered a revolution inevitable, and Jeroboam was then called to reign over the ten tribes by the style of “King of Israel” (1Ki 12:1-20). Autumn, B.C. 973. SEE REHOBOAM.

(For the general course of his conduct on the throne, SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.)

The leading object of his policy was to widen the breach between the two kingdoms, and to rend asunder those common interests among all the descendants of Jacob, which it was one great object of the law to combine and interlace. To this end he scrupled not to sacrifice the most sacred and inviolable interests and obligations of the covenant people by forbidding his subjects to resort to the one temple and altar of Jehovah at Jerusalem and by establishing shrines at Dan and Beth-el — the extremities of his kingdom — where “golden calves” were set up as the symbols of Jehovah, to which the people were enjoined to resort and bring their offerings. SEE CALF, GOLDEN.

The pontificate of the new establishment he united to his crown, in imitation of the Egyptian kings (1Ki 12:26-33). He was officiating in that capacity at Bethel, offering incense, when a prophet (Josephus, Ant. 8, 8, 5, calls him Jadon, i.e. probably Iddo; compare Ant. 8, 15, 4; Jerome, Quoest. Hebr. on 2Ch 10:4) appeared, and in the name of the Lord announced a coming time, as yet far off, in which a king of the house of David, Josiah by name, should burn upon that unholy altar the bones of its ministers. He was then preparing to verify, by a commissioned prodigy, the truth of the oracle he had delivered, when the king attempted to arrest him, but was smitten with palsy in the arm he stretched forth. At the same time the threatened prodigy took place — the altar was rent asunder, and the ashes strewed far around. Awestruck at this twofold miracle, the king begged the prophet to intercede with God for the restoration of his hand, which was accordingly healed (1Ki 13:1-6). B.C. 973. This measure had, however, no abiding effect. The policy on which he acted lay too deep in what he deemed the vital interests of his separate kingdom to be even thus abandoned; and the force of the considerations which determined his conduct may in part be appreciated from the fact that no subsequent king of Israel, however well disposed in other respects even ventured to lay a finger on this schismatical establishment (1Ki 13:33-34). Hence “the sin of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, wherewith he sinned and made Israel to sin,” became a standing phrase in describing that iniquity from which no king of Israel departed. SEE IDOLATRY.

The contumacy of Jeroboam eventually brought upon him the doom which he probably dreaded beyond all others — the speedy extinction of the dynasty which he had taken so much pains and incurred so much guilt to  establish on firm foundations. His son Abijah being sick, he sent his wife, disguised, to consult the prophet Ahijah, who had predicted that he should be king of Israel. The prophet, although he had become blind with age, knew the queen, and saluted her with, “Come in, thou wife of Jeroboam, for I am sent to thee with heavy tidings.” These were not merely that the son should die for that was intended in mercy to one who alone, of all the house of Jeroboam, had remained faithful to his God, and was the only one who should obtain an honored grave but that his race should be violently and utterly extinguished: “I will take away the remnant of the house of Jeroboam as a man taketh away dung, till it be all gone” (1Ki 14:1-18). The son died as soon as the mother crossed the threshold on her return; and, as the death of Jeroboam himself is the next event recorded, it would seem that he did not long survive his son (1Ki 14:20). B.C. early in 951. (See Kitto's Daily Bible Illustrations, ad loc.)

“Jeroboam was at constant war with the house of Judah, but the only act distinctly recorded is a battle with Abijah, son of Rehoboam, in which, in spite of a skilful ambush made by Jeroboam, and of much superior force, he was defeated and for the time lost three important cities Beth-el. Jeshanah, and Ephraim. The Targum on Rth 4:20 mentions Jeroboam having stationed guards on the roads which guards had been slain by the people of Netophah; but what is here alluded to, or when it took place, we have at present no clue to.” The Sept. has a long addition to the Biblical account (at 1Ki 12:24), evidently taken from some apocryphal source. Josephus simply follows the Hebrew text. (See Cassel, King Jeroboam, Erfurt, 1857.)

2. The son and successor of Jehoash, and the fourteenth king of Israel for a period of forty-one years, B.C. 823-782 (2Ki 14:23). He followed the example of the first Jeroboam in keeping up the idolatry of the golden calves (2Ki 14:24). Nevertheless, the Lord had pity upon Israel (2Ki 14:26), the time of its ruin had not yet come, and this reign was long and flourishing, being contemporary with those of Amaziah (2Ki 14:23) and Uzziah (2Ki 15:1) over Judah. Jeroboam brought to a successful result the wars which his father had undertaken, and was always victorious over the Syrians (comp. 2Ki 13:4; 2Ki 14:26-27). He even took their chief cities of Damascus (2Ki 14:28; Amo 1:3-5) and Hamnath, which had formerly been subject to the sceptre of David, and restored to the realm of Israel the ancient eastern limits from Lebanon to the Dead Sea (2Ki 14:25; Amo 6:14). Ammon and Moab were  reconquered (Amo 1:13; Amo 2:1-3); the Transjordanic tribes were restored to their territory (2Ki 13:5; 1Ch 5:17-22). But it was merely an outward restoration. The sanctuary at Beth-el was kept up in royal state (Amo 7:13), while drunkenness, licentiousness, and oppression prevailed in the country (Amo 2:6-8; Amo 4:1; Amo 6:6; Hos 4:12-14; Hos 1:2), and idolatry was united with the worship of Jehovah (Hos 4:13; Hos 13:6). During this reign lived the prophets Hosea (Hos 1:1), Joel (comp. Joe 3:16 with Amo 1:12), Amos (Amo 1:1), and Jonah (2Ki 14:25). In Amo 7:11, Amaziah, the high priest of Bethel, in reporting what he called the conspiracy of Amos against Jeroboam, represents the prophet as declaring that Jeroboam should die by the sword; and some would regard this as a prophecy that had failed of its fulfilment, as there is no evidence that his death was other than natural, for he was buried with his ancestors in state (2Ki 14:29), although the interregnum of eleven years which intervened before the accession of his son Zechariah (2Ki 14:23, comp. with 15:8) argues some political disorder at the time of his death (see the Studien und Kritiken, 1847, 3, 648). But the probability rather is that the high priest, who displayed the true spirit of a persecutor, gave an unduly specific and offensive turn to the words of Amos, in order to inflame Jeroboam the more against him. The only passages of Scripture where his name occurs are 2Ki 13:13; 2Ki 14:16; 2Ki 14:23; 2Ki 14:27-29; 2Ki 15:1; 2Ki 15:8; 1Ch 5:17; Hos 1:1; Amo 1:1; Amo 7:9-11; in all others the former Jeroboam is intended. SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

Jeroham (Heb. Yerocham', יְרֹחָם, cherished), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. ῾Ιερεμεήλ, ῾Ιεροβοάμ, ῾Ιερεάμ.) The son of Elihu (Eliab, Eliel), and father of Elkanah, Samuel's father (1Sa 1:1; 1Ch 6:27; 1Ch 6:34). B.C. ante 1142.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿εροάμ v.r. Ι᾿ροάμ) An inhabitant of Gedor, and father of Joelah and Zebadiah, two of the Benjamite archers who joined David's band at Ziklag (1Ch 12:7). B.C. ante 1055.

3. (Sept. Ι᾿ωράμ v.r. Ι᾿ρωάβ) The father of Azareel, which latter was “captain” of the tribe of Dan under David and Solomon (1Ch 27:22). B.C. ante 1017.

4. (Sept. Ι᾿ωράμ.) Father of Azariah, which latter is the first mentioned of the two of that name among the “captains of hundreds” with whom Jehoiada planned the restoration of prince Jehoash to the throne (2Ch 23:1). B.C. ante 876.

5. (Sept. Ι᾿εροάμ v.r. Ι᾿ροάμ.) The father of several Benjamite chiefs resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 7:27). B.C. appar. ante 588. See No. 6; SEE JEREMOTH, 4.

6. (Sept. Ι᾿εροάμ v.r. Ι᾿εροβοάμ) The father of Ibneiah, which latter was one of the Benjamite chiefs resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 9:8). B.C. apparently ante 536. Possibly identical with the preceding.

7. (Sept. Ι᾿εραάμ v.r. Ι᾿ραάμ) The son of Pashur, and father of Adaiah, which last was one of the chief priests resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 9:12). B.C. apparently ante 536.

8. (Sept. ῾Ιεροάμ) The son of Pelaliah, and father of Adaiah, which last was one of the chief priests resident at Jerusalem after the Exile (Neh 11:12). B.C. ante 440. Perhaps, however, this Jeroham was the same with No. 7.

## Jerome[[@Headword:Jerome]]

             (fully Latinized Sophronius Eusebius Hieroynyus), generally known as SAINT JEROME, one of the most learned and able among the fathers of the Western Church, was born at Stridon, a town on the confines of Dalmatia and Pannonia (but whose site is now unknown, as the place was destroyed by the Goths in A.D. 377), at some period between 331 and 345 according to Schaff, it probably occurred near 345. His parents were both Christians. His early education was superintended by his father, after which he studied Greek and Latin rhetoric and philosophy under Ælius Donatus at Rome. While a resident in this Christian city he was admitted to the rite of baptism and decided to devote his life, in rigid abstinence, to the service of his Master. It seems uncertain whether a visit which he made to Gaul was undertaken before or after this important event. At any rate, about 370 we find him at Treves and at Aquileia, busy in transcribing the commentaries of Hilarius on the Psalms and a work on the synods by the same author; and in composing his first theological essay, De muliere septies percussa, the letter to Innocentius. In 373 he set out on a journey to the East, in company with his friends Innocentius, Evagrius, and Heliodorus, and  finally settled for a time at Antioch. During his residence at this place he was seized with a severe fever and in a dream which he had in this sickness he fancied himself called before the judgment bar of God and as a heathen Ciceronian (he had hitherto given much of his time to the study of the classical writers) so severely reprimanded and scourged that even the angels interceded for him from sympathy with his youth and he himself was led to take the solemn vow hereafter to forsake the study and reading of worldly books, a pledge which, however, he did not adhere to in after life. A marked religious fervor thenceforth animated Jerome; a devotion to monastic habits became the ruling principle, we might say the ruling passion of his life he retired to the desert of Chalcis in 374, and there spent four years in penitential exercises and in study, paying particular attention to the acquirement of the Hebrew tongue. But his active and restless spirit soon brought him again upon the public stage, and involved him in all the doctrinal and ecclesiastical controversies of those controversial times. SEE MELETIUS.

In 379 he was ordained a presbyter by bishop Paulinus in Antioch, without receiving charge of a congregation, as he preferred the itinerant life of a monk and student to a fixed office. About 380 he journeyed to Constantinople, where, although past a student's age, he was not ashamed to take his seat at the feet of the celebrated Gregory Nazianzen and to listen to the anti-Arian sermons of this learned father of the Church. Indeed, the pupil and instructor soon became great friends; and there resulted from his study of the Greek language and literature, to which much of his time and attention was here devoted, several translations from the writings of the early Greek fathers among which the most important are the Chronicle of Eusebius, and the homilies of Origen on Jeremiah and Ezekiel. It cost Jerome no small sacrifice to tear himself away from his friend and instructor to return in 382 to Rome as mediator in the Meletian schism, which greatly, agitated the Church of Antioch at this time. In a council which was convened at Rome Jerome took a prominent part and afterwards acted as secretary to the Roman pontiff. By his adherence to Damasus, a close friendship sprang up between these two great men, which was broken only by the death of the pontiff. Some writers have criticized the conduct of Jerome against the Eastern churches and believe that Damasus purchased the influence of Jerome for his party; but for this opinion, as well as for that of others, that the domineering manner of Damasus made Jerome pliant and servile, there are no good grounds; indeed, Jerome was too independent and determined in character ever to be swayed in his opinion by the will of others. It is more likely that the flattery  which Damasus bestowed on Jerome by recognizing his abilities as superior, and urging him to undertake those vast exegetical labors which finally resulted in presenting the Church with a revised Latin version of the Bible (see below on the Vulgate), was what drew Jerome to Damasus, and made him one of the bishop's most faithful adherents.

Jerome's fame as a man of eloquence, learning, and sanctity was at this period in its zenith, and he improved his advantages to further the interests of monasticism. Everywhere he extolled the merit of that mode of life, though it had hitherto found few advocates at Rome and the clergy had even violently opposed it. He commended monastic seclusion even against the will of parents, interpreting the word of the Lord about forsaking father and mother as if monasticism and Christianity were the same. “Though thy mother, with flowing hair and rent garments, should show thee the breasts which have nourished thee though thy father should lie upon the threshold; yet depart thou, treading over thy father, and fly with dry eyes to the standard of the cross... The love of God and the fear of hell easily rend the bonds of the household asunder. The holy Scripture indeed enjoins obedience to parents, but he who loves them more than Christ loses his soul. O desert, where the flowers of Christ are blooming! O solitude, where the stones for the new Jerusalem are prepared! O retreat, which rejoices in the friendship of God! What doest thou in the world, my brother, with thy soul greater than the world? How long wilt thou remain. in the shadow of roofs, and in the smoky dungeon of cities? Believe me, I see here more of the light” (Ep. 14). Many pious persons placed themselves under his spiritual direction; “even the senator Pammachius, son-in-law to Paula (one of Jerome's most celebrated female converts), and heir to a fortune, gave his goods to the poor, exchanged the purple for the cowl, exposed himself to the mockery of his colleagues, and became, in the flattering language of Jerome, the general-in-chief of Roman monks, the first of monks in the first of cities” (Schaff, 2, 211).

His converts for the monastic life were, however, mainly of the female sex, and mostly daughters and widows of the most wealthy and honorable classes of Rome. These patrician converts “he gathered as a select circle around him; he expounded to them the holy Scriptures, in which some of those Roman ladies were very well read; he answered their questions of conscience; he incited them to celibate life, lavish beneficence, and enthusiastic asceticism; and flattered their spiritual vanity by extravagant praises. He was the oracle, biographer, admirer, and eulogist of these holy women, who  constituted the spiritual nobility of Catholic Rome”... But “his intimacy with these distinguished women, whom he admired more, perhaps, than they admired him, together with his unsparing attacks upon the immoralities of the Roman clergy and of the higher classes, drew upon him much unjust censure and groundless calumny, which he met rather with indignant scorn and satire than with quiet dignity and Christian meekness;” and when his patron Damasus died, in A.D. 384, he found it necessary, or, at least, thought it the more prudent course, to quit Rome, and to seek a home in the East. As “the solitudes of Europe were not yet sufficiently sanctified to satisfy a passion for holy seclusion,” by which Jerome was now wholly controlled, and “as the celebrity attending on ascetic privations was still chiefly confined to the Eastern world, Jerome bade adieu to his native hills, to his hereditary property, to pontifical Rome herself,” and, after touching at Rhegium and Cyprus, where he enjoyed a visit with Epiphanius, bishop of Salamis, and a short stay at Antioch, he continued his journey to the Holy Land and finally settled in 386 at Bethlehem. “In a retreat so well qualified to nourish religious emotion even in the most torpid heart, the zeal of Jerome did not slumber, but rather seemed to catch fresh fire from the objects and the recollections which surrounded him ... In that peaceful, pure, and pious solitude, where it was natural enough that he should exaggerate the merits of mortification, and fasting, and celibacy, and pilgrimage, and disparage the substantial virtues, which he could rarely witness and which he could never practice,” he gave himself up wholly to the further study of the sacred language, and here completed the great literary labor of his life, the translation of the Scriptures.

He was followed to this place by several of his lady friends, one of whom, Paula (q.v.), founded here four convents — three for nuns, one for monks — the last of which she placed under the care of Jerome. But his life, even in this retreat, was by no means a quiet or peaceful one wild and awful as the abode was, it did not deter him from sending forth from these solitudes fiery and vehement invectives not only against the opponents of Church orthodoxy, like Helvidius (against whom he had appeared before in 384), Jovinian (q.v.),Vigilantius (q.v.), and the Pelagians (q.v.), but he engaged in controversies even with his former friend Rufinus (q.v.) SEE ORIGENISTIC CONTROVERSY ), and in a moderate form even with St. Augustine (see Mohler, Vermischte Schriften, 1, 1 sq.; Hieron. Opera, ed. Vall. 1, 632 sq.) By his controversy with the Pelagians he had endangered his life, and he was obliged to flee from Bethlehem, and to live in concealment for over two years. In 418 he returned again to his monastery  at Bethlehem, worn out in body and mind by unceasing toil, privations, and anxieties, and, seized by sickness, his feeble frame soon gave way, and he died in 419 or 420 (some say Sept. 30, 420).

The influence which Jerome exerted on his contemporaries, the prominence which they assigned him, and the regard which the Christian Church has ever since bestowed upon him, may be justified in view of the customs of the period in which he lived. It is by considering both the sunny and shadowy side, not only of his own life, but also of the Christian Church in the 4th century, that we can accord to him a place among the great teachers and holy men of the early Church, and can afford to overlook the glaring inconsistencies and violent passions which disfigure him so greatly and which have inclined Protestant writers not unfrequently to call him “a Church father of doubtful character.” We think Dr. Vilmar (Jahrbücher deutscher Theol. 10, 746) has best delineated Jerome's character when he says, “Jerome yielded to the spirit which animated the Church in his day and willingly intrusted his spiritual development to her care in so far as he lacked independent judgment. And it is in this that his greatness consists, in his ability well to discern the true wants and opinions of his day from the vacillating views of the masses and the capricious inclinations of the men of momentary power. No opposition could move him from the defense of anything when once discerned by him as a truth ... Where he judged himself to be in the right, he manifested the energy worthy of a Roman, even though the world was against him.”

Thus he hesitated not to encounter the opposition of all Rome when once he believed it to be his duty to come, forward as a promoter of monasticism “in a country where it was as yet but little loved, in the great capital, where the rigidly ascetic tendency came into collision. with the propensities and interests of many,” and where “he could not fail, even on this score, to incur the hatred of numbers, both of the clergy and laity” (Nearder, 2, 683). Still, to his praise be it said, that however greatly we regret this attitude of Jerome in behalf of monachism, which, at this early period of the life of the Christian Church, may be pardoned on the ground that such great personal sacrifices and privations were the only proofs which the young convert could bring to evince his earnestness and zeal for the cause of his Master, yet “no one has denounced, no one has branded more energetically than he the false monks, the false penitents,. the false widows and virgins. He points out with a bold hand all the faults and dangers of the institution,” so far, of course, as an advocate of monasticism could have ventured to do it at all (compare  Montalembert, Monks of the West, 1, 406 sq.; Lea, Celibacty, p. 72 sq.). Jerome, in short, was in the service of the popular opinion and yet never yielded to the opinion of the day. In the opinion of Neander, Jerome's “better qualities were obscured by the great defects of his character, by his mean passions, his easily offended vanity, his love of controversy and of rule, his pride, so often concealed, under the garb of humility.” Much milder is the judgment of Dr. Schaff, who pronounces Jerome “indeed an accomplished and most serviceable scholar, and a zealous enthusiast for all which his age counted holy ... and that he reflected with the virtues the failings also of his age and of the monastic system,” adding in a footnote that “among later Protestant historians' opinion has become somewhat more favorable,” though he again modifies this statement by saying that this has reference “rather to his learning than to his moral character.”

The Vulgate. — Jerome gave also great offence to his contemporaries by his attempt to correct the Latin version of the Bible, then “become greatly distorted by the blending together of different translations, the mixing up. with each other of the different Gospels, and the ignorance of transcribers.” This he successfully completed, and it is regarded by all Biblical scholars as “by far the most important and valuable” work of Jerome, in itself constituting “an immortal service” to the Christian Church. “Above all his contemporaries, and even all his successors down to the 16th century, Jerome, by his linguistic knowledge, his Oriental travel, and his entire culture, was best fitted, and, in fact, the only man to undertake and successfully execute so gigantic a task, a task which just then, with the approaching separation of East and West, and the decay of the knowledge of the original languages of the Bible in Latin Christendom, was of the highest necessity. Here, as so often in history, we plainly discern the hand of divine Providence” (Schaff).

He had been urged to undertake this work by bishop Damasus, and it was commenced, as already noted, while Jerome was yet a resident at Rome and had there amended the translation of the Gospels and the Psalms. In his retreat at Bethlehem he extended this work to the whole Bible, supported in his task, it is generally believed, by the Hexapla of Origen, which he is supposed to have obtained from the library at Caesarea. “Even this was a bold undertaking, by which he must expose himself to being loaded with reproaches on the part of those who, in their ignorance, which they identified with a pious simplicity, were wont to condemn every deviation from the traditional text, however necessary or salutary it might be. They were very ready to see, in any change of the only  text which was known to them, a falsification, without inquiring any further into the reason of the alteration. Yet here he had in his favor the authority of a Roman bishop, as well as the fact that in this case it was impossible to oppose to him a translation established and transmitted by ecclesiastical authority, or a divine inspiration of the text hitherto received ... But he must have given far greater offence by another useful undertaking, viz. a new version of the Old Testament, not according to the Alexandrian translation, which before this had alone been accepted, but according to the Hebrew. This appeared to many, even of those who did not belong to the class of ignorant persons, a great piece of impiety to pretend to understand the Old Testament better than the seventy inspired interpreters better than the apostles who had followed this translation and who would have given another translation if they had considered it to be necessary to allow one's self to be so misled by Jews as for their accommodation to falsify the writings of the Old Testament!” (Neander, Church History, 2:684 sq.)

But with the opposition there came also friends, and among his supporters he counted even Augustine, until gradually it was introduced in all the churches of the West. Of this great work, as a whole, Dr. Schaff thus speaks (Ch. History, 3, 975 sq.): “The Vulgate takes the first place among the Bible versions of the ancient Church. It exerted the same influence upon Latin Christendom as the Septuagint upon Greek, and it is directly or indirectly the mother of most of the earlier versions in the European vernaculars. It is made immediately from the original languages, though with the use of all accessible helps, and is as much superior to the Itala as Luther's Bible is to the older German versions. From the present stage of Biblical philology and exegesis the Vulgate can be charged, indeed, with innumerable faults, inaccuracies, inconsistencies, and arbitrary dealing in particulars; but, notwithstanding these, it deserves, as a whole, the highest praise for the boldness with which it went back from the half-deified Septuagint directly to the original Hebrew; for its union of fidelity and freedom; and for the dignity, clearness, and gracefulness of its style. Accordingly, after the extinction of the knowledge of Greek, it very naturally became the clerical Bible of Western Christendom, and so continued to be till the genius of the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland, Holland, and England, returning to the original text, and still further penetrating the spirit of the Scriptures, though with the continual help of the Vulgate, produced a number of popular Bibles, which were the same to the evangelical laity that the Vulgate had been for many centuries to the Catholic clergy. This high place the Vulgate holds even to this day in the  Roman Church, where it is unwarrantably and perniciously placed on an equality with the original.” SEE VULGATE.

Jerome's other Writings. — As the result of his critical labors on the Holy Scriptures, we have also commentaries on Genesis, the major and minor prophets, Ecclesiastes, Job, on some of the Psalms, the Gospel of Matthew, and the epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Titus, and Philemon, besides translations of different parts of the Old and New Testaments. All these productions Dr. Schaff pronounces “the most instructive we have from the Latin Church of that day, not excepting even those of Augustine, which otherwise greatly surpass them in theological depth and spiritual unction.” Alban Butler thus speaks of Jerome's exegetical labors: “Nothing has rendered St. Jerome so famous as his critical labors on the holy Scriptures. For this the Church acknowledges him to have been raised by God through a special providence, and particularly assisted from above, and she styles him the greatest of all her doctors in expounding the divine oracles.” To works of an exegetical character in a wider sense belong also his Liber de interpretatione nominum Hebraicorum, or De nominibus Hebr. (Opera, 3, 1-120), the book On the Interpretation on the Hebrew Names, an etymological lexicon of the proper Names of the Old and New Testaments, useful for its time, but in many respects defective and now worthless; and Liber de situ et nominibus locorum Hebraicorum, usually cited under the title Eusebii Onomasticon (urbium et locorum S. Scripturae) (Opera, 3. 121-290), a free translation of the Onomasticon of Eusebius, a sort of Biblical topology in alphabetical order, still considered valuable to antiquarian scholarship.

Yet, the busy life which Jerome led, and the controversies which he waged in behalf of rigid orthodoxy in Christian belief, prove that, so far from confining himself to the production of exegetical works, he was employed on almost every subject: biography, history, and the vast field of theology, and in all he wielded the pen of a scholar, in a (Latin) style acknowledged by all to be both pure and terse. “The phraseology of Jerome,” says Prof. W. Ramsay (Smith, Diet. of Greek and Roman Biog. s.v.), “is exceedingly pure, bearing ample testimony to the diligence with which he must have studied the choicest models. No one can read the Vulgate without being struck by the contrast which it presents in the classic simplicity of its language to the degenerate affectation of Apuleius, and the barbarous obscurity of Ammianus, to say nothing of the ecclesiastical writers.” We lack the space to go into further details on his varied productions and are  obliged to refer for a more detailed statement to Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. (Lond. 1859, roy. 8vo), 2, 461 sq., and Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 26, 681 sq. In short, “Jerome excelled” (says Dr. Eadie, in Appleton's Cyclop. Biogr.) all his contemporaries in erudition. He wanted the glowing fancy of Chrysostom, and the serene temper and symmetrical intellect of Augustine, but he was beyond them both in critical skill and taste. His faults lie upon the surface — a hot and hasty disposition, which so resented every opposition, and magnified trifles, that, in his towering passion, he heaped upon opponents opprobrious epithets and coarse invective. Haste, eagerness, and acerbity appear also in his letters and expositions.

His mode of life must have greatly aggravated this touchiness and irascibility, as it deprived him of the mollifying influence of society and friendship. His heart was estranged from human sympathies; and, save when lighted up by the ardors of his indignant passion, it was, like his own cell, cold, gloomy, and uninviting. The works of Jerome will always maintain for him the esteem of Christendom. There is in them a great deal that is baseless, fanciful, and one-sided, but very much that is useful and instructive in exegesis and theology. A still greater, and to us nearer authority, Dr. Schaff (Ch. History, 3, 987 sq.), thus sums up the position and work of Jerome in the Christian Church: “Orthodox in theology and Christology, semi-Pelagian in anthropology, Romanizing in the doctrine of the Church and tradition, anti-chiliastic in eschatology, legalistic and ascetic in ethics, a violent fighter of all heresies, a fanatical apologist of all monkish extravagances, Jerome was revered throughout the Catholic middle age as the patron saint of Christian and ecclesiastical learning, and, next to Augustine, as maximus doctor ecclesioe; but by his enthusiastic love for the holy Scriptures, his recourse to the original languages, his classic translation of the Bible, and his manifold exegetical merits, he also played materially into the hands of the Reformation, and as a scholar and an author still takes the first rank, and as an influential theologian the second (after Augustine), among the Latin fathers.”

Of the various editions of Jerome's works a detailed account is given by Schönemann (Bibliotheca Patrums Latinorum, 1, c. 4, § 3). Parts of them were early published, but the first critical edition of his writings collectively was given to the public in 1516. It was superintended by Erasmus, with the assistance of Œcolampadius (Basle, 9 vols. fol.; reprinted in 1526 and 1537, the last edition being the best; and also at Lyons, 1530, in 8 vols. fol.). Another critical edition as prepared by Minarianus Victorinus (Rome,  1566-72, 9 vols. fol.; reprinted at Paris, 1578, 1608, 4 vols. and in 1643, 9 vols.). The Protestant Adam Tribbechovius prepared an edition which was published at Frankfort-on-the-Main and at Leipsic, 1684, 12 vols. fol.; then appeared the Benedictine edition prepared by John Martianay and Anton Pouget (Paris, 1693-1706, 5 vols. fol.), which was, however, far inferior to, and was wholly superseded by, the last and best of all, prepared by Dominicus Vallarsi and Scipio Maffei (Verona, 1734-42, 11 Vols. fol.; reprinted, with improvements, Ven. 1766-72). The edition of Migne, Paris (Petit-Montrouge), 1845-46, also in 11 vols. (tom. 22-30 of the Patrologia Lat.), “notwithstanding the boastful title, is only an uncritical reprint of the edition of Vallarsi, with unessential changes in the order of arrangement; the Vita Hieronymi and the Testimonia de Hieronymo being transferred from the eleventh to the first volume, which is more convenient” (Dr. Schaff). The so called Comes of Hieronymus (Liber Comitis Lectionarius), a work of great value for the history of liturgies, is falsely attributed to Jerome, and belongs to a later period; likewise his Martyrologium, and some of the epistles.

See Du Pin, Nouvelle Biblioth. des auteurs Eccles. 3, 100-140; Tillemont, Mém. Eccles. 12, 1-356; Martianay, La Vie de St. Jerôme (Paris, 1706); Joh. Stilting, in the Acta Sanctorum, Sept. 8, 418-688 (Antw. 1762); Butler, Lives of the Saints (sub. Sept. 30); Vallarsi (in Op. Hieron. 11, 1- 240); Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 8, 359 sq. and especially 11, 3-254; Neander, Ch. Hist. 2, 682 sq.; Schaff, Ch. History, 2, § 41; 3, § 177: Sebastian Dolci, Maximus Hieronymus Vitoe suoe Scriptor. (Ancon. 1750, 4to); Engelstoft, Hieron. Stridonensis, interpres, criticus, exegeta, apologeta, historicus, doctor, monachus (Havn. 1798); Ersch und Gruber's Encycl. sect. 2, vol. 8; Collombet, Histoire de St. Jerôme (Lyons, 1844); O. Zöckler, Hieronymus, sein Leben und Wirken. (Gotha, 1865, 8vo); Revue des Deux Mondes (1865, July 1). (J.H.V.)

## Jerome Of Prague[[@Headword:Jerome Of Prague]]

             one of the earliest and ablest of the reformers before the Reformation, a brave defender of the truth, and a most devoted friend and follower of John Huss, was a descendant of a noble Bohemian family, whose real name was Faulsch. Of his early history all data are wanting, but he appears to have been born about 1375, as he is known to have been somewhat younger than his friend Huss, who was born in 1369 (comp. Neander, Ch. Hist. 5, 246). After studying for several years at the university of his native place,  “Jerome, full of life and ardor, of an enterprising spirit, not disposed to remain still and quiet a long time in one place,” continued his studies at the universities of Paris, Cologne, Heidelberg, and Oxford, from each of which he received the doctorate of divinity (about 1398-1400). Endowed with great natural ability, Jerome obtained from such an extended course of study advantages which soon gave him great reputation for learning, especially as he was one of the few knights in Bohemia who had manifested any zeal for science and literary culture.

But if, by a careful cultivation of his superior natural abilities, he secured for himself the admiration and homage of the men of letters, it is unquestionable that his attachment to the cause of the great anti-reformer was due, in the main, to his stay at Oxford, where he became acquainted with the writings of Wickliffe (q.v.), and at once enlisted with great enthusiasm in defense of the doctrines of the English reformer. “Until now,” he is reported to have said when he commenced his copy of the Dialogus et Trialogus, “we had nothing but the shell of science; Wickliffe first laid open the kernel.” It is thought possible by some that Jerome had read these works before he went to Oxford, and that his esteem for the writer, whom he could conceive only as a man of a noble, acute, and remarkable mind, had attracted him to Oxford (compare Bohringer, Kirche Christi u. d. Zeugen, p. 611); but, be this as it may, so much is certain, that, on his return to Prague, Jerome “professed himself an open favorer of him (Wickliffe), and, finding his doctrines had made considerable progress in Bohemia, and that Huss was at the head of that party which had espoused them, he attached himself to that leader” (Gilpin, Lives, p. 234; compare, however, Gillett, Life of Huss, 1, 69). May 28, 1403, the University of Prague, at the instigation of the archiepiscopal officials and the cathedral chapter of Prague, publicly condemned the writings of John Wickliffe as heretical, in spite of a strong opposition, headed by John Huss, Jerome, and Master Nicholas of Leitomysl (q.v.). For some time past there had been growing a discontent between the native and foreign element represented at the university.

When that institution of learning was founded, Prague was the residence of the German emperor, but that city was also the capital of Bohemia, a country which “seemed fitted by location and general features to become one of the foremost states of Europe,” and the people, aware of their great natural resources, were unwilling to submit to the policy of the rulers to make their country a province of Germany. A strong feeling of nationality, such as is again witnessed in our day, developed itself in every Slavic heart, and gradually Bohemian literature, a nation's strength, which had before succumbed to  the German, began to revive, and with it there came a longing desire to force from the Germans the control of the university, in which the native Bohemians saw themselves outvoted by strangers. The Germans were Nominalists, Wickliffe a Realist; no wonder, then, that his writings were condemned, even though the Bohemians were in favor of the Englishman (see Reichel, See of Rome in the Middle Ages, p. 602 sq.; Studien und Kritiken, 1871, 2, 297 sq.). Here, then, came an opportunity for Huss and his friends to strike not only in behalf of the religious interests of their countrymen, but to become champions of their nation's rights, “and on this side they might count on receiving the support of many who did not agree with them in religious and doctrinal matters.” They could count on the most influential of the nobility; even king Wenzel himself was won for their cause. He was induced to change the relation of votes at the University at Prague in such a manner that the Bohemians could gain the ascendency, and, this once done, the election of Huss to the rectorate of the university followed. The Germans, of course, were unwilling to submit readily to such changes, and left Prague in large numbers, to found a university at Leipzig.

They also circulated the most injurious reports respecting the Hussites (as we will hereafter call the adherents of Huss and Jerome for convenience' sake). In the meantime also, “by the express admonition of the pope,” the archbishop of Prague, Zybneck, had issued (in 1406) a decree “that henceforth no one, under severe penalty, should hold, teach, or, for purposes of academic debate, argue in favor of Wickliffe's doctrines.” This same Zybneck was the legate of Gregory XII. To this last pope the king of Bohemia adhered at this time, but in 1409, when the Council of Pisa renounced the rival popes, Gregory XII and Benedict XIII, and declared Alexander V the legitimate incumbent of the papal chair, Huss inclined to favor the action of the Council of Pisa, and won also the king over to his side, through the influence of Jerome, who seems to have been a favorite at court. This brought about an open rupture with Zybneck, who had hitherto hesitated openly to attack Huss and Jerome. Now there was no longer any need for delaying the decisive conflict. “He issued an ordinance forbidding all teachers of the university who had joined the party of the cardinals (who controlled the Council of Pisa) against the schismatic popes, and had thus abandoned the cause of Gregory, to discharge any priestly duties within his diocese.”

The Bohemians refused to obey the mandate; the archbishop then complained to the king, and found that he was powerless to enforce obedience to his decrees; neither was his master, Gregory XII, able to do it. Determined to conquer, the archbishop now  suddenly espoused the cause of the stronger rival in the papacy, and appealed to Alexander V for his decision in the conflict with the Bohemians. A papal bull was secured condemning the articles of Wickliffe, forbidding preaching in private chapels, and authorizing the archbishop to appoint a commission to enforce the measures adopted by him for the extirpation of the spreading heresy. In addition to a renewal of his former decrees, the archbishop now condemned not only the writings of Wickliffe, but also those of Huss and Jerome, as well as those of their predecessors Milicz and Janow, and caused them to be publicly burned. “The deed was done. The books were burned. The ban of the Church rested on those who had dared to object. Doubtless the archbishop felt that he had secured a triumph. He had executed the papal sentence, and proved himself an able instrument of the Church party who had instigated him to the bold deed. But it provoked more than it overawed.

The king, the court, and a large proportion of the citizens of Prague were enraged and embittered by it. A cry of indignation ran throughout Bohemia” (Gillett, Huss, 1, 157). Acts of violence followed, and, as is too apt to be the case, excesses were committed by marauders, and the crime charged to the reformers. The king and the people siding with the Hussites, it remained for the papal party to adopt severer measures; these were soon found in the proclamation of an interdict on the city of Prague, and the excommunication of the leaders. Huss left the city to avoid an open conflict between his countrymen, and Jerome also soon quitted the place, and went to Ofen (1410). But Zybneck was unwilling to see his opponent abroad proclaiming everywhere the doctrines of Wickliffe, and denouncing even popery. Jerome dared to propose even such questions as these: Whether the pope possessed more power than another priest, and whether the bread in the Eucharist or the body of Christ possessed more virtue in the mass of the Roman pontiff than in that of any other officiating ecclesiastic. Nay, one day, while in an open square, surrounded by several of his friends and adherents, he exposed two sketches, in one of which Christ's disciples, on one side, following, with naked feet, their Master mounted on an ass; while on the other the pope and the cardinals were represented in great state on superb horses, and preceded, as usual, with drums and trumpets. Zybneck caused the arrest of Jerome by the archbishop of Grau, who, recognizing the superior abilities and great influence of Jerome, dismissed him five days after. More vehement and serious became Jerome's opposition to the papal party in 1412, after the publication of the papal bull granting plenary indulgence (q.v.) to all who should engage in “holy warfare” against king Ladislaus  (q.v.) of Naples.

Huss, who had returned to Prague, and who now was excommunicated, simply preached with all his power against this bull, but Jerome, urged on by his impulsive nature, was carried far beyond the limits of prudence and of decency. He caused (if he did not head the movement he undoubtedly inspired it) the bull to be carried about the streets by two lewd women, heading a long procession of students, and, after displaying it in this manner for some time, it was publicly burned, with some indulgence briefs, at the pillory of the new town. “That similar scenes not unfrequently occurred is most probable. Among the charges brought against Jerome at the Council of Constance are some which imply that his conduct in this respect had been far from unexceptionable. Some of these are denied; but the evidence is strong, if not decisive, in regard to his course on the reception of the papal bulls for the Crusade. On another occasion he is said to have thrown a priest into the Moldau, who, but for timely aid, would have been drowned. But such violence was bitterly provoked. The burning of the books by Sbynco (Zybneck), the execution of three men for asserting the falsehood of the indulgences, the excommunication of Huss, to say nothing of the course pursued by his assailants, had excited a strong feeling against the patrons of papal fraud and ecclesiastical corruption. We are only surprised that the deep resentment felt was confined in its expression within such limits” (Gillett, 1, 257). Both he and Huss were obliged to flee from Prague, as the safety of their lives was threatened. Huss (q.v.) retired to the castle of Kozi Hradek, while Jerome went to Poland and Lithuania. But the seed which they had widely sown sprang up quickly, and a council which had in the meantime convened at Constance cited Huss for a defense of his course. When the tidings of the imprisonment of his friend reached Jerome he determined to go to Constance himself. He went there at first incognito and secretly (April 4, 1415), but, fearing danger for himself without the possibility of affording relief to his friend, he left for a town four miles distant, and thence demanded of the emperor a safe conduct to Constance, that he might publicly answer before anyone to every charge of heresy that might be brought against him. Not being able to obtain such a safe conduct, he caused to be affixed the next day, on the gates of the emperor's palace, on the doors of the principal churches, the residences of the cardinals, and other eminent prelates, a notice in the Bohemian, Latin, and German languages, wherein he declared himself ready, provided only he should have full liberty and security to come to Constance and to leave it again, to defend himself in public before the council against every accusation made  against his faith. Not obtaining what he demanded, he procured a certificate to be drawn up to that effect by the Bohemian knights resident in Constance and sealed with their seals and with this to serve as a vindication of himself to his friends, he prepared to turn his face towards Bohemia.

The papists determining to secure his attendance at the council, a passport was now sent him from the council, guaranteeing his safety from violence, but not from punishment, if he were adjudged guilty of the heresy charged against him; but this Jerome — Huss having been already sent to prison — seemed insufficient, and he proceeded on his journey. But his enemies succeeded in waylaying him, and on the road he was arrested near Hirschau, a small town in Suabia, April 25, 1415, and delivered over into the power of the council May 23. He was immediately brought before a public convocation of that body. A citation was sent to him, which, it was said, had been posted up in Constance in reply to his declarations to the council. He denied to have seen them before he left the vicinity of Constance, where he had waited sufficiently long to be reached by any reply made within a reasonable limit of time, and that he would have complied with the summons had it reached him even on the confines of Bohemia. But this declaration rather aggravated, if anything, the members of the council, so eager to find a plea to condemn the prisoner. Many members of this council came from the universities of Paris, Heidelberg, and Cologne, and recollecting him, they desired to triumph over the man who had always far outstripped them. “Accordingly one after another addressed him, and reminded him of the propositions which he had set forth. The first among these was the learned chancellor Gerson, who captiously charged him with wishing to set himself up as an angel of eloquence, and with exciting great commotions at Paris by maintaining the reality of general conceptions. We may observe here, as well as in other like examples, the strong propensity which now prevailed to mix up together philosophical and theological disputes. But Jerome distinguished one from the other, and declared that he, as a university master, had maintained such philosophical doctrines as had no concern with faith.

In reference to all that had been objected to him by different parties, he held himself ready to recant as soon as he was taught anything better. Amid the noisy shouts was heard the cry. ‘Jerome must be burnt.' He answered with coolness, ‘Well, if you wish my death, let it come, in God's name!'” Wiser counsels, however, prevailed at the moment, and Jerome was remitted to prison, where he was bound to a stake, with his hands, feet, and neck so that he could scarcely move his head. Thus he lay two days, with nothing  to eat but bread and water. Then for the first time he obtained, through the mediation of Peter Maldonisuritz, who had been told of his situation by his keepers, other means of subsistence. This severe imprisonment threw him into a violent fit of sickness. He demanded a confessor, which was at first refused, and then granted with difficulty. After he had spent several months in this severe confinement, he heard of the martyrdom of his friend, whose death and the imprisonment of Jerome produced the greatest exasperation of feeling among the knights in Bohemia and Moravia. On the 2d of September they put forth a letter to the council, in which they expressed their indignation, declared that they had known Huss but as a pious man, zealous for the doctrines of the Gospel; and that he had fallen a victim only to his enemies and the enemies of his country. They entered a bitter complaint against the captivity of the innocent Jerome, who had made himself famous by his brilliant gifts; perhaps he, too, had already been murdered like Huss. They declared themselves resolved to contend, even to the shedding of their blood, in defense of the law of Christ and of his faithful servants” (Neander, Ch. Hist. 5, 375). This decided stand of Jerome's friends forced the council to milder terms, and they determined, if possible, to induce him to recant of his heretical opinions, a point which the effect of Jerome's close confinement, and the sufferings that he had endured for the past six months, made them believe might be carried without much difficulty.

They mainly pressed him to recant his opinion on the doctrine of transubstantiation; and on the third examination, Sept. 11, 1415, Jerome, by this time worn out both in body and mind, made a public and unqualified recantation of the Hussite statement of the eucharistic theory. Here the disreputable conduct of the Romanists might well have rested, and Jerome have been permitted to return to his native land. But there were men in the council who well understood that Jerome had been induced to recant only because he saw no other door to lead from the prison, and that, his liberty once regained, he would return to his friends, to preach anew the truth as he had heard it from the lips of Huss, and as he had received it from the writings of Wickliffe. Indeed, they had reasons to fear that if he ever escaped with his life, it would be given to the cause in which Huss had just fallen. On the other hand, there were men of honor in the council men who, though they had narrowed themselves down until they could see Christ exemplified only in those who bowed submissively before the papal chair, yet would not make pledges only to break them as soon as they found it to their interest to do so. One of these was the cardinal of Cambray, who insisted that Jerome ought now to be liberated,  as had been promised him before his recantation. The counsel of the more cunning, however, prevailed, and Jerome was detained to answer other and more serious accusations. Tired of the crooked ways of these so-called defenders of the Christian faith, Jerome finally declined to be any longer subjected to private examinations, and declared that publicly only would he be ready to answer the calumnies of his accusers. May 23, 1416, he finally succeeded in obtaining a public hearing.

On this day, and on the 26th, he spent from six in the morning until one in the afternoon in replying to the different accusations made against him, and closed, to the surprise of all the council, by passionately disclaiming his former cowardly recantation. “Of all the sins,” he exclaimed now, with great feeling, “that I have committed since my youth, none weigh so heavily on my mind and cause me such poignant remorse as that which I committed in this fatal place when I approved of the iniquitous sentence rendered against Wickliffe and against the holy martyr John Huss, my master and friend.” If his defense had been delivered with such presence of mind, with so much eloquence and wit as to excite universal admiration and to incline his judges to mercy, the closing declaration against his former recantation certainly sealed his own death warrant, and left not the least hope for escape from martyrdom. Yet there were some among his judges in whom he had excited so deep a sympathy that they would not declare against him; there were also some who dared not, by this new martyrdom, provoke still further the angry feelings of the Bohemians. He was granted a respite of forty days for reflection, and an opportunity was afforded to those who still wavered in condemning the heretic to influence him possibly to recant of this decided opposition to the Church. But Jerome remained steadfast this time.

If he had seen a period when, like Cranmer's, his faith faltered, it had passed, and he was now ready to die rather than again deny that he thought and felt as a Hussite. May 30 had been appointed to pass final judgment. He still refusing to recant, the council pronounced against him, and he was handed over for execution to the secular authorities. The whole trial and his last hours are vividly pictured by a Roman Catholic eyewitness, Poggio, a Florentine, who is freely cited by Neander (Ch. Hist. 5, 378 sq.), and is given in full by Gilpin (Lives, p. 255 sq.). Of his last hours Poggio relates as follows: “With cheerful looks he went readily and willingly to his death; he feared neither death nor the fire and its torture. No stoic ever suffered death with so firm a soul as that with which he seemed to demand it. Jerome endured the torments of the fire with more tranquillity than Socrates displayed in drinking his cup of hemlock.” Jerome was burned  like his friend and master Huss, and his ashes likewise thrown into the Rhine. “Historians, [Roman] Catholic and Protestant alike, vie with each other in paying homage to the heroic courage and apostolic resignation with which Jerome met his doom. Posterity has confirmed their verdict, and reveres him as a martyr to the truth, who, unwearied in life and noble in death, has acquired an immortal renown for his share in the Reformation.” Indeed we question whether to Jerome and Huss sufficient credit is given for their share in the Reformation of the 16th century. We fear that it is through neglect alone that to Huss and Jerome is denied a place by the side of Luther and Calvin, to which, as Gillett (Huss and his Times, Preface) rightly says, they are justly entitled. “It is true, indeed, that the great reform movement, of which Huss was the leader, was, to human view, after a most desperate and prolonged struggle, crushed out; not, however, without leaving behind it most important results.” See Gillett, Huss and his Times (2 vols. 8vo, new edit. 1871); Neander, Church History, vol. 5 (see Index); Tischer, Leben d. Hieron. v. Prag. (Lpz. 1835); Helfert, Hus u. Hieron.. (Prag. 1853, p. 151 sq., 208 sq.; perhaps the most important, though rather partial); Czerwenka, Gesch. der evangel. Kirche in Bohmen (Bielef. 1869). vol. 1; Bohringer, Die Kirche Christi, 2, 4, 608 sq.; Krummel, Gesch. der bohm. Reformation (Gotha, 1867, 8vo); Palacky, Gesch. v. Bohm. vol. 3 and 4. See Huss. (J.H.W.)

Jeromites.

SEE HIERONYMITES.

## Jerubbaal[[@Headword:Jerubbaal]]

             (Heb. Yerubba'al, יְרֻבִּעִל, contender with Baal; comp. ISHBAAL; Sept. Ι᾿εροβάαλ), a surname of GIDEON SEE GIDEON (q.v.), the judge of Israel, given him in consequence of his overthrow of the idol (Jdg 6:32; Jdg 7:1; Jdg 8:29; Jdg 8:35; Jdg 9:1-2; Jdg 9:5; Jdg 9:16; Jdg 9:19; Jdg 9:24; Jdg 9:28; Jdg 9:57; 2Sa 12:11). “The name Jerubbaal appears in the Graecized form of Hierombal ( ῾Ιερόμβαλος) in a fragment of Philo-Byblius preserved by Eusebius (Proep. Evang. 1, 9); but the identity of name does not authorize us to conclude that it is Gideon who is there referred to. In the Palmyrene inscriptions, Ι᾿αρίβολος appears as the name of a deity (Gesenius, Monun. Pheon. p. 229; Movers, Phonicier, 1, 434).” Josephus omits all reference to the incident (Ant. 5, 6). SEE JERUBBESHETH.

## Jerubbesheth[[@Headword:Jerubbesheth]]

             (Heb. Yerubbe'sheth, יְרֻבֶּשָׁת, countender with the shame, i.e. idol; compare ISHBOSHETH; Sept. Ι᾿εροβάαλ), a surname (probably to avoid mentioning the name of a false god, Exo 23:13) of GIDEON SEE GIDEON (q.v.), the Israelitish judge, acquired on account of his contest with the idolatry of Baal (2Sa 11:21). SEE JERUBBAAL.

## Jeruel[[@Headword:Jeruel]]

             (Heb. Yeruel', יַרוּאֵל, founded by God, otherwise fear of God; SEE JERIEL; Sept. Ι᾿εριήλ), a desert (מדְבָּר, i.e. open common) mentioned in the prediction by Jahaziel of Jehoshaphat's victory over the Moabites and Ammonites, where it is described as being situated on the ascent from the valley of the Dead Sea towards Jerusalem, at the foot of the valley leading towards the cliff Ziz (2Ch 20:16). The “desert” was probably so called as adjoining some town or village of the same name. From the context it appears to have lain beyond the wilderness of Tekoa (2Ch 20:20), in the direction of Engedi (2Ch 20:2), near a certain watchtower overlooking the pass (2Ch 20:24). It appears to correspond to the tract el- Hussasah, sloping from Tekoa to the precipice of Ain-Jidy, described by Dr. Robinson as fertile in the northwestern part (Researches, 2, 212), but sterile as it approaches the Ghor (p. 243), and forming part of the Desert of Judaea. The invading tribes, having marched round the south of the Dead Sea, had encamped at Engedi. The road thence to Jerusalem ascends from the shore by a steep and terrible pass” (Walcott, Bib. Sac. 1, 69), and thence leads northward, passing below Tekoa (Robinson, Bib. Res. 1, 501, 508). The valley (“brook,” 2Ch 20:16), at the end of which the enemy were to be found, was probably the wady Jehar, which, with its continuation wady el-Ghar, traverses the southern part of this plateau (Robinson's Res. 2, 185); and its upper end appears to have been the same through which the triumphant host passed on their return. and named it BERACHAH SEE BERACHAH (q.v.), i.e. blessing, in commemoration of the victory (2Ch 20:26).

## Jerusalem[[@Headword:Jerusalem]]

             (Heb. יְרוּשָׁלִם, Yerushala'im, fully [in 1Ch 3:5; 2Ch 25:1; Est 2:6; Jer 26:18] יְרוּשָׁלִים,  Yerushala'yim [with final ה directive, יְרוּשָׁלֵמָה, 1Ki 10:2; fully יְרוּשָׁלִיְמָה, 2Ch 32:9]; Chald. יְרוּשְׁלֵםor יְרוּשְׁלֶם, Yerushelem'; Syr. Urishlem; Gr. Ι᾿ερουσαλήμ (τὰ) ῾Ιεροσόλυμα [Gen. ύμων]; Latin Hierosolymna), poetically also SALEM (שָׁלֵם, Shalenz'), and once ARIEL SEE ARIEL (q.v.); originally JEBUS SEE JEBUS (q.v.); in sacred themes the “City of God,” or the “Holy City” (Neh 11:1; Neh 11:16; Mat 4:5), as in the modern Arab. name el-Khuds, the Holy (comp. ἱερόπολις, Philo, Opp. 2:524); once (2Ch 25:28) the “city of Judah.” The Hebrew name is a dual form (see Gesenius, Lehrg. p. 539 sq.; Ewald, Krit. Gramm. 332), and is of disputed etymology (see Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 628; Rosenmüller, Altflerth. 2, 2, 202; Ewald, Isr. Gesch. 2, 584), but probably signifies possession of peace (q.d. יֵרוּשׁאּשָׁלֵם[rather than יְרוּ שָׁלֵם, i.e. foundation of peace, as preferred by Gesenius and Fürst]), the dual referring to the two chief mountains (Zion and Moriah) on which it was built, or the two main parts (the Upper and the Lower City, i.e. Zion and Acra). It has been known under the above titles in all ages as the Jewish capital of Palestine.

I. History. — This is so largely made up of the history of Palestine itself in different ages, and of its successive rulers, that for minute details we refer to these, SEE JUDEA; we here present only a general survey, but with references to sources of more detailed information.

1. This city is mentioned very early in Scripture, being usually supposed to be the Salem of which Melchizedek was king (Gen 14:18). B.C. cir. 2080. Such was the opinion of the Jews themselves; for Josephus, who calls Melchizedek king of Solyma (Σόλυμα), observes that this name was afterwards changed into Hierosolyma (Ant. 1, 10, 3). All the fathers of the Church, Jerome excepted, agree with Josephus, and understand Jerusalem and Salem to indicate the same place. The Psalmist also says (Psa 76:2), “In Salem is his tabernacle, and his dwelling place in Zion.” SEE SALEM.

The mountain of the land of Moriah, which Abraham (Gen 22:2) reached on the third day from Beersheba, there to offer Isaac (B.C. cir. 2047), is, according to Josephus (Ant. 1, 13, 2), the mountain on which Solomon afterwards built the Temple (2Ch 3:1). SEE MORIAH.

The question of the identity of Jerusalem with “Cadytis, a large city of Syria,” “almost as large as Sardis,” which is mentioned by Herodotus (2, 159; 3, 5) as having been taken by Pharaoh-Necho, need not be investigated in this place. It is interesting, and, if decided in the affirmative, so far important as confirming the Scripture narrative, but does not in any way add to our knowledge of the history of the city. The reader will find it fully examined in Rawlinson's Herodotus, 2, 246; Blakesley's Herodotus Excursus on Bk. 3, ch. 5 (both against identification); and in Kenrick's Egypt, 2, 406, and Dict. of Gk. and Rom. Geogr. 2, 17 (both for it).

Nor need we do more than refer to the tradition — of traditions they are, and not mere individual speculation — of Tacitus (Hist. 5, 2) and Plutarch (Is. et Osir. ch. 31) of the foundation of the city by a certain Hierosolymus, a son of the Typhon (see Winer's note, 1, 545). All the certain information to be obtained as to the early history of Jerusalem must be gathered from the books of the Jewish historians alone.

2. The name Jerusalem first occurs in Jos 10:1, where Adonizedek (q.v.), king of Jerusalem, is mentioned as having entered into an alliance with other kings against Joshua, by whom they were all overcome (comp. Jos 12:10). B.C. 1618. SEE JOSHUA.

In drawing the northern border of Judah, we find Jerusalem again mentioned (Jos 15:8; compare Jos 18:16). This border ran through the valley of Ben-Hinnom; the country on the south of it, as Bethlehem, belonged to Judah; but the mountain of Zion, forming the northern wall of the valley, and occupied by the Jebusites, appertained to Benjamin. Among the cities of Benjamin, therefore, is also mentioned (Jos 18:28) “Jebus, which is Jerusalem” (comp. Jdg 19:10; 1Ch 11:4). At a later date, however, owing to the conquest of Jebus by David, the line ran on the northern side of Zion, leaving the city equally divided between the two tribes. SEE TRIBE. There is a rabbinical tradition that part of the Temple was in the lot of Judah, and part of it in that of Benjamin (Lightfoot, 1, 1050, Lond. 1684). SEE TEMPLE.

After the death of Joshua, when there remained for the children of Israel much to conquer in Canaan, the Lord directed Judah to fight against the Canaanites; and they took Jerusalem, smote it with the edge of the sword, and set it on fire (Jdg 1:1-8), B.C. cir. 1590. After that, the  Judahites and the Benjamites dwelt with the Jebusites at Jerusalem; for it is recorded (Jos 15:63) that the children of Judah could not drive out the Jebusites inhabiting Jerusalem; and we are farther informed (Jdg 1:21) that the children of Benjamin did not expel them from Jerusalem (comp. Jdg 19:10-12). Probably the Jebusites were removed by Judah only from the lower city, but kept possession of the mountain of Zion, which David conquered at a later period. This is the explanation of Josephus (Ant. 5, 2, 2). SEE JEBUS. Jerusalem is not again mentioned till the time of Saul, when it is stated (1Sa 17:54) that David took the head of Goliath and brought it to Jerusalem, B.C. cir. 1063. When David, who had previously reigned over Judah alone in Hebron, was called to rule over all Israel, he led his forces against the Jebusites, and conquered the castle of Zion which Joab first scaled (1Sa 5:5-9; 1Ch 12:4-8). He then fixed his abode on this mountain, and called it “the city of David,” B.C. cir. 1044. He strengthened its fortifications, SEE MILLO, but does not appear to have enlarged it.

Thither he carried the ark of the covenant; and there he built to the Lord an altar in the threshing floor of Araunah the Jebusite, on the place where the angel stood who threatened Jerusalem with pestilence (2Sa 24:15-25). But David could not build a house for the name of the Lord his God on account of the wars which were about him on every side (2Sa 7:13; 1Ki 5:3-5). Still the Lord announced to him, through the prophet Nathan. (2Sa 7:10), “I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own and move no more,” B.C. cir, 1043. From this it would seem that even David had, then at least, no assurance that Jerusalem in particular was to be the place which had so often been spoken of as that which God would choose for the central seat of the theocratical monarchy, and which it became after Solomon's Temple had been built. SEE TEMPLE.

3. The reasons which led David to fix upon Jerusalem as the metropolis of his kingdom are noticed elsewhere, SEE DAVID, being, chiefly, that it was in his own tribe of Judah, in which his influence was the strongest, while it was the nearest to the other tribes of any site he could have chosen in Judah. The peculiar strength also of the situation, enclosed on three sides by a natural trench of valleys, could not be without weight. Its great strength, according to the military notions of that age, is shown by the length of time the Jebusites were able to keep possession of it against the force of all Israel. David was doubtless the best judge of his own interests  in this matter; but if those interests had not come into play, and if he had only considered the best situation for a metropolis of the whole kingdom, it is doubtful whether a more central situation with respect to all the tribes would not have been far preferable, especially as the law required all the adult males of Israel to repair three times in the year to the place of the divine presence. Indeed, the burdensome character of this obligation to the more distant tribes seems to heave been one of the excuses for the revolt of the ten tribes, as it certainly was for the establishment of schismatic altars in Dan and Beth-el (1Ki 12:28). Many travelers have suggested that Samaria, which afterwards became the metropolis of the separated kingdom, was far preferable to Jerusalem for the site of a capital city; and its central situation would also have been in its favor as a metropolis for all the tribes. But as the choice of David was subsequently confirmed by the divine appointment, which made Mount Moriah the site of the Temple, we are bound to consider the choice as having been providentially ordered with reference to the contingencies that afterwards arose, by which Jerusalem was made the capital of the separate kingdom of Judah, for which it was well adapted. SEE JUDAH.

The promise made to David received its accomplishment when Solomon built his Temple upon Mount Moriah, B.C. 1010. He also added towers to the walls, and otherwise greatly adorned the city. By him and his father Jerusalem had been made the imperial residence of the king of all Israel; and the Temple, often called “the house of Jehovah,” constituted at the same time the residence of the King of kings, the supreme head of the theocratical state, whose vice regents the human kings were taught to regard themselves. It now belonged, even less than a town of the Levites, to a particular tribe: it was the center of all civil and religious affairs, the very place of which Moses spoke, Deu 12:5 : “The place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come” (comp. 9:6; 13:14; 14:23; 16:11-16; Psalms 122). SEE SOLOMON.

Jerusalem was not, indeed, politically important: it was not the capital of a powerful empire directing the affairs of other states, but it stood high in the bright prospects foretold by David when declaring his faith in the coming of a Messiah (Psa 2:6; Psalms 1, 2; Psalms 37; Psa 102:16-22; Psa 110:2). In all these passages the name Zion is used, which, although properly applied to the southernmost part of the site of Jerusalem, is often in Scripture put  poetically for Jerusalem generally, and sometimes for Mount Moriah and its Temple. SEE ZION.

The importance and splendor of Jerusalem were considerably lessened after the death of Solomon, under whose son Rehoboam ten of the tribes rebelled, Judah and Benjamin only remaining in their allegiance, B.C. 973. Jerusalem was then only the capital of the very small state of Judah. When Jeroboam instituted the worship of golden calves in Beth-el and Dan, the ten tribes went no longer up to Jerusalem to worship and sacrifice in the house of the Lord (1Ki 12:26-30). SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

After this time the history of Jerusalem is continued in the history of Judah, for which the second book of the Kings and of the Chronicles are the principal sources of information. After the time of Solomon, the kingdom of Judah was almost alternately ruled by good kings, “who did that which was right in the sight of the Lord,” and by such as were idolatrous and evil disposed; and the reign of the same king often varied, and was by turns good or evil. The condition of the kingdom, and of Jerusalem in particular as its metropolis, was very much affected by these mutations. Under good kings the city flourished, and under bad kings it suffered greatly. Under Rehoboam (q.v.) it was conquered by Shishak (q.v.), king of Egypt, who pillaged the treasures of the Temple (2Ch 12:9), B.C. 970. Under Amaziah (q.v.) it was taken by Jehoash, king of Israel, who broke down four hundred cubits of the wall of the city, and took all the gold and silver, and all the vessels that were found in the Temple (2Ki 14:13-14), B.C. cir. 830. Uzziah (q.v.), son of Amaziah, who at first reigned well, built towers in Jerusalem at the corner gate, at the valley gate, and at the turning of the wall, and fortified them (2Ch 26:9), B.C. cir. 807. His son, Jotham (q.v.), built the high gate of the Temple, and reared up many other structures (2Ch 27:3-4), B.C. cir. 755. Hezekiah (q.v.) added to the other honors of his reign that of an improver of Jerusalem (2Ch 29:3), B.C. 726. At a later date, however, he despoiled the Temple in some degree in order to pay the levy imposed by the king of Assyria (2Ki 18:15-16), B.C. 713. But in the latter part of the same year he performed his most eminent service for the city by stopping the upper course of Gihon, and bringing its waters by a subterraneous aqueduct to the west side of the city (2Ch 32:30). This work is inferred, from 2 Kings 20, to have been of great importance to Jerusalem, as it cut off a supply of water from any besieging enemy, and bestowed it upon the inhabitants of the city. The immediate  occasion was the threatened invasion by the Assyrians. SEE SENNACHERIB.

 Hezekiah's son, Manasseh (q.v.), was punished by a capture of the city in consequence of his idolatrous desecration of the Temple (2Ch 33:11), B.C. cir. 690; but in his later and best years he built a strong and very high wall on the west side of Jerusalem (2Ch 33:14). The works in the city connected with the names of the succeeding kings of Judah were, so far as recorded, confined to the defilement of the house of the Lord by bad kings, and its purgation by good kings, the most important of the latter being the repairing of the Temple by Josiah (2 Kings 20:23), B.C. 623, till for the abounding iniquities of the nation the city and Temple were abandoned to destruction, after several preliminary spoliations by the Egyptians (2Ki 23:33-35), B.C. 609, and Babylonians (2Ki 24:14), B. C. 606, and again (2Ki 24:13), B.C. 598. Finally, after a siege of three years, Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar, who razed its walls, and destroyed its Temple and palaces with fire (2 Kings 25; 2 Chronicles 36; Jeremiah 39), B.C. 588. Thus was Jerusalem smitten with the calamity which Moses had prophesied would befall it if the people would not keep the commandments of the Lord, but broke his covenant (Lev 26:14; Deuteronomy 28). The finishing stroke to this desolation was put by the retreat of the principal Jews, on the massacre of Gedaliah, into Egypt, B.C. 587, where they were eventually involved in the conquest of that country by the Babylonians (Jeremiah 40-44). Meanwhile the feeble remnant of the lower classes, who had clung to their native soil amid all these reverses, were swept away by a final deportation to Babylon, which left the land literally without an inhabitant (Jer 52:30). B.C. 582. SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR.

Moses had long before predicted that if, in the land of their captivity, his afflicted countrymen repented of their evil, they should be brought back again to the land out of which they had been cast (Deu 30:1-5; comp. 1Ki 8:46-53; Neh 1:8-9). The Lord also, through Isaiah, condescended to point out the agency through which the restoration of the holy city was to be accomplished, and even named, long before his birth, the very person, Cyrus, under whose orders this was to be effected (Isa 44:28; comp. Jer 3:2; Jer 3:7-8; Jer 23:3; Jer 31:10; Jer 32:36-37). Among the remarkably precise indications should be mentioned that in which Jer 25:9-12 limits the duration of Judah's captivity to  seventy years. SEE CAPTIVITY. These encouragements were continued through the prophets, who themselves shared the captivity. Of this number was Daniel, to whom it was revealed, while yet praying for the restoration of his people (Dan 9:16; Dan 9:19), that the streets and the walls of Jerusalem should be built again, even in troublous times (Dan 9:25). SEE SEVENTY WEEKS.

4. Daniel lived to see the reign of Cyrus, king of Persia (Dan 10:1), and the fulfilment of his prayer. It was in the year B.C. 536, “in the first year of Cyrus,” that, in accomplishment of the prophecy of Jeremiah, the Lord stirred up the spirit of this prince, who made a proclamation throughout all his kingdom, expressed in these remarkable words: “The Lord God of heaven hath given me all the kingdoms of the earth, and he has charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem, which is in Judah. Who is there among you of all his people? his God be with him, and let him go up to Jerusalem, and build the house of the Lord God of Israel” (Ezr 1:2-3). This important call was answered by a considerable number of persons, particularly priests and Levites; and the many who declined to quit their houses and possessions in Babylonia committed valuable gifts to the hands of their more zealous brethren. Cyrus also caused the sacred vessels of gold and silver which Nebuchadnezzar had taken from the Temple to be restored to Sheshbazzar, the prince of Judah, who took them to Jerusalem, followed by 42,360 people, besides their servants, of whom there were 7337 (Ezr 1:5-11).

On their arrival at Jerusalem they contributed, according to their ability, to rebuild the Temple; Jeshua the priest, and Zerubbabel, reared up an altar to offer burnt offerings thereon; and when, in the following year, the foundation was laid of the new house of God, “the people shouted for joy, but many of the Levites who had seen the first Temple wept with a loud voice” (Ezr 3:2; Ezr 3:12). When the Samaritans expressed a wish to share in the pious labor, Zerubbabel declined the offer, and in revenge, the Samaritans sent a deputation to king Artaxerxes of Persia, carrying a presentment in which Jerusalem was described as a rebellious city of old time which, if rebuilt, and its walls set up again, would not pay toll, tribute, and custom, and would thus endamage the public revenue. The deputation succeeded, and Artaxerxes ordered that the building of the Temple should cease. The interruption thus caused lasted to the second year of the reign of Darius (Ezr 4:24), when Zerubbabel and Jeshua, supported by the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, again resumed the work, and would not  cease though cautioned by the Persian governor of Judaea, B.C. 520. On the matter coming before Darius Hystaspis, and the Jews reminding him of the permission given by Cyrus, he decided in their favor, and also ordered that the expenses of the work should be defrayed out of the public revenue (Ezr 6:8). In the sixth year of the reign of Darius the Temple was finished, when they kept the dedicatory festival with great joy, and next celebrated the Passover (Ezr 6:15-16; Ezr 6:19), B.C. 516. Afterwards, in the seventh year of the second Artaxerxes (Longimanus), Ezra, a descendant of Aaron, came up to Jerusalem, accompanied by a large number of Jews who had remained in Babylon, B.C. 459. He was highly patronized by the king, who not only made him a large present in gold and silver, but published a decree enjoining all treasurers of Judaea speedily to do whatever Ezra should require of them; allowing him to collect money throughout the whole province of Babylon for the wants of the Temple at Jerusalem, and also giving him full power to appoint magistrates in his country to judge the people (Ezra 7, 8). At a later period, in the twentieth year of king Artaxerxes, Nehemiah, who was his cupbearer, obtained permission to proceed to Jerusalem, and to complete the rebuilding of the city and its wall, which he happily accomplished, in spite of all the opposition which he received from the enemies of Israel (Neh 1:2; Neh 1:4; Neh 1:6), B.C. 446.

The city was then capacious and large, but the people in it were few, and many houses still lay in ruins (Neh 7:4). At Jerusalem dwelt the rulers of the people and “certain of the children of Judah and of the children of Benjamin;” but it was now determined that the rest of the people should cast lots to bring one of ten to the capital (Neh 11:1-4), B.C. cir. 440. On Nehemiah's return, after several years' absence to court, all strangers, Samaritans, Ammonites, Moabites, etc., were removed, to keep the chosen people, from pollution; ministers were appointed to the Temple, and the service was performed according to the law of Moses (Ezra 10; Nehemiah 8, 10, 12, 13), B.C. cir. 410. Of the Jerusalem thus by such great and long-continued exertions restored, very splendid prophecies were uttered by those prophets who flourished after the exile; the general purport of which was to describe the Temple and city as destined to be glorified far beyond the former, by the advent of the long and eagerly-expected Messiah, “the desire of all nations” (Zec 9:9; Zec 12:10; Zec 13:3; Hag 2:6-7; Mal 3:11). SEE EZRA; SEE Nehemiah 5. For the subsequent history of Jerusalem (which is closely connected with that of Palestine in general), down to its destruction by the Romans, we must draw chiefly upon Josephus and the books of the Maccabees, It is said by Josephus (Ant. 11, 8) that when the dominion of this part of the world passed from the Persians to the Greeks, Alexander the Great advanced against Jerusalem to punish it for the fidelity to the Persians which it had manifested while he was engaged in the siege of Tyre. His hostile purposes, however, were averted by the appearance of the high priest Jaddua at the head of a train of priests in their sacred vestments. Alexander recognized in him the figure which in a dream had encouraged him to undertake the conquest of Asia. He therefore treated him with respect and reverence, spared the city against which his wrath had been kindled, and granted to the Jews high and important privileges. The historian adds that the high priest failed not to apprise the conqueror of those prophecies in Daniel by which his successes had been predicted. The whole of this story is, however, liable to suspicion, from the absence of any notice of the circumstance in the histories of this campaign which we possess. SEE ALEXANDER THE GREAT.

After the death of Alexander at Babylon (B.C. 324), Ptolemy surprised Jerusalem on the Sabbath day, when the Jews would not fight, plundered the city, and carried away a great number of the inhabitants to Egypt, where, however, from the estimation in which the Jews of this period were held as citizens, important privileges were bestowed upon them (Joseph. Ant. 12, 1). In the contests which afterwards followed for the possession of Syria (including Palestine), Jerusalem does not appear to have been directly injured, and was even spared when Ptolemy gave up Samaria, Acco, Joppa, and Gaza to pillage. The contest was ended by the treaty in B.C. 302, which annexed the whole of Palestine, together with Arabia Petraea and Coele-Syria to Egypt. Under easy subjection to the Ptolemies, the Jews remained in much tranquillity for more than a hundred years, in which the principal incident, as regards Jerusalem itself, was the visit which was paid to it, in B.C. 245, by Ptolemy Euergetes, on his return from his victories in the East. He offered many sacrifices, and made magnificent presents to the Temple. In the wars between Antiochus the Great and the kings of Egypt, from B.C. 221 to 197, Judaea could not fail to suffer severely; but we are not acquainted with any incident in which Jerusalem was principally concerned till the alleged visit of Ptolemy Philopator in B.C. 211. He offered sacrifices, and gave rich, gifts to the Temple, but, venturing to  enter the sanctuary in spite of the remonstrances of the high priest, he was seized with a supernatural dread, and fled in terror from the place. It is said that on his return to Egypt he vented his rage on the Jews of Alexandria in a very barbarous manner. SEE ALEXANDRIA. But the whole story of his visit and its results rests upon the sole authority of the third book of Maccabees (chaps. 1 and 3), and is therefore not entitled to implicit credit. Towards the end of this war the Jews seemed to favor the cause of Antiochus; and after he had subdued the neighboring country, they voluntarily tendered their submission, and rendered their assistance in expelling the Egyptian garrison from Mount Zion. For this conduct they were rewarded by many important privileges by Antiochus. He issued decrees directing, among other things, that the outworks of the Temple should be completed, and that all the materials for needful repairs should be exempted from taxes. The peculiar sanctity of the Temple was also to be respected. No foreigner was to pass the sacred walls, and the city itself was to be protected from pollution; it being strictly forbidden that the flesh or skins of any beasts which the Jews accounted unclean should be brought into it (Joseph. Ant. 12, 3, 3). These were very liberal concessions to what the king himself must have regarded as the prejudices of the Jewish people.

Under their new masters the Jews enjoyed for a time nearly as much tranquillity as under the generally benign and liberal government of the Ptolemies. But in B.C. 176, Seleucus Philopator, hearing that great treasures were hoarded up in the Temple, and being distressed for money to carry on his wars, sent his treasurer, Heliodorus, to bring away these treasures. But this personage is reported to have been so frightened and stricken by an apparition that he relinquished the attempt, and Seleucus left the Jews in the undisturbed enjoyment of their rights (2Ma 3:4-40; Joseph. Ant. 12, 3, 3). His brother and successor, Antiochus Epiphanes, however, was of another mind. He took up the design of reducing them to a conformity of manners and religion with other nations; or, in other words, of abolishing those distinctive features which made the Jews a peculiar people, socially separated from all others. This design was odious to the great body of the people, although there were many among the higher classes who regarded it with favor. Of this way of thinking was Menelaus, whom Antiochus had made high priest, and who was expelled by the orthodox Jews with ignominy, in B.C. 169, when they heard the joyful news that Antiochus had been slain in Egypt. The rumor proved untrue, and Antiochus, on his return, punished them by plundering and  profaning the Temple. Worse evils befell them two years after; for Antiochus, out of humor at being compelled by the Romans to abandon his designs upon Egypt, sent his chief collector of tribute, Apollonius, with a detachment of 22,000 men, to vent his rage on Jerusalem. This person plundered the city and razed its walls, with the stones of which he built a citadel that commanded the Temple Mount. A statue of Jupiter was set up in the Temple; the peculiar observances of the Jewish law were abolished, and a persecution was commenced against all who adhered to these observances, and refused to sacrifice to idols. Jerusalem was deserted by priests and people, and the daily sacrifice at the altar was entirely discontinued (1 Macc. 1, 29-40; 2 Macc. 5, 24-26; Joseph. Ant. 12, 5, 4). SEE ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES.

This led to the celebrated revolt of the Maccabees who, after an arduous and sanguinary struggle, obtained possession of Jerusalem (B.C. 163), and repaired and purified the Temple, which was then dilapidated and deserted. New utensils were provided for the sacred services: the old altar, which had been polluted by heathen abominations, was taken away, and a new one erected. The sacrifices were then recommenced, exactly three years after the Temple had been dedicated to Jupiter Olympius. The castle, however, remained in the hands of the Syrians, and long proved a sore annoyance to the Jews, although Judas Maccabaeus surrounded the Temple with a high and strong wall, furnished with towers, in which soldiers were stationed to protect the worshippers from the Syrian garrison (1 Macc. 1, 36, 37; Joseph. Ant. 7, 7). Eventually the annoyance grew so intolerable that Judas laid siege to the castle. This attempt brought a powerful army into the country under the command of the regent Lysias, who, however, being constrained to turn his arms elsewhere, made peace with the Jews; but when he was admitted into the city, and observed the strength of the place, he threw down the walls in violation of the treaty (1Ma 6:48-63). In the ensuing war with Bacchides, the general of Demetrius Soter, in which Judas was slain, the Syrians strengthened their citadel, and placed in it the sons of the principal Jewish families as hostages (1Ma 9:52-53; Joseph. Ant. 13, 1, 3). The year after (B.C. 159) the temporizing high priest Alcimus directed the wall which separated the court of Israel from that of the Gentiles to be cast down, to afford the latter free access to the Temple; but he was seized with palsy as soon as the work commenced, and died in great agony (1Ma 9:51-57).

When, a few years after, Demetrius and Alexander Balas sought to outbid each  other for the support of Jonathan, the hostages in the castle were released; and subsequently all the Syrian garrisons in Judaea were evacuated, excepting those of Jerusalem and Bethzur, which were chiefly occupied by apostate Jews, who were afraid to leave their places of refuge. Jonathan then rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem, and repaired the buildings of the city, besides erecting a palace for his own residence (1 Maccabees 10, 2-4; Joseph. Ant. 13, 2, 1). The particular history of Jerusalem for several years following is little more than an account of the efforts of the Maccabaean princes to obtain possession of the castle, and of the Syrian kings to retain it in their hands. At length, in B.C. 142, the garrison was forced to surrender by Simon, who demolished it altogether, that it might not again be used against the Jews by their enemies. Simon then strengthened the fortifications of the mountain on which the Temple stood, and built there a palace for himself (1Ma 13:43-52; Joseph. Ant. 13, 6, 6). This building was afterwards turned into a regular fortress by John Hyrcanus (q.v.), and was ever after the residence of the Maccabean princes (Joseph. Ant. 15, 11, 4). It is called by Josephus “the castle of Baris,” in his history of the Jews; till it was strengthened and enlarged by Herod the Great, who called it the castle of Antonia, under which name it makes a conspicuous figure in the Jewish wars of the Romans. SEE MACCABEES.

6. Of Jerusalem itself we find no notice of consequence in the next period till it was taken by Pompey (q.v.) in the summer of B.C. 63, and on the very day observed by the Jews as one of lamentation and fasting, in commemoration of the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. Twelve thousand Jews were massacred in the Temple courts, including many priests, who died at the very altar rather than suspend the sacred rites (Joseph. Ant. 14, 1-4). On this occasion, Pompey, attended by his generals, went into the Temple and viewed the sanctuary; but he left untouched all its treasures and sacred things, while the walls of the city itself were demolished. From this time the Jews are to be considered as under the dominion of the Romans (Joseph. Ant. 14, 4, 5). The treasures which Pompey had spared were seized a few years after (B.C. 51) by Crassus. In the year B.C. 43, the walls of the city, which Pompey had demolished, were rebuilt by Antipater, the father of that Herod the Great under whom Jerusalem was destined to assume the new and more magnificent aspect which it bore in the time of Christ, and which constituted the Jerusalem which Josephus describes. SEE HEROD. Under the following reign the city was improved with magnificent taste and profuse expenditure; and  even the Temple, which always formed the great architectural glory of Jerusalem, was taken down and rebuilt by Herod the Great, with a splendor exceeding that of Solomon's (Mar 13:1; Joh 2:20). SEE TEMPLE. It was in the courts of the Temple as thus rebuilt, and in the streets of the city as thus improved, that the Savior of men walked up and down. Here he taught, here he wrought miracles, here he suffered; and this was the Temple whose “goodly stones” the apostle admired (Mar 13:1), and of which he foretold that ere the existing generation had passed away not one stone should be left upon another. Nor was the city in this state admired by Jews only. Pliny calls it “longe clarissimam urbium orientis, non Judsee modo” (Hist. Nat. 5, 16).

Jerusalem seems to have been raised to this greatness as if to enhance the misery of its overthrow. As soon as the Jews had set the seal to their formal rejection of Christ by putting him to death, and invoking the responsibility of his blood upon the heads of themselves and of their children (Mat 27:25), its doom went forth. After having been the scene of horrors without example, during a memorable siege, the process of which is narrated by Josephus in full detail, it was, in A.D. 70, captured to the Romans, who razed the city and Temple to the ground, leaving only three of the towers and a part of the western wall to show how strong a place the Roman arms had overthrown (Joseph. War, 7, 1, 1). Since then the holy city has lain at the mercy of the Gentiles, and will so remain “until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled.”

The destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans did not cause the site to be utterly forsaken. Titus (q.v.) left there in garrison the whole of the tenth legion, besides several squadrons of cavalry and cohorts of foot. For these troops, and for those who ministered to their wants, there must have been dwellings; and there is no reason to suppose that such Jews or Christians as appeared to have taken no part in the war were forbidden to make their abode among the ruins, and building them up so far as their necessities might require. But nothing like a restoration of the city could have arisen from this, as it was not likely that any but poor people, who found an interest in supplying the wants of the garrison, were likely to resort to the ruins under such circumstances. H0owever, we learn from Jerome that for fifty years after its destruction, until the time of Hadrian, there still existed remnants of the city. But during all this period there is no mention of it in history.  Up to A.D. 131 the Jews remained tolerably quiet, although apparently awaiting any favorable opportunity of shaking off the Roman yoke. The then emperor, Hadrian (q.v.), seems to have been aware of this state of feeling, and, among other measures of precaution, ordered Jerusalem to be rebuilt as a fortified place wherewith to keep in check the whole Jewish population.

The work had made some progress when the Jews, unable in endure the idea that their holy city should be occupied by foreigners, and that strange gods should be set up within it, broke out into open rebellion under the notorious Barchochebas (q.v.), who claimed to be the Messiah. His success was at first very great, but he was crushed before the tremendous power of the Romans, so soon as it could be brought to bear upon him; and a war scarcely inferior in horror to that under Vespasian and Titus was, like it, brought to a close by the capture of Jerusalem, of which the Jews had obtained possession. This was in A.D. 135, from which period the final dispersion of the Jews has often been dated. The Romans then finished the city according to their first intention. It was made a Roman colony, inhabited wholly by foreigners, the Jews being forbidden to approach it on pain of death: a temple to Jupiter Calitolinus was erected on Mount Moriah, and the old name of Jerusalem was sought to be supplanted by that of Elia Capitolina, conferred upon it in honor of the emperor AElius Hadrianus and Jupiter Capitolinus. By this name was the city known till the time of Constantine, when that of Jerusalem again became current, although Elia was still its public designation, and remained such so late as A.D. 536, when it appears in the acts of a synod held there. This name even passed to the Mohammedans, by whom it was long retained; and it was not till after they recovered the city from the Crusaders that it became generally known among them by the name of El-Khud — “the holy” — which it still bears.

7. From the rebuilding by Hadrian the history of Jerusalem is almost a blank till the time of Constantine, when its history, as a place of extreme solicitude and interest to the Christian Church, properly begins. Pilgrimages to the Holy City now became common and popular. Such a pilgrimage was undertaken in A.D. 326 by the emperor's mother Helena, then in the eightieth year of her age, who built churches on the alleged site of the nativity at Bethlehem, and of the resurrection on the Mount of Olives. This example may probably have excited her son to the discovery of the site of the holy sepulchre, and to the erection of a church thereon. He removed the temple of Venus, with which, in studied insult, the site had  been encumbered. The holy sepulchre was then purified, and a magnificent church was, by his order, built over and around the sacred spot. This temple was completed and dedicated with great solemnity in A.D. 335. There is no doubt that the spot thus singled out is the same that has ever since been regarded as the place in which Christ was entombed; but the correctness of the identification then made has of late years been much disputed, on grounds which have been examined in the article GOLGOTHA SEE GOLGOTHA. The very cross on which our Lord suffered was also, in the course of these explorations, believed to have been discovered, under the circumstances which have elsewhere been described. SEE CROSS.

By Constantine the edict excluding the Jews from the city of their fathers' sepulchres was so far repealed that they were allowed to enter it once a year to wail over the desolation of “the holy and beautiful house” in which their fathers worshipped God. When the nephew of Constantine, the emperor Julian (q.v.), abandoned Christianity for the old Paganism, he endeavored, as a matter of policy, to conciliate the Jews. He allowed them free access to the city, and permitted them to rebuild their Temple. They accordingly began to lay the foundations in A.D. 362; but the speedy death of the emperor probably occasioned that abandonment of the attempt which contemporary writers ascribe to supernatural hindrances. The edicts seem then to have been renewed which excluded the Jews from the city, except on the anniversary of its capture, when they were allowed to enter the city and weep over it. Their appointed wailing place remains, and their practice of wailing there continues to the present day. From St. James, the first bishop, to Jude II, who died A.D. 136, there had been a series of fifteen bishops of Jewish descent; and from Marcus, who succeeded Simeon, to Macarius, who presided over the Church of Jerusalem under Constantine, there was a series of twenty-three bishops of Gentile descent, but, beyond a bare list of their names, little is known of the Church or of the city of Jerusalem during the whole of this latter period.

In the centuries ensuing the conversion of Constantine, the roads to Zion were thronged with pilgrims from all parts of Christendom, and the land abounded in monasteries, occupied by persons who wished to lead a religious life amid the scenes which had been sanctified by the Savior's presence. After much struggle of conflicting dignities, Jerusalem was, in  A.D. 451, declared a patriarchate by the Council of Chalcedon. SEE PATRIARCHATE OF JERUSALEM.

In the theological controversies which followed the decision of that council with regard to the two natures of Christ, Jerusalem bore its share with other Oriental churches, and two of its bishops were, deposed by Monophysite fanatics. The Synod of Jerusalem in A.D. 536 confirmed the decree of the Synod of Constantinople against the Monophysites. SEE JERUSALEM, COUNCILS OF.

In the same century it found a second Constantine in Justinian, who ascended the throne A.D. 527. He repaired and enriched the former structures, and built upon Mount Moriah a magnificent church to the Virgin, as a memorial of the persecution of Jesus in the Temple. He also founded ten or eleven convents in and about Jerusalem and Jericho, and established a hospital for pilgrims in each of those cities.

In the following century, the Persians, who had long harassed the empire of the East, penetrated into Syria, and in A.D. 614, under Chosroes II, after defeating the forces of the emperor Heraclius, took Jerusalem by storm. Many thousands of the inhabitants were slain, and much of the city, including the finest churches that of the Holy Sepulchre among them was destroyed. When the conquerors withdrew they took away the principal inhabitants, the patriarch, and the true cross; but when, the year after, peace was concluded, these were restored, and the emperor Heraclius entered Jerusalem in solemn state, bearing the cross upon his shoulders.

The damage occasioned by the Persians was speedily repaired. But Arabia soon furnished a more formidable enemy in the khalif Omar, whose troops appeared before the city in A.D. 636, Arabia, Syria, and Egypt having already been brought under the Moslem yoke. After a long siege the austere khalif himself came to the camp, and the city was at length surrendered to him in A.D. 637. The conqueror of mighty kings entered the holy city in his garment of camel's hair, and conducted himself with much discretion and generous forbearance. By his orders the magnificent mosque which still bears his name was built upon Mount Moriah, upon the site of the Jewish Temple.

8. Jerusalem remained in possession of the Arabians, and was occasionally visited by Christian pilgrims from Europe till towards the year 1000, when a general belief that the second coming of the Savior was near at hand drew pilgrims in unwonted crowds to the Holy Land, and created an impulse for pilgrimages thither which ceased not to act after the first  exciting cause had been I forgotten. The Moslem government, in order to derive some profit from this enthusiasm, imposed the tribute of a piece of gold as the price of entrance into the holy city. The sight, by such large numbers, of the holy place in the hands of infidels, the exaction of tribute, and the insults to which the pilgrims, often of the highest rank, were exposed from the Moslem rabble, excited an extraordinary ferment in Europe, and led to those remarkable expeditions for recovering the Holy Sepulchre from the Mohammedans which, under the name of the Crusades, will always fill a most important and curious chapter in the history of the world. (See Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.) SEE CRUSADES.

The dominion over Palestine had passed in A.D. 960 from the khalifs of Baghdad to the Fatimite khalifs of Egypt, and these in their turn were dispossessed in A.D. 1073 by the Turkomans, who had usurped the powers of the Eastern khalifat. The severities exercised by these more fierce and uncivilized Moslems upon both the native Christians and the European pilgrims supplied the immediate impulse to the first Eastern expedition. But by the time the Crusaders, under Godfrey of Bouillon, appeared before Jerusalem, on the 17th of June, 1099, the Egyptian khalifs had recovered possession of Palestine, and driven the Turkomans beyond the Euphrates.

After a siege of forty days, the holy city was taken by storm on the 15th day of July, and a dreadful massacre of the Moslem inhabitants followed, without distinction of age or sex. As soon as order was restored, and the city cleared of the dead, a regular government was established by the election of Godfrey as king of Jerusalem. One of the first cares of the new monarch was to dedicate anew to the Lord the place where his presence had once abode, and the Mosque of Omar be came a Christian cathedral, which the historians of the time distinguish as “the Temple of the Lord” (Templum Domini). The Christians kept possession of Jerusalem eighty- eight years. SEE JERUSALEM, KNIGHTS OF.

During this long period they appear to have erected several churches and many convents. Of the latter, few, if any, traces remain; and of the former, save one or two ruins, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, which they rebuilt, is the only memorial that attests the existence of the Christian kingdom of Jerusalem. In A.D. 1187 the holy city was wrested from the hands of the Christians by the sultan Saladin, and the order of things was then reversed. The cross was  removed with ignominy from the sacred dome, the holy places were purified from Christian stain with rose water brought from Damascus, and the call to prayer by the muezzin once more sounded over the city. From that time to the present day the holy city has remained, with slight interruption, in the hands of the Moslems. On the threatened siege by Richard of England in 1192, Saladin took great pains in strengthening its defenses. New walls and bulwarks were erected, and deep trenches cut, and in six months the town was stronger than it ever had been, and the works had the firmness and solidity of a rock. But in A.D. 1219, the sultan Melek el-Moaddin of Damascus, who then had possession of Jerusalem, ordered all the walls and towers to be demolished, except the citadel and the inclosure of the mosque, lest the Franks should again become masters of the city and find it a place of strength. In this defenseless state Jerusalem continued till it was delivered over to the Christians in consequence of a treaty with the emperor Frederick II, in A.D. 1229, with the understanding that the walls should not be rebuilt. Yet ten years later (A.D. 1239) the barons and knights of Jerusalem began to build the walls anew, and to erect a strong fortress on the west of the city. But the works were interrupted by the emir David of Kerek, who seized the city, strangled the Christian inhabitants, and cast down the newly erected walls and fortress. Four years after, however (A.D. 1243), Jerusalem was again made over to the Christians without any restriction, and the works appear to have been restored and completed; for they are mentioned as existing when the city was stormed by the wild Kharismian hordes in the following year, shortly after which the city reverted for the last time into the hands of its Mohammedan masters, who have substantially kept it to the present day, although in 1277 Jerusalem was nominally annexed to the kingdom of Sicily.

9. From this time Jerusalem appears to have sunk very much in political and military importance, and it is scarcely named in the history of the Mameluke sultans who reigned over Egypt and the greater part of Syria in the 14th and 15th centuries. At length, with the rest of Syria and Egypt, it passed under the sway of the Turkish sultan Selim I in 1517, who paid a hasty visit to the holy city from Damascus after his return from Egypt. From that time Jerusalem has formed a part of the Ottoman Empire, and during this period has been subject to few vicissitudes; its history is accordingly barren of incident. The present walls of the city were erected by Suleiman the Magnificent, the successor of Selim, in A.D. 1542, as is  attested by an inscription over the Jaffa gate. As lately as A.D. 1808, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was partially consumed by fire; but the damage was repaired with great labor and expense by September, 1810, and the traveler now finds in this imposing fabric no traces of that calamity.

In A.D. 1832 Jerusalem became subject to Mohammed Ali, the pasha of Egypt, the holy city opening its gates to him without a siege. During the great insurrection in the districts of Jerusalem and Nabllis in 1834, the insurgents seized upon Jerusalem, and held possession of it for a time; but by the vigorous operations of the government order was soon restored, and the. city reverted quietly to its allegiance on the approach of Ibrahim Pasha with his troops. In 1841 Mohammed Ali was deprived of all his Syrian possessions by European interference, and Jerusalem was again subjected to the Turkish government, under which it now remains.

In the same year took place the establishment of a Protestant bishopric at Jerusalem by the English and Prussian governments, and the erection upon Mount Zion of a church calculated to hold 500 persons, for the celebration of divine worship according to the ritual of the English Church. SEE JERUSALEM, SEE OF (below).

In 1850 a dispute about the guardianship of the holy places between the monks of the Greek and Latin churches, in which Nicholas, emperor of Russia, sided with the Greeks, and Louis Napoleon, emperor of the French, with the Latins, led to a decision of the question by the Porte, which was unsatisfactory to Russia, and which resulted in a war of considerable magnitude, known as “the Crimean War,” between that country on the one side, and the allied forces of England and France on the other. This war has led to greater liberties of all classes of citizens in the enjoyment of their religious faith, and to a partial adjustment of the rival claims of the Greek and Latin monks to certain portions of the holy places; it has also resulted in much more freedom towards Frank travelers in visiting the city, so that even ladies have been allowed to enter the mosque inclosure; but it has caused no material alteration in the city or in its political relations.

For details, see Witsius, Hist. Hierosolymoe, in his Miscell. Sacr. 2, 187 sq.; Spalding, Gesch. d. Christl. Konigsreichs Jerusalem (Berlin, 1803); Devling, AElioe Capitolinoe Origg. et Historia (Lips. 1743); Wagnitz, Ueb. d. Phanomane vor d. Zerstörung Jeremiah (Halle, 1780); R. Bessoie, Storia della Basilica di P. Croce in Gerus. (Rome, 1750); C. Cellarius, De AElia Capitolina, etc., in his Programmata, p. 441 sq.; Poujoulat, Histoire  de Jerusalem (Brux. 1842); F. Minter's treatise on the Jewish War under Hadrian, transl. in the Biblioth. Sacra for 1843 p. 393 sq.; Raumer's Palastina; Robinson's Bib. Res. in Palestine; and especially Williams, Holy City, vol. 1.

II. Ancient Topography. — This has been a subject of no little dispute among antiquarian geographers. We prefer here briefly to state our own independent conclusions, with the authority on which each point rests, and we shall therefore but incidentally notice the controversies, which will be found discussed under the several heads elsewhere in this Cyclopaedia.

1. Natural Features. — These, of course, are mostly the same in all ages, as the surface of the region where Jerusalem is situated is generally limestone rock. Yet the wear of the elements has no doubt caused some minor changes, and the demolition of large buildings successively has effected very considerable differences of level by the accumulation of rubbish in the hollows, and even on some of the hills; while in some cases high spots were anciently cut away, valleys partially filled, and artificial platforms and terraces formed, and in others deep trenches or massive structures have left their traces to this day.

(A.) Hills. —

(1.) Mount Zion, frequently mentioned in the Old Testament, only once in the New (Rev 14:1), called by Josephus “the Upper City” (War, 5, 4, 1), was divided by a valley (Tyropoeon) from another hill opposite (Acra), than which it was “higher, and in length more direct (ibid.). It is almost universally assigned, in modern times, as the southwestern hill of the city. SEE ZION.

(2.) Mount Moriah, mentioned in 2Ch 3:1, as the site of the Temple, is unmistakable in all ages. Originally, according to Josephus (War, 5, 5, 1), the summit was small, and then platform was enlarged by Solomon, who built up a high stone terrace wall on three sides (east, south, and west), leaving a tremendous precipice at the (southeastern) corner (Ant. 15:11, 3 and 5). Some of the lower courses of these stones are still standing. SEE MORIAH.

(3.) The hill Acra is so called by Josephus, who says it “sustained the Lower City, and was of the shape of a moon when she is horned,” or a  crescent (War, 5, 4, 1). It was separated from another hill (Bezetha) by a broad valley, which the Asmonleans partly filled up with earth taken from the top of Acra, so that it might be made lower than the Temple. (ibid.). Concerning the position of this hill there is much dispute, which can only be settled by the location of the valleys on either side of it (see Caspari, in the Stud. und Krit. 2, 1864). SEE ACRA.

(4.) The hill Bezetha, interpreted by Josephus as meaning “New City,” placed by him opposite Acra, and stated to be originally lower than it, is said by him also to lie over against the tower Antonia, from which it was separated by a deep fosse (War, 5, 4, 1 and 2). SEE BEZETHA.

(5.) Ophel is referred to by Neh 3:26-27, as well as by Josephus. (War, 5, 4, 2), in such connection with the walls as to show that none other can be intended than the ridge of ground sloping to a point southward from the Temple area. SEE OPHEL.

(6.) Calvary, or more properly Golgotha, was a small eminence, mentioned by the evangelists as the place of the crucifixion. Modern tradition assigns it to the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but this is greatly contested; the question turns chiefly upon the course of the second wall, outside of which the crucifixion undoubtedly took place (Joh 19:17). SEE CALVARY.

(7.) The Mount of Olives is so often referred to by Josephus, as well as in the Bible, that it can be taken for no other than that which now passes under the same name. SEE OLIVET.

(8.) Scopus is the name assigned by Josephus to an elevated plain about seven furlongs distant from the city wall in a northerly direction (War, 2, 19, 4; 5, 2, 3), an interval that was leveled by Titus on his approach from Samaria (ibid. 3, 2). By this can therefore be meant neither the rocky prominences on the southern, nor those on the northern edge of that part of the valley of Jehoshaphat which sweeps around the city on the north, for the former are too near, and the latter intercepted by the valley; but rather the gentle slope on the northwest of the city.

Besides these, there is mentioned in Jer 31:39, “the hill Gareb,” apparently somewhere on the northwest of the city, and Goath, possibly an  eminence on the west. “Mount Gihon,” so confidently laid down on certain maps of the ancient city, is a modern invention.

(B.) Valleys. —

(1.) The principal of these was the one termed by Josephus that of the Tyropoeon, or Cheese makers, running between Zion and Acra, down as far as Siloam (War, 5, 4, 1). The southern part of this is still clearly to be traced, although much choked up by the accumulated rubbish of ages; but as to the northern part there is considerable discrepancy. Some (as Dr. Robinson) make it bend around the northern brow of Zion, and so end in the shallow depression between that hill and the eminence of the Holy Sepulchre; while others (Williams, with whose views in this particular we coincide) carry it directly north, through the depression along the western side of the mosque area, and eastward of the church, in the direction of the Damascus Gate. SEE TYROPEON.

(2.) The only other considerable valley within, the city was that above referred to as lying between Acra and Bezetha. The language of Josephus, in the passage where he mentions this valley (War, 5, 4, 1), has been understood by some as only applicable to the upper portion of that which is above regarded as the Tyropoeon, because he calls it “a broad valley,” and this is the broadest in that vicinity. But the Jewish historian only says that the hills Acra and Bezetha “were formerly divided by a broad valley; but in those times when the Asmonaeans reigned, they filled up that valley with earth, and had a mind to join the city to the Temple: they then took off a part of the height of Acra, and reduced it to a less elevation than it was before, that the Temple might be superior to it.” From this it is clear that in the times of Josephus this valley was not so distinct as formerly, so that we must not look for it in the plain and apparently unchanged depression west of the Temple, but rather in the choked and obscure one running northward from the middle of the northern side of the present mosque inclosure. The union of the city and Temple across this valley is also more explicable on this ground, because it not only implies a nearly level passage effected between the Temple area and that part of the city there intended — which is true only on the northern side, but it also intimates that there had previously been no special passageway there — whereas on the west the  Temple was connected with Zion by a bridge or causeway, besides at least two other easy avenues to the parts of the city in that direction.

(3.) The longest and deepest of the valleys outside the walls was the Valley of Jehoshaphat, which ran along the entire eastern and northeastern side, forming the bed of the brook Kedron. Respecting the identity of this, the modern name leaves no room for dispute. SEE JEHOSHAPHAT, VALLEY OF.

(4.) On the south side ran the Valley ben-Hinnom (i.e. “son of Hinnom”), corrupted in our Savior's time into Gehenna, and anciently styled Tophet. Of this also the modern name is still the same. SEE GEHENNA.

(5.) On the west, forming the northern continuation of the last, was what has acquired the appellation of the Valley of Gihon, from the pools of that name situated in it. SEE GIHON.

(C.) Streams. — Of these none were perennial, but only brooks formed by the winter rains that collected in the valleys and ran off at the southeastern corner towards the Dead Sea. The brook Kedron was the principal of these, and is mentioned in both the Old and New Testaments (2Sa 15:23; Joh 18:1), and by Josephus (War, 5, 2, 3), as lying between the city and the Mount of Olives. SEE KERON.

(D.) Fountains. —

(1.) En-roegel, first mentioned in Jos 15:7-8, as a point in the boundary line of Judah, on the south side of the hill Zion. It is generally identified with the deep well still found at the junction of the valleys of Hinnom and Jehoshaphat, and currently known as the well of Joab or Nehemiah. It is evidently the same as that called by Josephus “the fountain in the king's garden” (Ant. 7, 14, 4). Its water is peculiar, but no underground connection has been traced with any other of the fountains. SEE EN-ROGEL.

(2.) Siloamn or Shiloah is mentioned in the Old and New Testaments; as well as by Josephus, and the last indicates its site at the mouth of the Valley of Tyropoeon (War, 5, 4, 1). It is identical with the modem fount of Selwan. SEE SILOAM.

(3.) The only remaining one of the three natural springs about Jerusalem is that now known as the Fountain of the Virgin (Um ed-Deraj, “the mother  of steps”), above the Pool of Siloam. It is intermittent, the overflow apparently of the Temple supply; and it is connected by a passage through the rock with the Pool of Siloam (Robinson, Researches, 1, 502 sq.). It is apparently the same with the “king's pool” (Neh 2:14; comp. 3:16) and “‘Solomon's Pool” (Josephus, War, 5, 4, 2). This we are inclined (with Lightfoot and Robinson) to identify with the “Pool of Bethesda” in Joh 5:2. SEE BETHESDA.

There are several other wells adjoining the Temple area which have the peculiar taste of Siloam, but whether they proceed from a living spring under Moriah, or are conducted thither by the aqueduct from Bethlehem, or come from some distant source, future explorations can alone determine. Some such well has, however, lately been discovered, but how far it supplies these various fountains has not yet been fully determined (Jour. Sac. Lit. April, 1864). SEE SOLOMONS POOL.

(E.) Reservoirs, Tanks, etc. —

(1.) The Upper Pool of Gihon, mentioned in Isa 7:3; 2Ch 32:30, etc., can be no other than that now found in the northern part of the valley at the west of the city. This is probably what is called the “Dragon Well” by Neh 2:11, lying in that direction. Josephus also incidentally mentions a “Serpent's Pool” as lying on the northwestern side of the city (I, War, 5, 3, 2), which the similarity of name and position seems to identify with this. SEE GIHON.

(2.) The Lower Pool (of Gihon), referred to in Isa 22:9, is also probably that situated in the southern part of the same valley. SEE POOL.

(3.) There still exists on the western side of the city another pool, which is frequently termed the Pool of Hezekiah, on the supposition that it is the one intended to hold the water which that king is said (2Ki 20:20; 2 Chronicles 22:30) to have brought down to the city by a conduit from the upper pool. It is to this day so connected by an aqueduct, which renders the identification probable. But it does not follow (as some argue) that this pool was within the second wall in the time of Christ, if, indeed, it ever lay strictly within the city; the statements above referred to only show that it was designed as a reservoir for supplying the inhabitants, especially on Mount Zion, within the bounds of which it could never have been embraced. This pool is perhaps also the same as one mentioned by Josephus, under the title of Amagdalon, as opposite the third of the  “banks” raised by Titus (War, 5, 11, 4). He there locates it “a great way off” from Antonia yet “on the north quarter” of the city; and a more suitable place for an assault could not have been selected, as it was in the corner where the three walls joined, being evidently within the outer one, and in front of the inner one (yet to be taken), but not necessarily within the middle wall (which had been taken and demolished). SEE HEZEKIAHS POOL.

(4.) Josephus also mentions a deep trench which was dug on the north of the tower Antonia for its defense (War, 5, 4, 2). The western part of this seems to have been filled up during the siege, in order to prepare a way for the approach of the Roman engines first to the tower and afterwards to the Temple wall (War, 5, 11, 4; 7, 2, 7). The eastern portion still exists, and appears to have been wider and deeper than elsewhere (being unenclosed by the wall), forming, indeed, quite a receptacle for rainwater. This pit we are inclined to identify with the pool Struthius, which Josephus locates at this spot (War, 5, 11, 4). In modern times it has often been assigned as the site of the Pool of Bethesda, but this can hardly be correct. What is now known as the pool of Bethesda is perhaps a reservoir built in the pit from which Herod quarried the stone for reconstructing the Temple,

(5.) Of aqueducts, besides the two already mentioned as supplying respectively the pools of Siloam and Hezekiah, there still exists a long subterranean conduit that brings water from the pools of Bethlehem (attributed to Solomon); which, passing along the southwestern side of the Valley of Hinnom, then crossing it above the lower pool, and winding around the northern brow of Zion, at last supplies one or more wells in the western side of the mosque inclosure. This is undoubtedly an ancient work, and can be no other than the aqueduct which the Talmud speaks of (as we shall see) as furnishing the Temple with an abundance of water. It was probably reconstructed by Pilate, as Josephus speaks of “aqueducts whereby he brought water from the distance of 400 [other editions read 300, and even 200] furlongs” (War, 2, 9, 4). (See below, water supply of modern Jerusalem.)

2. Respecting the ancient walls, with their gates and towers, our principal authority must be the description of ancient Jerusalem furnished by Josephus (War, 5, 4, 2), to which allusion has so often been made. The only other account of any considerable fullness is contained in Nehemiah's statement of the portions repaired under his superintendence (ch. 3).  Besides these, and some incidental notices scattered in other parts of these authors and in the Bible generally, there are left us a few ruins in particular places, which we may combine with the natural points determined above in making out the circuit and fortifications of the city. (See below, fortifications of the city.)

(F.) The First or Old Wall. — Josephus' account of this is as follows: “Beginning on the north from the tower Hippicus (so called), and extending to the Xystus (so called), thence touching the council [house], it joined the western cloister of the Temple; but in the other direction, on the west, beginning from the same tower, and extending through the place Bethso (so called) to the gate of the Essenes, and thence on the south turning above the fountain Siloam, and thence again being on the east to the Pool of Solomon, and reaching as far as a certain place which they call Ophla, it joined the eastward cloister of the Temple.” It was defended by sixty towers (ibid. § 3), probably at equal distances, and of the same average dimensions (but probably somewhat smaller than those of the outer wall), exclusive of the three towers specially described.

(1.) On the north side it began at the Tower of Hippicus. This has been with great probability identified with the site of the present citadel or Castle of David, at the northwestern corner of Zion. This tower is stated by Josephus to have been 25 cubits (about 45 feet square), and solid to the height of 30 cubits (War, 5, 4, 3). At the northwestern corner of the modern citadel is a tower 45 feet square, cut on three sides to a great height out of the solid rock, which (with Mr. Williams) we think can be no other than Hippicus. This is probably the tower at the Valley Gate mentioned in 2Ch 26:9. SEE HIPPICUS.

(2.) Not far from Hippicus, on the same wall, Josephus places the Tower of Phasaelys, with a solid base of 40 cubits (about 73 feet) square as well as high (ibid.). To this the tower on the northeastern corner of the modern citadel so nearly corresponds (its length being 70 feet, and its breadth now shortened to 56 feet, the rest having probably been masonry), that they cannot well be regarded as other than identical.

(3.) Not far from this again, Josephus locates the Tower of Mariamne, 20 cubits (about 36 feet) square and high (ibid.). This we incline (with Mr. Williams) to place about the same distance east of Phasaelus.  (4.) The Gate Gennath (i.e. “garden”), distinctly stated by Josephus as belonging to the first wall (War, 5, 4, 2), apparently not far east of Mariamne. The arch now known by this name, near the south end of the bazaars, evidently is comparatively recent. SEE GENNATH.

(5.) There is another “obscure gate” referred to by Josephus, as lying near Hippicus, through which the Jews made a sally upon the Romans (War, 5, 6; 6, 5). This could not have been on the north side, owing to the precipice. It must be the same as that through which he says elsewhere (ibid. 7:3) water was brought to the tower Hippicus, evidently from the Upper and Lower Pools, or from Siloam. It can therefore only be located just south of Hippicus. It appears to be identical with that mentioned in the Old Testament as the Valley Gate (Neh 3:13; compare 2Ch 26:9; 2Ch 32:14).

(6.) On the southern side of this wall we next come (omitting “Bethso” for the present) to Josephus's “Gate of the Essenes.” This we should naturally expect to find opposite the modern Zion Gate; but as the ancient city took in more of this hill than the modem (for the Tomb of David is now outside), we must look for it along the brow of Zion at the southwest corner. Here, accordingly, the Dung gate is mentioned in Neh 2:13; Neh 3:13, as lying next to the Valley gate; and in this latter passage it is placed at 1000 cubits (1820 feet) from it the accordance of the modern distance with which may be considered as a strong verification of the correctness of the position of both these gates. The Dung gate is also referred to in Neh 12:31, as the first (after the Valley gate, out of which the company appear to have emerged) toward the right (i.e. south) from the northwest corner of the city (i.e. facing the wall on the outside).

From this point, the escarpments still found in the rock indicate the line of the wall as passing along the southern brow of Zion, as Josephus evidently means. Beyond this he says it passed above the fountain Siloam, as indeed the turn in the edge of Zion here requires.

(7.) At this southeast corner of Zion probably stood the Pottery gate, mentioned (Jer 19:2, where it is mistranslated “east gate”) as leading into the Valley of Hinnom; and it apparently derived its name from the “Potter's Field,” lying opposite. SEE POTTERS FIELD.  Beyond this, it becomes more difficult to trace the line indicated by Josephus. His language plainly implies that in skirting the southern brow of Zion it curved sufficiently to exclude the Pool of Siloam, although it has been strongly contended by some that this fountain must have been within the city.

(8.) At the mouth of the Tyropoeon we should naturally look for a gate, and accordingly we find mention of a Fountain gate along the Valley of Hinnom beyond the Dung gate (Neh 2:14; Neh 12:37), and adjoining the Pool of Siloah (Neh 3:15), which seems to fix its position with great certainty. The next bend beyond Siloam would naturally be at the termination of the ridge coming down from the Temple. From this point, according to Josephus, it curved so as to face the east and extended to the Fountain of the Virgin (Solomon's Pool), thus passing along the verge of Ophel. If this fountain really be the Pool of Bethesda, we must locate here

(9.) The Sheep gate, which, on the whole, we are inclined to fix in this vicinity (Neh 12:39; Neh 3:1; Neh 3:32; Joh 5:2).

The line of the wall, after this, according to Josephus, ran more definitely upon the edge of Ophel (thus implying a slight bend to the east), and continued along it till it reached the Temple. We are not compelled, by his language, to carry it out to the extreme southeastern corner of the Temple area, because of the deep precipice which lay there (Ant. 15, 11, 4). Just. so, the modern wall comes up nearly in the middle of the south side of this area. The ancient point of intersection has been discovered by the recent excavations of the English engineers. (See the sketch of Ophel above.)

From this account of the first wall, we should naturally conclude that Josephus's Upper City included the Tyropoeon as well as Ophel; but from other passages it is certain that Zion had a separate wall of its own on its eastern brow, and that Josephus here only means to speak of the outer wall around the west, south, and east. Thus he states (War, 6, 7, 2) that, after the destruction of the Temple, the Romans, having seized and burned the whole Lower City as far as Siloam, were still compelled to make special efforts to dislodge the Jews from the Upper City; and from his account of the banks raised for this purpose between the Xystus and the bridge (ibid. 8, 1), it is even clear that this wall extended around the northeastern brow of Zion quite to the north part of the old walls leaving a space between the Upper City and the Temple. He also speaks (ibid. 6, 2) of the bridge as parting the tyrants in the Upper City from Titus in the western cloister of  the Temple. This part of the Tyropoeon was therefore enclosed by barriers on all its four sides, namely, by the wall on the west and north, by the Temple on the east, and by the bridge on the south. The same conclusion of a branch from the outer wall, running up the western side of the Tyropoeon, results from a careful inspection of the account of the repairs in Nehemiah 3.

The historian there states that adjoining (“after him”) the part repaired around the Fountain gate at Siloah (Neh 3:15) lay a portion extending opposite the “sepulchres of David” (Neh 3:16). By these can only be meant the tomb of David, still extant on the crown of Zion, to which Peter alludes (Act 2:29) as existing in his day within the city. But we cannot suppose Nehemiah to be here returning along the wall in a westerly direction, and describing repairs which he had just attributed to others (Act 2:14-15); nor call he be speaking of the wall eastward of Siloam, which would in no sense be opposite David's tomb, but actually intercepted from it by the termination of Ophel: the only conclusion therefore is, that he is now proceeding along this branch wall northward, lying opposite David's tomb on the east. By “the pool that was made,” mentioned as situated here (Act 2:16), cannot therefore be meant either Siloam, or the Lower Pool, or even the Virgin's Fountain, but some tank in the valley, since filled up, probably the same with the ”ditch made between the two walls for the water of the old pool” (Isa 22:11), which might easily be conducted (from either of the pools of Gihon) to this spot, along the line of the present aqueduct from Bethlehem. Moreover, it was evidently along this branch wall (“the going up of the wall”) that one party of the priests in Neh 12:37 ascended to meet the other. This double line of wall is also confirmed, not only by this passage, but likewise by the escape of Zedekiah “by the way of the [Fountain ] Gate between the two walls, which is by the king's garden” (i.e. around Siloam), in the direction of the plain leading to Jericho (2Ki 25:4-5; Jer 29:4; Jer 52:7). From 2Ch 27:3; 2Ch 23:14, it is also evident that Ophel was enclosed by a separate wall. We will now endeavor to trace this branch wall around to the Temple and to the gate Gennath as definitely as the intricate account in Nehemiah, together with other scattered notices, will allow.

We may take it for granted that this part of the wall would leave the other at the southeastern corner of Zion, near the Pottery gate, where the hill is steep, and keep along the declivity throughout its whole extent, for the sake of more perfect defense. There were stairs in this wall just above the  wall that continued to the Fountain gate (Neh 12:37; Neh 3:15), which imply at least a small gate there, as they led into the Upper City. They would naturally be placed within the outer wall for the sake of security, and at the eastern side of this corner of Zion, where the rock is still precipitous (although the stairs have disappeared), so that they afford additional confirmation to the wall in question.

(10.) Above the Sepulchre of David, and beyond “the pool that was made,” Nehemiah (chap. 3:16) places “the house of the mighty,” apparently a Giants' Tower, to defend the wall. Immediately north of this we may conjecture would be a gate, occurring opposite the modern Zion gate, and over against the ancient Sheep gate, although the steepness of the hill would prevent its general use.

Farther north is apparently mentioned (Neh 3:19) another minor entrance, “the going up to the armory at the turning of the wall,” meaning probably the bend in the brow of Zion opposite the southwestern corner of the Temple, near where the bridge connected them.

Farther on, another “turning of the wall, even unto the corner,” is mentioned (Neh 3:24), but in what direction, and how far off, cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. It may mean the junction with the wall of the bridge.

From this point it becomes impossible to trace the order pursued by Nehemiah in the rest of the third chapter, as he does not describe the wall from point to point, but mostly refers to certain objects opposite which they lay, and frequently omits the sign of continuity (“after him”). All that can be definitely gathered as to the consecutive course of the wall is that, by various turns on different sides, its respective parts faced certain fixed points, especially “the tower lying out” (Neh 3:25-27); that it contained three gates (the “Water gate,” Neh 3:26; the “Horse gate,” Neh 3:28; and the gate “Miphkad,” Neh 3:31); that it adjoined Ophel (Neh 3:27); and that it completed the circuit of walls in this direction (Neh 3:32). It needs but a glance to see that all this strikingly agrees, in general, with the above-mentioned inclosure in the valley of the Tyropoeon just above the bridge, which certainly embraced all the objects referred to by Nehemiah, as we shall see; and this fact of the quadrilateral form of these portions of the wall will best account for the apparent confusion of this part of his statement (as our total ignorance of many of the elements of elucidation makes it now seem), as well as his repeated use of the peculiar mode of  description, “over against.” Our best course is to follow the presumed line, which the nature of the ground seems to require, and identify the points as they occur, trusting to the naturalness with which they may fall in with our scheme for its vindication.

After leaving the bend at the junction with the bridge, we should therefore indicate the course of the wall as following the natural declivity on the northeast edge of Zion in a gentle curve, till it joined the northern line of the old wall, about half way between the gate Gennath and the Temple. Indeed, the language of Neh 12:37 implies that “the going up of the [branch] wall” extended “above the house of David” (i.e. the “king's house”), and thence bent “even unto the Water gate eastward.”

(11.) On this part of the wall, at its junction with the bridge, we think must be placed the Horse gate (2Ki 11:16; 2Ch 23:15; Neh 3:28; Jer 31:38-40).

(12.) Not far to the north of this must be placed “the Tower lying out” (Neh 3:25-27).

(13.) On the north side of the space included by the parts of this wall we place the Water gate (Neh 3:26; Neh 12:37; comp. Neh 8:1; Neh 8:3; Neh 8:16); probably the same with the Middle gate (Jer 39:3; compare 2, 4, 5).

(14.) The only remaining gate in this part of the walls is the Prison gate, in the middle of the bridge opposite the Water gate (Neh 12:30-40); probably the same with the gate Miphkad, referred to by Nehemiah as lying between the Horse gate and the Sheep gate (chap. Neh 3:28; Neh 3:31-32), an identity which the name favors — being literally Gate of reviewing, perhaps from the census being taken at this place of concourse, or (with the Vulgate) Gate of judgment, from its proximity to the prison.

(G.) The Second or Middle Wall. — Josephus' statement of the course of this wall is in these words: “But the second [wall] had (first) its beginning from the gate which they called Gennath, belonging to the first wall, and then, encircling the northern slope only, went up [or, returned] as far as Antonia” (War, 5, 4, 2). It had fourteen towers (ibid. 3), probably of the same general size as those of the outer wall. If we have correctly identified Acra, it must be this hill that Josephus calls “the northern slope;” and the direction of this will require that the wall, after leaving Gennath, should  skirt the lowest edge of Golgotha in nearly a straight line till it reached the upper end of the Tyropoeon, opposite the western edge of Acra. This direct course agrees with the absence of any special remark in Josephus respecting its line between these two points. Neither is there mention of any gate or tower along it, near Gennath nor opposite Golgotha; so that,

(1.) The first point of note in this direction is the Tower of Furnaces, which may be located on the northeastern slope of the elevation assumed to be that of Golgotha (Neh 3:8; Neh 3:11; Neh 3:13; Neh 12:38; comp. 2Ch 26:9); and

(2.) on the western bank of this entrance of the Tyropoeon would be situated the Corner gate (compare Jer 31:38).

From this point the wall would run directly across the broad beginning of the Tyropoeon, to meet the northwestern brow of Acra, which Josephus intimates it only served to include. This part spanning the valley must be the Broad Wall, referred to in Neh 3:8; Neh 12:38, as lying here. A stronger wall would be needed here, as there was no natural breastwork of rock, and it was on this side that invaders always approached the city. Accordingly, this strengthening of the wall in this part by an additional thickness was first effected by Manasseh (2Ch 33:14); and having been broken down in Hezekiah's time, it was rebuilt by him as a defense against the Assyrians (2Ch 32:5), and again broken down by the rival Jehoash, on his capture of the city (2Ki 14:13).

(3.) On the eastern slope of this depression, we think, must be placed the Ephraim gate (Nehemiah 3:38, 39; 2Ki 14:13; comp Neh 8:16), corresponding to the modern “Damascus gate,” and probably identical with the Benjamin gate (Jer 37:12-13; comp. Jer 38:7; see Zec 14:10), but different from the “High gate of Benjamin, that was by the house of the Lord” (Jer 20:2). The character of the masonry at the present Damascus gate, and the rooms on each side of it, indicate this as one of the ancient entrances (Robinson, Researches, 1, 463, 464).

From this point the wall probably ran in a circular northeast course along the northern declivity of Acra, about where the modern wall does, until it reached,

(4.) The Old gate, which appears to have stood at the northeast corner of Acra (Neh 3:3; Neh 3:6; Neh 3:8; Neh 12:39); apparently the same as the First-gate (Zec 14:10).

Here, we conceive, the wall took a bend to the south, following the steep eastern ridge of Acra; for Josephus states that it “only enclosed” this hill, and then joined the tower Antonia. For this latter reason, also, it must lave passed along the edge of the valley which connects this point with the western end of the pseudo-Bethesda (evidently the valley separating Acra and Bezetha); and this will give one horn of the “crescent-shape” attributed by him to the Upper City, including the Temple in the middle, and Ophel as the other horn. We should therefore indicate for the line of the rest of this wall a very slight outward curve from near Herod's Gate to about the middle of the northern side of the mosque area.

(5.) The only remaining gate expressly referred to as lying in this wall is the Fish gate, which stood not very far from the junction with Antonia (Neh 3:1; Neh 3:3; Neh 3:6; Neh 12:39; comp. 2Ch 33:14; Zep 1:10).

(6.) The Tower Antonia, at which we thus arrive, was situated (according to Josephus, War, 5, 5, 8) at the corner of the Temple court where the northern and western cloisters met. This shows that it did not cover the whole of the platform north of the Temple, but only had “courts and broad spaces” occupying this entire area, with a tower at each of the four corners (ibid.). Of these latter the proper Antonia seems to have been one, and they were all doubtless connected by porticoes and passages. They were all on a precipitous rock, fifty cubits high, the proper tower Antonia being forty cubits above this, the southeastern tower seventy, and the others fifty cubits (ibid.). It was originally built by the Asmonaean princes for the safe keeping of the high priest's vestments, and called by them Baris (ibid., Ant. 15, 11, 4). It was “the castle” into which Paul was taken from the mob (Act 21:34; Act 21:37). SEE ANTONIA.

(7.) That one of these four towers which occupied the northeast corner of the court of Antonia we are inclined to identify with the ancient Tower of Ishmael, between the tower of Meah and the Fish gate (Neh 3:1; Neh 3:3; Neh 12:39), and at the most northeastern point of the city (Jer 31:38, compared with Zec 14:10).

(8.) The southeast one of these towers, again, we take to be the ancient Tower of Meah, referred to in the above passages of Nehemiah.

Pierotti has found a subterraneous passage extending from the Golden gate in a northwesterly direction (Jerusalem Explored, 1, 64). He cannot trace it completely, only in two unconnected fragments, one 130 feet long, and another 150 feet. This may be the secret passage (κρυπτὴ διώπυξ) which Herod excavated from Antonia to the eastern gate, where he raised a tower, from which he might watch any seditious movement of the people; thus establishing a private communication with Antonia, through which he might pour soldiers into the heart of the Temple area as need required (Josephus, Ant. 15, 11, 7).

This will make out the circuit of the general tower of Antonia, the proper castle standing on the southwest corner, and thence extending a wing to reach the tower on the northwest corner; and the two towers on the east side being built up on the basis of the ancient ones. It had gates doubtless on all sides, but, besides that on the south (which will be considered under the Temple), there is distinct evidence of none except,

(9.) The Golden gate, so called in modern times. It is a double-arched passage in the outer wall of the Haram, now closed up, but evidently a work of antiquity, from its Roman style of architecture, which would naturally refer it to this time of Herod's enlargement of Antonia. Its position, as we shall see, is such as to make it a convenient entrance to this inclosure. SEE FENCED CITY.

The eastern wall of the Temple area, which evidently served for that of the city, and connects Josephus' first and second walls on this part, we reserve for consideration under the head TEMPLE SEE TEMPLE .

(H.) The Third or Outer Wall. — This was not yet built in the time of Christ, having been begun by Herod Agrippa I about A.D. 43. Josephus's account of its course is in the following words (War, 5, 4, 2): “The starting point of the third [wall], however, was the tower Hippicus, whence stretching as far as the northern slope to the tower Psephinos, thence reaching opposite the monuments of Hellina,... and prolonged through [the] royal vaults, it bent in the first place with a corner tower to the (so- styled) Fuller's monument, and then joining the old circuit [i.e. the former wall], ended at the (so-called) valley Kedron.” It enclosed that part of the town called Bezetha, or the “New City,” and was (in parts at least) ten  cubits thick and twenty-five high (ibid.). It was defended by ninety towers twenty cubits square and high, two hundred cubits apart (ibid. 3).

(1.) The first mark, then, after leaving Hippicus, was the Tower Psephinos, described (ibid.) as being an octagon, seventy cubits high, at the northwest corner of the city, opposite Hippicus. It was situated quite off the direct road by which Titus approached the city from the north (ibid. 2, 2), and lay at a bend in the northern wall at its western limit (ibid. 3, 5). All these particulars agree in identifying it with the foundations of some ancient structure still clearly traceable on the northwestern side of the modern city, opposite the Upper Pool. Indeed, the ruins scattered along the whole distance between this point and the present Jaffa gate suffice to indicate the course of this, part of the third wall along the rocky edge of the Valley of Gihon. We therefore locate Psephinos opposite the southernmost two of four square foundations (apparently the towers at intervals) which we find marked on Mr. Williams' Plan, and indicating a salient point in the wall here, which is traceable on either side by a line of old foundations. These we take to be remnants of that part of this outer wall which Josephus says was begun with enormous stones, but was finished in an inferior manner on account of the emperor's jealousy (War, ut sup.). Although no gate is referred to along this part of the wall, yet there probably was one not far below Psephinos, where the path comes down at the northwest corner of the present city wall.

(2.) Between the tower Psephinos and the gate leading to the northwest were the Women's Towers, where a sallying party came near intercepting Titus (Joseph. War, 5, 2; compare 3, 3). They appear to have issued from the gate and followed him to the towers.

(3.) Not very far beyond this, therefore, was the gate through which the above party emerged. This could have been none other than one along the present public road in this direction, a continuation of that leading through the Ephraim gate up the head of the Tyropoeon. It appears that the gates in this outer wall had no specific names.

(4.) The language of Josephus implies that after the sweep of the wall (in its general northern course) at the tower Psephinos, it took, on the whole, a pretty direct line till it passed east of the Monuments of Helena. It should therefore be drawn with a slight curve from the old foundations above  referred to (northeast of Psephinos) to the base of a rock eminence just to the north of the present northwest road, upon which, we think, must be placed the monuments in question (Josephus, Ant. 20, 4, 3.

(5.) The next point referred to by Josephus is the Royal Vaults, which have been with most probability identified with the ruins still found on the north of the city at and around the “Tombs of the Kings.”

(6.) Next in Josephus's description comes the Corner Tower, at which the wall bent in a very marked manner (hence doubtless the name), evidently on meeting the Valley of Jehoshaphat.

For the rest of the way the wall therefore must have followed the ridge of the Valley of Jehoshaphat; and our only task is to identify points of interest along it.

(7.) A little to the east of this corner tower, in the retreating angle of the wall, which accommodates a small ravine setting up southward from the Valley of Jehoshaphat, we locate the gate which Titus was approaching when he met the above-mentioned sally.

(8.) The last point mentioned by Josephus is the Fuller's Monument, which we locate on the eminence not very far east of the above gate, and it would thus be the northeast corner of the outer wall. Amid the numerous sepulchral caves, however, with which the whole face of the hill is perforated, it is impossible to identify any one in particular.

From this point the wall naturally returned in a distinctly southern course, along the edge of the valley, until it joined the ramparts of the court of Antonia, at the tower of Hananeël. Although there is no allusion to any gate along this part, yet there could scarcely have failed to be one at the notch opposite the northeast corner of the present city. Below this spot the ancient and modern walls would coincide in position.

3. As to the internal subdivisions of the city, few data remain beyond the arrangement necessarily resulting from the position of the hills and the course of the walls. Little is positively known respecting the streets of ancient Jerusalem. Josephus says: (War, 5, 4, 1) that the corresponding rows of houses on Zion and Acra terminated at the Tyropoeon, which implies that there were streets running across it; but we must not think here of wide thoroughfares like those of our cities, but of covered alleys, which constitute the streets of Oriental cities, and this is the general character of  those of modern Jerusalem. The same remark will apply to the “narrow streets leading obliquely to the [second] wall” on the inside, several times referred to in the account of the capture of the city (War, 5, 8, 1). The principal thoroughfares must be gathered from the position of the gates and the nature of the ground, with what few hints are supplied in ancient authors. In determining their position, the course of the modern roads or paths around the city is of great assistance, as even a mule track in the East is remarkably permanent.

We must not, however, in this connection, fail to notice the famous bridge mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 14, 4, 2; War 1, 7, 2; 2, 16, 3; 4, 6, 2; 6, 8, 1) as being anciently connected the hill Zion with the Temple near its southwest angle. Dr. Robinson (who was in Palestine in 1838, and published his book in 1841) claims to have discovered this (Researches, 1, 425 sq.) in the three ranges of immense stones still jutting out from the Haram wall at this point; whereas Dr. Olin (who visited Palestine in 1840, and published in 1843) asserts that this relic had hitherto been unmentioned by any traveler, although well known to the citizens of Jerusalem (Travels, 2, 26). The controversy which arose on the subject was closed by a letter from the Rev. H.A. Homes, of Constantinople stating that the existence and probable character of the remains in question were suggested in his presence to Dr. Robinson by the missionaries then resident at Jerusalem. The excavations of the English engineers on the spot have demonstrated the truth of the identification thus proposed. SEE TEMPLE.

Doubtless Jerusalem anciently, like all other cities, had definite quarters or districts where particular classes of citizens especially resided, but there was not the same difference in religion which constitute such marked divisions within the bounds of the modern city. It is clear, however, as well from the great antiquity of the Upper City as from its being occupied in part by, palaces, that it was the special abode of the nobility (so to speak), including perhaps the higher order of the priesthood. Ophel appears (from Neh 3:26; Neh 10:21) to have been the general residence of the Levites and lower officers connected with the Temple. The Lower City, or Acra, would there constitute the chief seat of business, and consequently of tradesmen's and mechanics' residence, while Bezetha would be inhabited by a miscellaneous population. There are, besides these general sections,  but three particular districts, the names of which have come down to us; these are:

(1.) Bethso, which is named by Josephus as lying along the western side of the first wall; but we are ignorant of its extent or special appropriation.

(2.) Millo is mentioned in several places in the Old Testament (2Sa 5:9; 1Ki 9:15; 1Ki 9:24; 1Ki 11:27; 2Ki 12:20) in such connections as to imply that it was the name of some tract adjoining on in the interior of the city, and we have therefore ventured to identify it with the space so singularly enclosed by the walls on the north side of the bridge. — See Millo.

(3.) The Suburbs mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 15, 16, 5) as the quarter to which the middle two of the four western Temple gates led, we think, must be not simply Bezetha in general (which was separated from the Temple by the interwoven Lower City), but rather the low ground (naturally, therefore; indifferently inhabited) lying immediately north of Zion and in the upper expansion of the Tyropoeon, including a tract on both sides of the beginning of the second wall.

4. It remains to indicate the location of other public buildings and objects of note connected with the ancient city. The topography of the TEMPLE will be considered in detail under that article.

(a.) Within the Upper City — Zion. —

(1.) Herod's Palace. This, Josephus states (War 5, 4, 4), adjoined the towers Hippicus, etc., on the north side of the old wall, being “entirely walled about to the height of 30 cubits, with towers at equal distances.” Its precise dimensions in all are not given, but it must have been covered a large area with its “innumerable rooms,” its “many porticoes” and “‘courts”‘ with “several groves of trees, and long walks through them, with deep canals and cisterns.” Similar descriptions are also given in Ant. 15, 9, 3; War, 1, 21, 1. We do not regard it, however, as identical with the dining hall built by Herod Agrippa on Zion (Ant. 20, 8, 11), for that was only a wing to the former palace of the Asmonaeans (apparently a reconstruction of the ancient ”king's house”), and lay nearer the Temple (War, 2, 16, 3)  the adjoining “portico” or “gallery” mentioned in these passages being probably a covered portion of the Xystus. One of the ground apartments of this building appears to have been the procurator's proetorium, mentioned in the account of Christ's trial before Pilate (Joh 18:28; Joh 18:33; Joh 19:9; Mar 15:16), as Josephus informs us (War 2:14, 8) that the Roman governors took up their quarters in the palace, and set up their tribunal (compare Mat 27:19) in front (i.e. at the eastern entrance) of it (namely, on the “Pavement” of Joh 19:13).

(2.) There is no reason to suppose that David's Tomb occupied any other position than that now shown as his burial place on Mount Zion. It was within the precincts of the old city (1Ki 2:10) Nehemiah mentions it as surviving the first overthrow of the city (Neh 3:16): Peter refers to it as extant at Jerusalem in his time (Act 2:29); and Josephus alludes to it as a costly and noble vault of sepulture (Ant. 13, 8, 4; 16, 7, 1) The present edifice, however, is doubtless a comparatively modern structure, erected over the site of the ancient monument, now buried by the accumulated rubbish of ages.

(3.) The Armory referred to in Neh 3:19, has already been located at the bend of the branch wall from a northeast to a northwest direction, a little below the bridge. Its place was probably represented in our Savior's time by an improved building for some similar public purpose.

(4.) The King's House, so often mentioned in the Old Testament, has also been sufficiently noticed above, and its probable identity with Herod Agripa's “dining hall” pointed out.

(b.) Within the Lower City — Acra and Ophel. —

(1.) Josephus informs us (War, 6, 6, 3) that “Queen Helena's Palace was in the middle of Acra,” apparently upon the summit of that hill, near the modern site of the traditionary “palace of Herod.” It is also mentioned as the (northeast) limit of Simon's occupancy in the Lower City (War 6, 1).

(2.) There were doubtless Bazaars in ancient as in modern Jerusalem, but of these we have no account except in two or three instances. Josephus mentions “a place where were the merchants of wool, the braziers, and the market for cloth.” just inside the second wall not far from its junction with the first (War 5, 8, 1). It would also seem from Neh 8:1; Neh 8:16, that there was some such place of general record at the head of the Tyropoeon.  A “baker's street” or row of shops is referred to in Jer 37:21, but its position is not indicated, although it appears to have been in some central part of the city. SEE MAKTESH. Perhaps bazaars were stretched along the low tract between the Ephraim gate and the northern brow of Zion.

(3.) The Xystus is frequently mentioned by Josephus as a place of popular assemblage between Zion and the Temple; and between the bridge and the old wall (War, 5, 4, 2; 6, 3, 2; 6, 2; 8, 1). We have therefore thought that it would scarcely be included within the Upper City, the abode of the aristocracy, where, moreover, it would not be so generally accessible.

(4.) The Prison, so often referred to in the Old Testament (Neh 3:24-25; Jer 32:2; Jer 38:6), must have been situated in the northwest corner of the inclosure which we have designated as “Millo,” near the “Prison gate” (Neh 12:39), and Peter's “iron gate” (Act 12:10). SEE PRISON.

(5.) On the ridge of Ophel, not far from the “Fountain of the Virgin,” appears to have stood the Palace of Monobazus, otherwise styled that of Grapte (Josephus, War 6, 1; 4, 2; 4, 9, 11; 6, 7, 1).

(6.) Josephus states (Ant. 15, 8, 1) that Herod “built a theater at Jerusalem, as also a very great amphitheater in the plain;” but this notice is too indefinite to enable us to fix the site of these buildings. He also speaks elsewhere (Ant. 17, 10, 2) of a hippodrome somewhere near the Temple, but whether it was the same as the amphitheatre is impossible to determine; the purposes of the three edifices, however, would appear to have been cunerent.

(c.) Within the New City — Bezetha. —

(1.) The Monuments of king Alexander, referred to by Josephus (War, 5, 7, 3) were on the southwest edge of the proper hill Bezetha, nearly opposite the Fish gate, as the circumstances there narrated seem to require. This will also agree with the subsequent erection of the second engine by the Romans (evidently by the same party of besiegers operating on this quarter, ''a great way off” from the other), which was reared at 20 cubits' distance from the pool Struthius (ibid. 11, 4), being just south of this monument.

(2.) The Sepulchre of Christ was not far from the place of the Crucifixion (Joh 19:42); if, therefore, the modern church occupy the true Calvary,  we see no good reason to dispute the identity of the site of the tomb still shown in the middle of the west rotunda of that building. SEE GOLGOTHA.

(3.) The Camp of the Assyrians was on the northwest side of the city (Isa 26:2; 2Ki 18:17), identical with the site of Titus's second camp within the outer wall, but sufficiently outside the second wall to be beyond the reach of darts from it (Josephus, War, 5, 7, 3; 12, 2), so that we can well refer it only to the western part of the general swell which terminates in the knoll of Callary.

(4.) The Monument of the high priest Johns is to be located near the bottom of the north edge of Zion, a little east of the tower Mariamne (Josephus, War, 5, 11, 4; 6, 2; 9. 2; 7, 3).

(d.) In the Environs of the city. —

(1.) Herod's Monuments we incline to locate on the brow of the ridge south of the “upper pool of Gihon” (see Josephus, War, 5, 3, 2; 12, 2).

(2.) The Village of the Erebinthi is mentioned by Josephus (ibid.) as lying. along this line of blockade south of Herod's Monuments, and therefore probably on the western edge of Gihon, near the modern hamlet of Abu- Wa'ir.

(3.) The Fellers' Field we take to be the broad Valley of Gihon, especially between the two pools of that name; for not only its designation, but all the notices respecting it (Isa 7:3; Isa 36:2; 2Ki 18:17), indicate its proximity to these waters. SEE FULLERS FIELD.

(4.) Pompey's Camp is placed by Josephus (War, 5, 12. 2) on a mountain, which can be no other than a lower spur of the modern “Hill of Evil Counsel.” This must have been that general's preliminary camp, for, when he captured the city, “he pitched his camp within [his own line of circumvallation, the outer wall being then unbuilt], on the north side of the Temple” (Ant. 14, 4, 2).

(5.) There is no good ground to dispute the traditionary site of Aceldama or the Potter's Field (Mat 27:7-8), in the face of the south brow of the Valley of Hinnom. SEE ACELDAMA.  (6.) The Monument of Ananus [i.e. Annas or Hananiah], the high priest, mentioned by Josephus (War, 5, 12, 2), must have been just above the site of Aceldama.

(7.) The King's Garden (Neh 3:15) could have been no other than the well-watered plot of ground around the well of En-ROGEL, where were also the king's winepresses (Zec 14:10).

(8.) The rock Peristereon (literally “pigeon holes”) referred to by him in the same connection has been not inaptly identified with the perforated face of the Valley of Jehoshaphat at the foot of the Mount of Olives, where modern tradition assigns the graves of Jehoshaphat, Absalom, James, and Zechariah.

(9.) The second of these ruins from the north is probably the veritable Pillar of Absalom, referred to in the Scriptures (2Sa 18:18), and by Joseph's as if extant in his day (“a marble pillar in the king's dale [the Valley of Jehoshaphat, which led to ‘the king's gardens'], two furlongs distant from Jerusalem” (Ant. 7, 10, 3). SEE ABSALOMS TOMB.

(10.) The last and most interesting spot in this survey is the garden of Gethsemane, which tradition has so consistently located that nearly every traveler has acknowledged its general identity. Respecting its size, however, we know very little; but we are unable to perceive the propriety of supposing a village of the same name to have been located near it. SEE GETHSEMANE.

(11.) Finally, we may briefly recapitulate the different points in the Romans' wall of circumvallation, during the siege by Titus; as given by Josephus (War, 5, 12, 2), at the same time indicating their identity as above determined: “Titus began the wall from the camp of the Assyrians, where his own camp was pitched [i.e., near the northwest angle of the modern city wall], and drew it [in a northeast curve] down to the lower parts of the New City [following the general direction of the present north wall]; thence it went [southeasterly] along [the eastern bank of] the Valley of Kedron to the Mount of Olives; it then bent [directly] towards the south, and encompassed the [western slope of that] mountain as far the rock Peristereon [the tombs of Jehoshaphat, etc.], and [of] that other hill [the Mount of Offense] which lies next it [on the south ], and [which] is over i.e. east of] the Valley [of Jehoshaphat] which reaches to Siloam; whence it bent again to the west, and went down [the hill] to the Valley of the  Fountain [the wady En-Nar], beyond which it went up again at the start monument of Ananius the high priest [above Aceldama], and circompassing that mountain where Pompey had formerly pitched his camp [the extremity of the Hill of Evil Counsel, it returned to [i.e. towards] the north side of the city, and was carried [along the southwestern bank of Gihon Valley] as far as a certain village called the house of the Erebinthi [at Abu-Wa'ir]; after which it encompassed [the foot of the eminence on which stood] Herod's monument [south of Upper Gihon], and there on the east [end] was joined to Titus's own camp, where it began. Now the length of this wall was forty furlongs less one.” Along the line thus indicated it would be precisely this length; it would make no sharp turns nor devious projections, and would keep on commanding eminences, following the walls at a convenient distance so as to be out of the reach of missiles.

For a further discussion of the various points connected with the ancient topography of Jerusalem, see Villalpandi, Apparatus urbis Hierosol. in pt. 3 of Pradi and Villalp. Explanat. in Ezech. (Rome, 1604); Lamy, De Tab. foed. sanct. civ. etc., 7 (Paris, 1720), bk. 4, p 552-687; Reland, Paloest. p. 832 sq.; Offenhaus, Descript. vet. Hierosol. (Daventr. 1714); Faber, Archoeol. 1, 273 sq.; Hamesveld, 2, 2 sq.: Rosenmüller, Alterth. II, 2, 202 sq.; Robinson, Researches, 1, 408-516; Williams, Holy City, 2, 13-64; Bibliotheca Sacra, 1843, p. 154 sq.; 1846, p. 413 sq., 605 sq.; 1848, p. 92 sq.; Reisner, Ierusalem Vetustissima Descripta (Francof. 1563); Olshausen, Zur Topographie d. alten Jerusalem (Kiel, 1833); Adrichomius, Hierusalem sicut Christi tempore floruit (Colon. 1593); Chrysanthi (Beat. Patr. Hierosolymorum) Historia et Descriptio Terroe Sanctoe, Urbisque Santoe Hierusalem (Venet. 1728) [this work is in Greek]; D'Anville, Dissert. sur l'Etendue de l'Ancienne Jerusalem (Paris, 1747); Thrupp, Ancient Jerusalem (Lond. 1855); Strong's Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels, Append. 2; Sepp, Jerusalem (Munich, 1863); Barclay, City of the Great King (Phila. 1858); Fergusson, Ancient Topography of Jerusalem [altogether astray] (Lond. 1847); Lewin, Jerusalem (London, 1861); Pierotti, Jerusalem Explored (London, 1864); Unruh, Das alte Jerusalem (Langens, 1861); Scholz, De Hierosolymoe situ (Bonn, 1835).

III. Modern City. —

1. Situation. — The following able sketch of the general position of Jerusalem is extracted from Dr. Robinson's Researches (1, 380-384):  “Jerusalem lies near the summit of a broad mountain ridge, extending without interruption from the plain of Esdraelon to a line drawn between the south end of the Dead Sea and the southeast corner of the Mediterranean; or, more properly, perhaps, it may be regarded as extending as far south as to Jebel Araif, in the Desert, where it sinks down at once to the level of the great western plateau. This tract, which is everywhere not less than from 20 to 25 geographical miles in breadth, is, in fact, high, uneven table land. It everywhere forms the precipitous western wall of the great valley, of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, while towards the west it sinks down by an offset into a range of lower hills, which lie between it and the great plain along the coast of the Mediterranean. The surface of this upper region is everywhere rocky, uneven, and mountainous, and is, moreover, cut up by deep valleys which run east or west on either side towards the Jordan or the Mediterranean. The line of division, or watershed, between the waters of these valleys a term which here applies almost exclusively to the waters of the rainy season follows for the most part the height of land along the ridge, yet not so but that the heads of the valleys, which run off in different directions, often interlap for a considerable distance. Thus, for example, a valley which descends to the Jordan often has its head a mile or two westward of the commencement of other valleys which run to the western sea.

“From the great plain of Esdraelon onwards towards the south, the mountainous country rises gradually, forming the tract anciently known as the mountains of Ephraim and Judah, until, in the vicinity of Hebron, it attains an elevation of nearly 3000 Paris feet above the level of the Mediterranean Sea. Further north, on a line drawn from the north end of the Dead Sea towards the true west, the ridge has an elevation of only about 2500 Paris feet, and here, close upon the watershed, lies the city of Jerusalem. Its mean geographical position is in lat. 31° 46' 43” N., and long. 350 13' E. from Greenwich.

“Six or seven miles north and northwest of the city is spread out the open plain or basin round about el-Jib (Gibeon), extending also towards el-Bireh (Beeroth), the waters of which flow off at its southeast part through the deep valley here called by the Arabs wady Beit Hanina, but to which the monks and travelers have usually given the name of the ‘Valley of Turpentine,' of the Terebinth, on the mistaken supposition that it is the ancient Valley of Elah. This great valley passes along in a southwest direction an hour or more west of Jerusalem, and finally opens out from the  mountains into the western plain, at the distance of six or eight hours southwest from the city, under the name of wady es-Surar. The traveler, on his way from Ramleh to Jerusalem, descends into and crosses this deep valley at the village of Kulonieh, on its western side, an hour and a half from the latter city. On again reaching the high ground on its eastern side, he enters upon an open tract sloping gradually downward towards the, east, and sees before him, at the distance of about two miles, the walls and domes of the holy city, and beyond them the higher ridge or summit of the Mount of Olives. The traveler now descends gradually towards the city along a broad swell of ground, having at some distance on his left the shallow northern part of the Valley of Jehoshaphat; close at hand, on his right, the basin which forms the beginning of the Valley of Hinnom. Farther down both these valleys become deep, narrow, and precipitous; that of Hinnom bends south and again east nearly at right angles, and unites with the other, which then continues its course to the Dead Sea. Upon the broad and elevated promontory within the fork of these two valleys lies the holy city. All around are higher hills; on the east, the Mount of Olives; on the south, the Hill of Evil Counsel, so called, rising directly from the Vale of Hinnom; on the west the ground rises gently, as above described, to the borders of the great wady; while on the north, a bend of the ridge, connected with the Mount of Olives, bounds the prospect at the distance of more than a mile. Towards the southwest the view is somewhat more open, for here lies the plain of Rephaim; commencing just at the southern brink of the Valley of Hinnom, and stretching off southwest, where it runs to the western sea. In the northwest, too, the eye reaches up along the upper part of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, and from many points can discern the Mosque of Neby Samwil, situated on a lofty ridge beyond the great wady, at the distance of two hours.

“The surface of the elevated promontory itself, on which the city stands, slopes somewhat steeply towards the east, terminating on the brink of the Valley of Jehoshaphat. From the northern part, near the present Damascus gate, a depression or shallow wady runs in a southern direction, and is joined by another depression or shallow wady (still easy to be traced) coming down from near the Jaffa gate. It then continues obliquely down the slope, but with a deeper bed, in a southern direction, quite to the Pool of Siloam and the Valley of Jehoshaphat. This is the ancient Tyropoeon. West of its lower part Zion rises loftily, lying mostly without the modern city; while on the east of the Tyropoeon lie Bezetha, Moriah, and Ophel,  the last a long and comparatively narrow ridge, also outside of the modern city, and terminating in a rocky point over the Pool of Siloam. These last three hills may strictly be taken as only parts of one and the same ridge. The breadth of the whole site of Jerusalem, from the brow of the Valley of Hinnom, near the Jaffa gate, to the brink of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, is about 1020 yards, or nearly half a geographical mile, of which distance 318 yards are occupied by the area of the great mosque el-Haram esh-Sherif. North of the Jaffa gate the city wall sweeps round more to the west, and increases the breadth of the city in that part.

“The country around Jerusalem is all of limestone formation, and not particularly fertile. The rocks everywhere come out above the surface, which in many parts is also thickly strewed with loose stones, and the aspect of the whole region is barren and dreary; yet the olive thrives here abundantly, and fields of grain are seen in the valleys and level places, but they are less productive than in the region of Hebron and Nablus. Neither vineyards nor fig trees flourish on the high ground around the city, though the latter are found in the gardens below Siloam, and very frequently in the vicinity of Bethlehem.”

“The elevation of Jerusalem is a subject of constant reference and exultation by the Jewish writers. Their fervid poetry abounds with allusions to its height, to the ascent thither of the tribes from all parts of the country. It was the habitation of Jehovah, from which ‘he looked upon all the inhabitants of the world' (Psa 33:14): its kings were ‘higher than the kings of the earth' (Psa 89:27). In the later Jewish literature of narrative and description this poetry is reduced to prose, and in the most exaggerated form. Jerusalem was so high that the flames of Jamnia were visible from it (2Ma 12:9). From the tower of Psephinus, outside the walls, could be discerned on the one hand the Mediterranean Sea, on the other the country of Arabia (Josephus, War, 5, 4, 3). Hebron could be seen from the roofs of the Temple (Lightfoot, Chor. Cent. 49). The same thing can be traced in Josephus' account of the environs of the city, in which he has exaggerated what is, the truth, a remarkable ravine [and has, by late excavations, been proved to have been much greater anciently], to a depth so enormous that the head swam and the eyes failed in gazing into its recesses (Ant. 15, 11, 5).”  The heights of the principal points in and round the city, above the Mediterranean Sea, as given by lieutenant Van de Velde, in the Memoir (p. 179, 180) accompanying his Map, 1858, are as follow:

FEET.

Northwest corner of the city (Kasr Jalud)....        2610

Mount Zion (Coenaculum) .......................            2537

Mount Moliah (Haram esh-Sherif) .........….          2429

Bridge over the Kedron, near Gethsemane ....         2281

Pool of Siloam ................................………..       2114

Bir-Eyub, at the confluence of Hinnom and Kedron.    1996

Mount of Olives, Church of Ascension on summit...    2724

A table of levels differing somewhat from these will be found in Barclay's City of the Great King, p. 103 sq.

2. Respecting the supply of the city with water, we learn from Strabo's account of the siege of Jerusalem by Pompey that the town was well provided with water within the walls, but that there was none in the environs (Geog. 16, 2, 40). Probably the Roman troops then suffered from want of water, as did other armies which laid siege to Jerusalem. In the narratives of all such sieges we never read of the besieged suffering from thirst, although driven to the most dreadful extremities and resources by hunger, while the besiegers are frequently described as suffering greatly from want of water, and as being obliged to fetch it from a great distance. The agonies of thirst sustained by the first Crusaders in their siege of Jerusalem will be remembered by most readers from the vivid picture drawn by Tasso, if not from the account furnished by William of Tyre. Yet when the town was taken plenty of water was found within it. This is a very singular circumstance, and is perhaps only in part explained by reference to the system of preserving water in cisterns, as at this day in Jerusalem. Solomon's aqueduct near Bethlehem to Jerusalem could have been no dependence, as its waters might easily have been cut off by the besiegers. All the wells, also, are now outside the town, and no interior fountain is mentioned save that of Hezekiah, which is scarcely fit for drinking. At the siege by Titus the well of Siloam may have been in possession of the Jews, i.e. within the walls; but at the siege by the Crusaders it was certainly held by the besieging Franks, and yet the latter perished from thirst, while the besieged had “ingentes copias aquae.” We  cannot here go through the evidence which by combination and comparison might throw some light on this remarkable question. There is, however, good ground to conclude that from very ancient times there has been under the Temple an unfailing source of water, derived by secret and subterraneous channels from springs to the west of the town, and communicating by other subterranean passages with the Pool of Siloam and the Fountain of the Virgin in the east of the town, whether they were within or without the walls of the town.

The existence of a perennial source of water below the Temple has always been admitted. Tacitus knew of it (Hist. 5, 12); and Aristeas, in describing the ancient Temple, informs us that “the supply of water was unfailing, inasmuch as there was an abundant natural fountain flowing in the interior, and reservoirs of admirable construction under ground, extending five stadia round the Temple, with pipes and conduits unknown to all except those to whom the service was intrusted, by which the water was brought to various parts of the Temple and again conducted off.” The Moslems also have constantly affirmed the existence of this fountain or cistern; but a reserve has always been kept up as to the means by which it is supplied. This reserve seems to have been maintained by the successive occupants of Jerusalem as a point of civic honor; and this fact alone intimates that there was danger to the town in its becoming known, and points to the fact that the supply came from without the city by secret channels, which it was of importance not to disclose. Yet we are plainly told in the Bible that Hezekiah “stopped the upper watercourse of Gihon, and brought it down to the west side of the city of David” (1Ki 1:33; 1Ki 1:38); from 2Ch 32:30, it seems that all the neighboring fountains were thus “stopped” or covered, and the brook which they had formed diverted by subterraneous channels into the town, for the express purpose of preventing besiegers from finding the “much water” which previously existed outside the walls (comp. also Ecclesiastes 48:17). Perhaps, likewise, the prophet Ezekiel (Eze 47:11) alludes to this secret fountain under the Temple when he speaks of waters issuing from the threshold of the Temple towards the east, and flowing down towards the desert as an abundant and beautiful stream. This figure may be drawn from the waters of the inner source under the Temple, being at the time of overflow discharged by the outlets at Siloam into the Kidron, which takes the eastward course thus described.  There are certainly wells, or rather shafts, in and near the Temple area, which are said to derive their waters through a passage of masonry four or five feet high, from a chamber or reservoir cut in the solid rock under the grand mosque, in which the water is said to rise from the rock into a basin at the bottom. The existence of this reservoir and source of water is affirmed by the citizens, and coincides with the previous intimations, but it must be left for future explorers to clear up all the obscurities in which the matter is involved. Even Dr. Barclay, who gave great attention to this subject, was unable fully to clear it up (City of the Great King, p. 293).

The pools and tanks of ancient Jerusalem were very abundant, and, each house being provided with what we may call a bottle-necked cistern for rainwater, drought within the city was rare; and history shows us that it was the besiegers, not the besieged, that generally suffered from want of water (Gul. Tyr. bk. 8, p. 7; De Waha, Labores Godfredi, p. 421), though occasionally this was reversed (Josephus, War, 5, 9, 4). Yet neither in ancient nor modern times could the neighborhood of Jerusalem be called “waterless,” as Strabo describes it (Geogr. 16, 2, 36). In summer the fields and hills around are verdureless and gray, scorched with months of drought, yet within a radius of seven miles there are some thirty or forty natural springs (Barclay's City of the Great King, p. 295). The artificial provision for a supply of water in Jerusalem in ancient times was perhaps the most complete and extensive ever undertaken for a city. Till lately this was not fully credited; but Barclay's, and, more recently Whitty's and Pierotti's subterraneous excavations have proved it. The aqueduct of Solomon (winding along for twelve miles and a quarter) pours the waters of the three immense pools into the enormous Temple wells, cut out like caverns in the rock; and the pools, which surround the city in all directions, supply to a great extent the want of a river or a lake (Traill's Josephus, vol. 1; Append. p. 57, 60). For a description of these, see Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 523 sq.

The ordinary means taken by the inhabitants to secure a supply of water have been described under the article CISTERN; for interesting details, see Raumer's Pelastina, p. 329-333; Robinson's Researches, 1, 479-516; Olin's Travels, 2, 168-181; and Williams' Holy City, 2, 453-502.

3. We present in this connection some additional remarks on the fortifications of the city. Dr. Robinson thinks that the wall of the new city, the AElia of Hadrian, nearly coincided with that of the present Jerusalem;  and the portion of Mount Zion which now lies outside would seem then also to have been excluded; for Eusebius and Cyril, in the 4th century, speak of the denunciation of the prophet being fulfilled, which describes Zion as “a plowed field” (Mic 3:2).

In the Middle Ages there appear to have been two gates on each side of the city, making eight in all a number not greatly short of that assigned in the above estimate to the ancient Jerusalem, and probably occupying nearly the places of the most important of the ancient ones.

On the west side were two gates, of which the principal was the Porta David, gate of David, often mentioned by the writers on the Crusades. It was called by the Arabs Bab el-Mihrab, and corresponds to the present Jaffa gate, or Bab el-Khulil. The other was the gate of the Fuller's Field (Porta Villoe Fullonis), so called from Isa 7:3. This seems to be the same which others call Porta Judiciaria, and which is described as being in the wall over against the church of the Holy Sepulchre, leading to Silo (Neby Samwil) and Gibeon. This seems to be that which the Arabian writers call Serb. There is no trace of it in the present wall.

On the north there were also two gates, and all the Middle-Age writers speak of the principal of them as the gate of St. Stephen, from the notion that the death of the protomartyr took place near it. This was also called the gate of Ephraim, in reference to its probable ancient name. Arabic writers called it Bab ‘Amud el-Ghurab, of which the present name, Bab el- 'Amud, is only a contraction. The present gate of St. Stephen is on the east of the city, and the scene of the martyrdom is now placed near it; but there is no account of the change. Further east was the gate of Benjamin (Porta Benjaminis), corresponding apparently to what is now called the gate of Herod.

On the east there seem to have been at least two gates. The northernmost is described by Adamnanus as a small portal leading down to the Valley of Jehoshaphat. It was called the gate of Jehoshaphat from the valley to which it led. It seems to be represented by the present gate of St. Stephen. The Arabian writers call it Bab el-Usbat, gate of the Tribes, being another form of the modern Arabic name Bab es-Subat. The present gate of St. Stephen has four lions sculptured over it on the outside, which, as well as the architecture, show that it existed before the present walls. Dr. Robinson suggests that the original “small portal” was rebuilt on a larger scale by the Franks when they built up the walls of the city, either in A.D. 1178 or  1239. The other gate is the famous Golden Gate (Porta aurea in the eastern wall of the Temple area. It is now called by the Arabs Bab ed- Dalhariyeh, but formerly Bab er-Rameh, “Gate of Mercy.” The name Golden Gate appears to have come from a supposed connection with one of the ancient gates of the Temple, which are said to have been covered with gold; but this name cannot be traced back beyond the historians of the Crusades. This gate is, from its architecture, obviously of Roman origin, and is conjectured to have belonged to the inclosure of the temple of Jupiter which was built by Hadrian upon Mount Moriah. The exterior is now walled up; but, being double, the interior forms within the area a recess, which is used for prayer by the Moslem worshipper. Different reasons are given for the closing of this gate. It was probably because it was found inconvenient that a gate to the mosque should be open in the exterior wall. Although not walled up, it was kept closed even when the Crusaders were in possession of the city, and only opened once a year, on Palm Sunday, in celebration of our Lord's supposed triumphal entry through it to the Temple.

Of all the towers with which the city was anciently adorned and defended, the most important is that of Hippicus, which Josephus, as we have already seen, assumed as the starting point in his description of all the walls of the city. Herod gave to it the name of a friend who was slain in battle. It was a quadrangular structure, twenty-five cubits on each side, and built up entirely solid to the height of thirty cubits. Above this solid part was a cistern twenty cubits; and then, for twenty-five cubits more, were chambers of various kinds, with a breastwork of two cubits and battlements of three cubits upon the top. The altitude of the whole tower was consequently eighty cubits. The stones of which it was built were very large, twenty cubits long by ten broad and five high and (probably in the upper part) were of white marble. Dr. Robinson has shown that this tower should be sought at the northwest corner of the upper city, or Mount Zion. This part, a little to the south of the Jaffa gate, is now occupied by the citadel. It is an irregular assemblage of square towers, surrounded on the inner side towards the city by a low wall, and having on the outer or west side a deep fosse. The towers which rise from the brink of the fosse are protected on that side by a low sloping bulwark or buttress, which rises from the bottom of the trench at an angle of forty-five degrees. This part bears evident marks of antiquity, and Dr. Robinson is inclined to ascribe these massive  outworks to the time of the rebuilding and fortifying of the city by Hadrian. This fortress is described by the Middle-Age historians as the tower or citadel of David. Within it, as the traveler enters the city by the Jaffa gate, the northeastern tower attracts his notice as bearing evident marks of higher antiquity than any of the others. This upper part is, indeed, modern, but the lower part is built of larger stones, beveled at the edges, and apparently still occupying their original places. This tower has been singled out by the Franks, and bears among them the name of the tower of David, while they sometimes give to the whole fortress the name of the castle of David. Taking all the circumstances into account, Dr. Robinson thinks that the antique lower portion of this tower is in all probability a remnant of the tower of Hippicus, which, as Josephus states, was left standing by Titus when he destroyed the city. This discovery, however, is not new, the identity having been advocated by Raumer and others before Dr. Robinson traveled. This view has been somewhat modified by Mr. Williams, who shows that the northwestern angle of the present citadel exactly corresponds in size and position to the description of Josephus, while other portions of the same general structure have been rebuilt upon the old foundations of the adjoining towers of Mariamne and Phasaelus (Holy City, 2, 14-16).

The present Damascus gate in particular, from its massive style and other circumstances, seems to have occupied a prominent point along the ancient “second wall” of the city. Connected with its structures are the immense underground quarries, on which, as well as out of which, the city may be said to be built. From them have been hewn, in past ages, the massive limestone blocks which appear in the walls and elsewhere. In these dark chambers one may, with the help of torches, wander for hours, scrambling over mounds of rubbish: now climbing into one chamber, now descending into another, noting the various cuttings, grooves, cleavages and hammer marks; and wondering at the different shapes bars here, slices there, boulders there, thrown up together in utter confusion. Only in one corner do we find a few drippings of water and a tiny spring; for these singular excavations, like the great limestone cave at Khureitun (beyond Bethlehem, probably Adullam), are entirely free from damp; and though the only bit of intercourse with the upper air is by the small twenty inch hole at the Damascus gate, through which the enterprising traveler wriggles into them like a serpent, yet the air is fresh and somewhat warm (Stewart's Tent and  Khan. p. 263-266). These are no doubt the subterranean retreats referred to by Josephus as occupied by the despairing Jews in the last days of Jerusalem (War, 6, 7, 3; 6, 8, 4); and to which Tasso alludes when relating the wizard's promise to conduct the “Soldan” through Godfrey's leaguer into the heart of the city (Gerus. Liber. 10, 29). The native name for the quarries is Magharet el-Kotton, the Cotton Cave. For a full description of these caverns, see Barclay, City of the Great King p. 460 sq.; Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 491 sq.; Wilson in the Ordnance Survey (1865, p. 63).

4. The following description of the present city is chiefly abridged from the excellent account of Dr. Olin (Travels, vol. 2, chap. 4). The general view of the city from the Mt. of Olives is mentioned more or less by all travelers as that from which they derive their most distinct and abiding impression of Jerusalem.

The summit of the Mount of Olives is about half a mile east from the city, which it completely overlooks, every considerable edifice and almost every house being visible. The city, seen from this point, appears to be a regular inclined plain, sloping gently and uniformly from west to east, or towards the observer, and indented by a slight depression or shallow vale, running nearly through the center in the same direction. The southeast corner of the quadrangle — or that may be assumed as the figure formed by the rocks — that which is nearest to the observer, is occupied by the mosque of Omar and its extensive and beautiful grounds. This is Mount Moriah, the site of Solomon's Temple; and the ground embraced in this inclosure occupies about an eighth of the whole modern city. It is covered with greensward, and planted sparingly with olive, cypress, and other trees, and it is certainly the most lovely feature of the town, whether we have reference to the splendid structures or the beautiful lawn spread out around them.

The southwest quarter, embracing that part of Mount Zion which is within the modern town, is to a great extent occupied by the Armenian convent, an enormous edifice, which is the only conspicuous object in this neighborhood. The northwest is largely occupied by the Latin convent, another very extensive establishment. About midway between these two convents is the castle or citadel, close to the Bethlehem gate, already mentioned. The northeast quarter of Jerusalem is but partially built up, and  it has more the aspect of a rambling agricultural village than that of a crowded city. The vacant spots here are green with gardens and olive trees. There is another large vacant tract along the southern wall, and west of the Haram, also covered with verdure. Near the center of the city also appear two or three green spots, which are small gardens. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre is the only conspicuous edifice in this vicinity, and its domes are striking objects. There are no buildings which, either from their size or beauty, are likely to engage the attention. Eight or ten minarets mark the position of so many mosques in different parts of the town, but they are only noticed because of their elevation above the surrounding edifices. Upon the same principle the eye rests for a moment upon a great number of low domes, which form the roofs of the principal dwellings, and relieve the heavy uniformity of the flat plastered roofs which cover the greater mass of more humble habitations. Many ruinous piles and a thousand disgusting objects are concealed or disguised by the distance. Many inequalities of surface, which exist to so great an extent that there is not a level street of any length in Jerusalem, are also unperceived.

From the same commanding point of view a few olive and fig trees are seen in the lower part of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, and scattered over the side of Olivet from its base to the summit. They are sprinkled yet more sparingly on the southern side of the city on Mounts Zion and Ophel. North of Jerusalem the olive plantations appear more numerous as well as thriving, and thus offer a grateful contrast to the sunburned fields and bare rocks which predominate in this landscape. The region west of the city appears to be destitute of trees. Fields of stunted wheat, yellow with the drought rather than white for the harvest, are seen on all sides of the town.

Within the gates, however, the city is full of inequalities. The passenger is always ascending or descending. There are no level streets, and little skill or labor has been employed to remove or diminish the inequalities which nature or time has produced. Houses are built upon mountains of rubbish, which are probably twenty, thirty, or fifty feet above the natural level, and the streets are constructed with the same disregard to convenience, with this difference, that some slight attention is paid to the possibility of carrying. off surplus water. The streets are, without exception, narrow, seldom exceeding eight or ten feet in breadth. The houses often meet, and in some instances a building occupies both sides of the street, which runs under a succession of arches barely high enough to permit an equestrian to pass under them. A canopy of old mats or of plank is suspended over the  principal streets when not arched. This custom had its origin, no doubt, in the heat of the climate, which is very intense in summer, and it gives a gloomy aspect to all the most thronged and busy parts of the city. These covered ways are often pervaded by currents of air when a perfect calm prevails in other places. The principal streets of Jerusalem run nearly at right angles to each other. Very few, if any of them, bear names among the native population. They are badly paved, being merely laid irregularly with raised stones, with a deep square channel for beasts of burden in the middle; but the steepness of the ground contributes to keep them cleaner than in most Oriental cities.

The houses of Jerusalem are substantially built of the limestone of which the whole of this part of Palestine is composed: not usually hewn, but broken into regular forms, and making a solid wall of very respectable appearance. For the most part, there are no windows next to the street, and the few which exist for the purposes of light or ventilation are completely masked by casements and lattice work. The apartments receive their light from the open courts within. The ground plot is usually surrounded by a high inclosure, commonly forming the walls of the house only, but sometimes embracing a small garden and some vacant ground. The rainwater which falls upon; the pavement is carefully conducted, by means of gutters, into cisterns, where it is preserved for domestic uses. The people of Jerusalem rely chiefly upon these reservoirs for their supply of this indispensable article. Every house has its cistern, and the larger habitations are provided with a considerable number of them, which occupy the ground story or cells formed for the purpose below it. Stone is employed in building for all the purposes to which it can possibly be applied, and Jerusalem is hardly more exposed to accidents by fire than a quarry or subterranean cavern. The floors, stairs, etc., are of stone, and the ceiling is usually formed by a coat of plaster laid upon the stones, which at the same time form the roof and the vaulted top of the room. Doors, sashes, and a few other appurtenances, are all that can usually be afforded of a material so expensive as wood. The little timber which is used is mostly brought from Mount Lebanon, as in the time of Solomon. A rough, crooked stick of the fig tree, or some gnarled, twisted planks made of the olive the growth of Palestine, are occasionally seen. In other respects, the description in the article HOUSE will afford a sufficient notion of those in Jerusalem. A large number of houses in Jerusalem are in a dilapidated and ruinous state. Nobody seems to make repairs so long as his dwelling does  not absolutely refuse him shelter and safety. If one room tumbles about his ears he removes into another, and permits rubbish and vermin to accumulate as they will in the deserted halls. Tottering staircases are propped to prevent their fall; and when the edifice becomes untenable, the occupant seeks another a little less ruinous, leaving the wreck to a smaller or more wretched family, or more probably, to a goatherd and his flock. Habitations which have a very respectable appearance as seen from the street, are often found, upon entering them, to be little better than heaps of ruins.

Nothing of this would be suspected from the general appearance of the city as seen from the various commanding points without the walls, nor from anything that meets the eye in the streets. Few towns in the East offer a more imposing spectacle to the view of the approaching stranger. He is struck with the height and massiveness of the walls, which are kept in perfect repair, and naturally produce a favorable opinion of the wealth and comfort which they are designed to protect. Upon entering the gates, he is apt, after all that has been published about the solitude that reigns in the streets, to be surprised at meeting large numbers of people in the chief thoroughfares, almost without exception decently clad. A longer and more intimate acquaintance with Jerusalem, however, does not fail to correct this too favorable impression, and demonstrate the existence and general prevalence of the poverty and even wretchedness which must result in every country from oppression, from the absence of trade, and the utter stagnation of all branches of industry. Considerable activity is displayed in the bazaars, which are supplied scantily, like those of other Eastern towns, with provisions, tobacco, coarse cottons, and other articles of prime necessity. A considerable business is still done in beads, crosses, and other sacred trinkets, which are purchased to a vast amount by the pilgrims who annually throng the holy city. The support and even the existence of the considerable population of Jerusalem depend upon this transient patronage a circumstance to which a great part of the prevailing poverty and degradation is justly ascribed. The worthless articles employed in this pitiful trade are, almost without exception, brought from other places, especially Hebron and Bethlehem the former celebrated for its baubles of glass, the latter chiefly for rosaries, crucifixes, and other toys made of mother-of-pearl, olive wood, black stones from the Dead Sea, etc. These are eagerly bought up by the ignorant pilgrims, sprinkled with holy water by the priests, or consecrated by some other religious mummery, and  carried off in triumph and worn as ornaments to charm away disease and misfortune, and probably to be buried with the deluded enthusiast in his coffin, as a sure passport to eternal blessedness. With the departure of the swarms of pilgrims, however, even this poor semblance of active industry and prosperity deserts the city. With the exception of some establishments for soap making, a tannery, and a very few weavers of coarse cottons, there do not appear to be any manufacturers properly belonging to the place. Agriculture is almost equally wretched, and can only give employment to a few hundred people. The masses really seem to be without any regular employment. A considerable number, especially of the Jews, professedly live on charity. Many Christian pilgrims annually find their way hither on similar resources, and the approaches to the holy places are thronged with beggars, who in piteous tones demand alms in the name of Christ and the blessed Virgin. The general condition of the population is that of abject poverty. A few Turkish officials, ecclesiastical, civil, and military; some remains of the old Mohammedan aristocracy once powerful and rich, but now much impoverished and nearly extinct; together with a few tradesmen in easy circumstances, form almost the only exceptions to the prevailing indigence. There is not a single broker among the whole population, and not the smallest sum can he obtained on the best bills of exchange short of Jaffa or Beirut.

5. The population of Jerusalem has been variously estimated by different travelers, some making it as high as 30,000, others as low as 12,000. All average of these estimates would make it somewhere between 12,000 and 15,000; but the Egyptian system of taxation and of military conscription in Syria has lately furnished more accurate data than had previously been obtainable, and on these Dr. Robinson estimates the population at not more than 1l,500, distributed thus:

Mohammedans ........................     4,500

Jews ..............................……..  3,000

Christians..…...................….....   3,500

                        11,000

If to this be added something for possible omissions, and the inmates of the convents, the standing population, exclusive of the garrison, would not exceed 11,500. Dr. Barclay is very minute in regard to the Christian sects, and his details show that Robinson greatly underestimated them when he gave their number as 3500. Barclay shows them to be in all 4518 (p. 588).  The latest estimate of the population is that of Pierotti, who gives the entire sum as 20,330, subdivided as follows: Christian sects, 5068; Moslems (Arabs and Turks), 7556; Jews, 7706. The language most generally spoken among all classes of the inhabitants is the Arabic. Schools are rare, and consequently facility in leading is not often met with. The general condition of the inhabitants has already been indicated. The Turkish governor of the town holds the rank of pasha, but is responsible to the pasha of Beirfit. The government is somewhat milder than before the period of the Egyptian dominion; but it is said that the Jewish and Christian inhabitants at least have ample cause to regret the change of masters, and the American missionaries lament that change without reserve (Am. Bib. Repos. for 1843). Yet the Moslems reverence the same spots which the Jews and Christians account holy, the holy sepulchre only excepted: and this exception arises from their disbelief that Christ was crucified, or buried, or rose again. Formerly there were in Palestine monks of the Benendictine and Augustine orders, and of those of St. Basil and St. Anthony; but since 1304 there have been none but Franciscans, who have charge of the Latin convent and the holy places. They resided on Mount Zion till A.D. 1561, when the Turks allowed them the monastery of St. Salvador, which they now occupy. They had formerly a handsome revenue out of all Roman Catholic countries, but these sources have fallen off since the French Revolution, and the establishment is said to be poor and deeply in debt. The expenses arise from the duty imposed upon the convent of entertaining pilgrims, and the cost of maintaining the twenty convents belonging to the establishment of the Terra Santa is estimated at 40,000 Spanish dollars a year. Formerly it was much higher, in consequence of the heavy exactions of the Turkish government. Burckhardt says that the brotherhood paid annually £12,000 to the pasha of Damascus. But the Egyptian government relieved them from these heavy charges, and imposed instead a regular tax on the property possessed. For the buildings and lands in and around Jerusalem the annual tax was fixed at 7000 piastres, or 350 Spanish dollars. It is probable that the restored Turkish government has not yet, in this respect, recurred to its old oppressions. The convent contains fifty monks, half Italians and half Spaniards. In it resides the intendant or the principal of all the convents, with the rank of abbot, and the title of guardian of Mount Zion and customs of the Holy Land. He is always an Italian, and has charge of all the spiritual affairs of the Roman Catholics in the Holy Land. There is also a president or vicar, who takes the place of the guardian in case of absence or death: he was formerly a Frenchman, but  is now either an Italian or Spaniard. The procurator, who manages their temporal affairs, is always a Spaniard. A council, called Discretorium, composed of these officials and three other monks, has the general management of both spiritual and temporal matters. Much of the attention of the order is occupied, and much of its expense incurred, in entertaining pilgrims and in the distribution of alms. The native Roman Catholics live around the convent, on which they are wholly dependant. They are native Arabs, and are said to be descended from converts in the times of the Crusades.

There is a Greek patriarch of Jerusalem, but he usually resides at Constantinople, and is represented in the holy city by one or more vicars, who are bishops residing in the great convent near the church of the Holy Sepulchre. At present the vicars are the bishops of Lydda, Nazareth, and Kerek (Petra), assisted by the other bishops resident in the convent. In addition to thirteen monasteries in Jerusalem, they possess the convent of the Holy Cross, near Jerusalem; that of St. Helena; between Jerusalem and Bethlehem; and that of St. John, between Jerusalem and the Dead Sea. All the monks of the convents are foreigners. The Christians of the Greek rite who are not monks are all native Arabs, with their native priests, who are allowed to perform the Church services in their mother tongue the Arabic.

The Armenians in Jerusalem have a patriarch, with three convents and 100 monks. They have also convents at Bethlehem, Ramleh, and Jaffa. Few of the Armenians are natives: they are mostly merchants, and among the wealthiest inhabitants of the place, and their convent in Jerusalem is deemed the richest in the Levant. Their church of St. James, upon Mount Zion, is very showy in its decorations, but void of taste. The Coptic Christians at Jerusalem are only some monks residing in the convent of es- Sultan, on the north side of the pool of Hezekiah. There is also a convent of the Abyssinians, and one belonging to the Jacobite Syrians.

The estimate of the number of the Jews in Jerusalem at 3000 is given by Dr. Robinson on the authority of Mr. Nicolayson, the resident missionary to the Jews; yet in the following year (1839) the Scottish deputation set them down at six or seven thousand on the same authority. (See Dr. Barclay's estimate above.) They inhabit a distinct quarter of the town, between Mount Zion and Mount Moriah. This is the worst and dirtiest part of the holy city, and that in which the plague never fails to make its first appearance. Few of the Jerusalem Jews are natives, and most of them come  from foreign parts to die in the city of their fathers' sepulchres. The greater proportion of them are from different parts of the Levant, and appear to be mostly of Spanish and Polish origin. Few are from Germany, or understand the German language. They are, for the most part, wretchedly poor, and depend in a great degree for their subsistence upon the contributions of their brethren in different countries. These contributions vary considerably in amount in different years, and often occasion much dissatisfaction in their distribution (see the Narrative of the Scottish deputation, p. 148). An effort, however, is now making in Europe for the promotion of Jewish agriculture in Palestine, and a society formed for that purpose, under whose auspices several Jewish families have emigrated to their sacred fatherland, and are engaged in the culture of the productions for which the soil was anciently so famous. Prominent among these philanthropic exertions are those of Sir Moses Montefiore, of London, who has established a farm in the vicinity of Jerusalem for the benefit of his Jewish brethren (Benjamin, Eight Years in Asia and Africa, p. 34). Under the reforms and religious toleration introduced by the present sultan an amelioration of the condition of the Jewish and Christian inhabitants of Jerusalem may be expected. It should also be added that European enterprise has projected a railway from Jaffa to Jerusalem as one of the fruits of the alliance during the late war, and on its completion an additional impulse will doubtless be given to this ancient metropolis by the facilities of travel and transportation thus afforded.

6. The most recent and complete works on modern Jerusalem are Dr. Titus Tobler's Zwei Bucher Topographie von Jerusalem und seine Umgebungen (Berl. 1853, et seq.), which contains (vol. 1, p. 11-104) a nearly full list of all works by travelers and others on the subject, with brief criticisms (continued in an appendix to his Dritte Wanderung, Gotha, 1859, and greatly enlarged in his Bibliographia Geographica Paloestinoe, Lpz. 1867), and Prof. Sepp's Jerusalem und das Heilige Land (München, 1864, 2 vols.), which almost exhaustively treats the sacred topography from the Roman Catholic point of view. The city has been more or less described by nearly all who have visited the Holy Land; see especially Bartlett's Walks about Jerusalem (Lond. 1842). The map of Van de Velde (Gotha, 1858), with a memoir by Tobler, has remained the most exact one of the present city till the publication of the English Ordnance Survey (London 1864-5, 1866; N.Y., 1871), which contains minute details. The most perfect pictorial representation is the Panorama of Jerusalem, taken from the  Mount of Olives, in three large aquatint engravings, with a key, published in Germany (Munich, 1850). Many new and interesting details have been furnished by the scientific surveys and subterranean explorations of the engineers lately employed under the auspices of the “Palestine Exploration Fund” of England, the results of which are detailed in their successive Quarterly Statements, and popularly summed up in their volume entitled Jerusalem Recovered (Lond. and N.Y. 1871, 8vo). SEE PALESTINE.

## Jerusalem Creed[[@Headword:Jerusalem Creed]]

             The early churches of the sacred city are now generally acknowledged to have had a creed of their own, which some believe to have been the production of Cyril of Jerusalem, while others claim that it originated before his time. It has been preserved in the catechetical discourses of Cyril, and reads as follows: I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, begotten; of the Father before all worlds; very God by whom all things were made, who was incarnate and made man, crucified and buried, and the third day ascended into the heavens, and sat down at the right hand of the Father, and is coming to judge quick and dead. And in the Holy Ghost, the Paraclete, who spake by the prophets; and in one holy catholic Church; and resurrection of the flesh; and in life everlasting.” See Library of the Fathers (Oxford transl. 1838), 2, 52 sq.; Migne, Patrologia Groeca, 33, 505 sq.; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 474 ,

## Jerusalem, Councils Of[[@Headword:Jerusalem, Councils Of]]

             (Concilia Hierosolymitana). Much depends, in determining the number of councils held, on the significance of the name. SEE COUNCIL. We have room here only for the principal councils held at Jerusalem. They are,

I. The first ecclesiastical council mentioned in Acts 15, which is believed to have been held during the year 47, under James the Less, bishop of Jerusalem, in consequence of the dispute in the Church of Antioch on the propriety of dispensing with circumcision (probably provoked by Judaizers). By the decisions of this council, the faithful were commanded to abstain

(1) from meats which had been offered to idols (so as not” even to appear to countenance the worship of the heathen),

(2) from blood and strangled things (probably to avoid giving offense to the prejudices of the Jewish converts), and

(3) from fornication (the prevailing vice of the Gentiles). SEE COUNCIL, APOSTOLICAL, AT JERUSALEM.

II. In 335, when many bishops had met in the sacred city to consecrate the church of the Holy Sepulchre, Constantine directed that an effort should be made to heal the divisions of the Church. It was by this council that Arius was restored to fellowship, and allowed to return to Alexandria. Eusebius (Vit. Const. 4, 47) pronounces it the largest he knew next to the Council of Nice, with which he even compares it.

III. One in 349, by Maximus, bishop of Jerusalem, and some sixty bishops upon the return of Athanasius (q.v.) to Alexandria, after the death of Gregory. They rescinded the decree which had been published against him, and drew up a synodal letter to the Church in Alexandria.

IV. Held in 399, in consequence of a synodal letter from Theophilus of Alexandria on the decrees passed in council against the Origenists. They concurred in the judgment, and stated their resolution not to hold communion with any who denied the equality of the Son and the Father. SEE ORIGEN; SEE TRINITY.

V. In 453, on Juvenal's restoration, by the emperor Marcian, to the bishopric of Jerusalem (from which he had been deposed on account of his concurrence in the oppression of Flavianus in the Latrocinium at Ephesus), and the expulsion of Theodosius, a Eutychian heretic, who had become bishop by prejudicing the empress Eudoxia and the monks against Juvenal (q.v.).

VI. Held in 518, under the patriarch John III, and composed of thirty- three bishops. They addressed a synodal letter to John of Constantinople indorsing the decisions of the council of that city, and condemned the Severians and Eutychians.

VII. About 536, under patriarch Peter, attended by forty-five bishops. They indorsed the acts of the Council of Constantinople (536) concerning the deposition of the Monothelite patriarch Anthymus and the election of Menai in his stead. The Acephalists were also condemned by them.

VIII. Held in 553, where the acts of the fifth ecumenical council of Constantinople were received by all the bishops of Palestine with the exception of Alexander of Abilene, who was therefore deposed.

IX. In 634. In this council the patriarch Sophronius addressed a synodal letter to the different patriarchs, informing them of his election, and urging them to oppose the Monothelites.

X. In 1443, under Arsenius of Caesarea, ordering that no ordination of a clerk should be considered valid if performed by a bishop in communion with Rome, unless the clerk proved to the orthodox bishops his adhesion to the faith of the Greek Church.

XI. By far the most important council held there was that of 1672. It was convened by Dositheus, at that time patriarch of Jerusalem. There were present fifty-three prelates of his diocese, including the ex-patriarch Nectarius; six metropolitans, archimandrates, presbyters, deacons, and monks. The council called itself ἀσπις ὀρθοδοξίας ἣ ἀπολογία. Its  main object was to eradicate Calvinism, which threatened to find many adherents amongst this branch of the Eastern Church, into which it had been introduced by Cyrillus Lucaris. The declarations of belief put forth by this council gave rise to considerable trouble in the Eastern Church. Many charged it with Romanistic tendencies, especially because it avoided all utterance on points of difference between the two churches; and it was claimed, also, that their confession directly opposed the confession of Cyril. (Consult Harduin, 11, 179; Kimmel, Libri Symbolici eccles. Orient.) See Mansi, Suppl. 1, coll. 271; Baronius, 4, Conc. p. 1588; 5, Conc. p. 275, 739; Mansi, note to Raynaldus, 9, 420; Landon, Man. Councils, p. 271 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 6, 501 sq.

## Jerusalem, Friends Of[[@Headword:Jerusalem, Friends Of]]

             is the name of a fanatical sect in Wurtemberg who claim it to be the duty of the believers of the Bible to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem, and to congregate there, according to Ezekiel 40 and sq.

## Jerusalem, Johann Friedrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Jerusalem, Johann Friedrich Wilhelm]]

             a German theologian — one of the best apologetic and practical theologians of the last century, was born at Osnabruck Nov. 22, 1709, and was educated at the Universities of Leipzig and Wittenberg; at the latter he took his master's degree. Disinclined to enter the ministry, for which he had prepared himself, and too young to enter the ranks of academical instructors, he went to the Low Countries, and studied at Leyden, where he enjoyed the counsels of such men as Albert Schultens, Peter Burman, etc. He sought and secured the friendship of the leading minds of the different Christian denominations of Holland, and learned to appreciate men out of the pale of his own band. After his return to his native place, still only twenty-four years old, he received the most flattering offers, one of which was a position at the newly created University of Göttingen, which he inclined to accept. Fearing that he might not be thoroughly prepared, he again set out on a journey, this time to spend a year of further preparatory study in England, more especially at London. He there became acquainted with the master theologians of that age and country. Thomas Sherlock, Daniel Waterland, Samuel Clarke freely admitted the young scholar to their studies, and so interested became he in English theology that he remained there three years and declined to go to Göttingen. In 1740 he returned to Germany, and was appointed tutor and preacher of prince Charles William Ferdinand of Brunswick. In 1743 he was appointed provost of the  monasteries of St. Crucis and AEgidi; in 1749 he was made abbot of Marienthal, and in 1752 abbot of the convent of Riddagshausen, a theological training school of the Brunswick ministry, with which he remained associated for two scores of years, and in which he labored earnestly to promote especially the religious spirit of the young preachers. Indeed, so well were his labors performed, that a late biographer of Jerusalem is found to say that in no small measure the religious spirit of Brunswick of our day is due to the work which he performed at this institution. In 1771 he became vice-president of the consistory of Wolfenbuttel. In the latter part of his life he was severely afflicted by the suicide of his son (1775), who had gone to Wetzlar to practice law. Jerusalem died Sept. 2, 1789. His most important work, Betrachtunqen u. d. fornehmsten Warheiten der Religion, written for the instruction of the hereditary prince of Brunswick (Braunsch. 1768-79, 1785, 1795, 2 vols.), has been translated into most European languages. Of his other works, we notice two collections of sermon (Braunsch. 1745-53, 1788-89); for a full list, see Doring's D. deutschen Kanzelredner d. 18 u. 19 Jahrhunderts; Jerusalems Selbstbiographie (Braun. 1791). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. (Adelung's Addendda), s.v.; Dorner, Geschichte der Protest. Theolog. bk. 2, divis. 3, § 1 Tholuck. Gesch. des Rationalismus, pt. 1; Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent. (see Index); Zeitschr. hist. Theol. 1869, p. 530 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Jerusalem, Knights Of[[@Headword:Jerusalem, Knights Of]]

             The possession of Jerusalem by a Christian power during the period of the Latin kings (see above, history of Jerusalem), gave birth to the two great orders of knighthood, that of the Temple, and that of St. John of  Jerusalem; the former of which was distributed throughout Europe, and the latter — known also under the name of Knights Hospitallers (q.v.) — first fixed themselves at Rhodes, and afterwards dwindled into the little society of the Knights of Malta (q.v.). The Teutonic order sprung up at Acre in 1191, and its grand masters, who became hereditary, were the ancestors of the house of Brandenburg and the kings of Prussia. SEE TEMPLARS.

## Jerusalem, New[[@Headword:Jerusalem, New]]

             the symbolic name of the Christian Church; also called “the Bride, the Lamb's wife” (Rev 21:2-21; Rev 3:12). The apostle, from the summit of a high mountain, beheld, in a pictorial symbol of scenic representation, a city resplendent with celestial brightness, which seemed to descend from the heavens to the earth. It was built upon terraces, one rising above another, each terrace having its distinct wall supporting or encircling it: and thus, although each wall was only 144 cubits = 252 feet high, the height of the whole city was equal to its diameter. This was stated to be a square of about 400 miles; or 12,000 stadia = about 1600 miles in circumference — of course a mystical number, denoting that the city was capable of holding almost countless myriads of inhabitants. In its general form, the symbolic city presents a striking resemblance to that of the new city in Ezekiel 40-48. The pictorial symbol must be regarded as the representation not of a place or state, but of the Church as a society, the “body of Christ” (Eph 5:23-30; Gal 4:26). As Jerusalem and Zion are often used for the inhabitants and faithful worshippers, so the new Jerusalem is emblematical of the Church of God, part on earth and part in heaven. To suppose the invisible world to be exclusively referred to would deprive the contrast between the Law and the Gospel economy, Sinai and Zion, of its appositeness and force. Moreover, the distinction between “the general assembly of the enrolled citizens,” and “the spirits of the just made perfect” (Heb 12:22-24), can be explained only by interpreting the former of the Church militant, or the body of Christ on earth, and the latter of the Church triumphant in heaven. Thus we see why the New Jerusalem was beheld, like Jacob's ladder, extending from earth to heaven. SEE ZION.

## Jerusalem, New, Church[[@Headword:Jerusalem, New, Church]]

             SEE NEW-JERUSALEM CHURCH.

## Jerusalem, Patriarchate Of[[@Headword:Jerusalem, Patriarchate Of]]

             SEE PATRIARCHATE OF JERUSALEM.

## Jerusalem, Synod Of, 1672[[@Headword:Jerusalem, Synod Of, 1672]]

             Of all synods which were held at Jerusalem since the apostles' time this is the most important. The doctrines of Cyril Lucar (q.v.) were condemned by his successor, Cyril of Berrhoe, at the Council of Constantinople in 1638, and again by the next patriarch, Parthenius, at the Synod of Jassy in 1642. The metropolitan of Kiew, Petrus Mogilas, also found it necessary to protest against these doctrines; and his confession, ὀρθόδοξος ὁμολογία τῆς πίστεως τῆς καθολικῆς καὶ ἀποστολικῆς ἐκκλεσίας τῆς ἀνατολικῆς, was sanctioned, in 1643, by the patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Moscow. Thus an effective barrier was erected against the Calvinistic invasions of the orthodoxy of the Eastern Church. Nevertheless, both the Reformed and the Roman Catholic theologians continued to hint that the Greek Church was leaning respectively either this or that way. In the controversy between the Reformed minister, Jean Claude, and the Jansenists, Nicole and Arnauld, concerning the eucharist and transubstantiation, the former alleged, in support of his views, the dogma of the Eastern Church, such as it appeared in its oldest form, and such as it had been revived by Cyril Lucarm; while the latter appealed to the dogma of the Eastern Church in its oecumenical form. In 1660 the patriarch of Jerusalem, Nectarius, published a book against Claude, and in 1672 his successor, Dosithens, convened a synod at Jerusalem for the purpose of still further defending the orthodoxy of the Eastern Church. The synod was attended by sixty-eight representatives, and resulted in the so-called Shield of Orthodoxy, March 20, 1672, one of the most important confessional works of the Eastern Church, the full title of which is, Α᾿σπὶς ὀρθοδοξίας, ἢ ἀπολογία καὶ ἔλεγχος πρὸς τοὺς διασύροντας τὴν ἀνατολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν αἱρετικῶς φρονεῖν ἐν  τοῖς περὶ θεοῦ καὶ τῶν θείων, ὡς κακοφρονοῦσιν ουτοι αὐτοὶ οἱ Καλουῖνοι δηλονότι. The first part is directed against the Calvinists, and contains a strong condemnation of the views ascribed to Cyril Lucar, and at the same time an adroit vindication of him personally, flatly denying that he ever held such opinions, ever wrote the books containing them, etc. The second part is critico-dogmatical, and presents a full confession of the Orthodox Greek faith in the form of a refutation of the theses of Cyril. This second part, or σύντομος ὁμολογία, treats in eighteen decretaa and four questiones the following subjects:

1. Trinity;

2. The holy Scriptures and their interpretation by the Church;

3. Predestination;

4. Origin of the evil;

5. Relation of divine Providence to the evil;

6. Original sin;

7. Incarnation of the Son of God;

8. The mediatorship of Christ and the saints;

9. Faith acting in charity;

10. Church and episcopacy;

11. Church membership;

12. Infallibility of the Church;

13. Justification by faith and works;

14. Ability of the natural and of the regenerated man;

15. Seven sacraments;

16. Infant baptism;

17. Eucharist;

18. State after death. The four quaestiones are:

1. Can all Christians read the Bible?

2. Is the Bible conspicuous for all?

3. What constitutes the holy Scriptures? (acceptance of the apocryphal books);

4. What is to be believed concerning images and veneration of the saints?

The synodical acts were first published in Greek and Latin, Paris, 1676, and again in 1678. The best editions are found in Harduin, Acta Concil.  11:179 sq., and in Kimmel, Monumenta Fidei Eccl. Orientalis (Jena, 1850). See also Gass, Symbolik der griechischen Kirche (Berlin, 1872), page 79 sq.; Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, 1:61-67; Plitt-Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Jerusalem, The New See Of St. James In[[@Headword:Jerusalem, The New See Of St. James In]]

             The city, sacred alike to the Jew, the Gentile, and the Turk, never felt the influence of Protestant teachings until the opening of the present era, and, strange to say, the destitute condition of the Jews first caused the appointment of two missionaries to Palestine. These were sent in 1818 by the North American Missionary Society, of Boston. In Europe, no action was taken until 1832: in this year the London Jewish Missionary Society also entered the field. In 1840, at last, the expedition of the great European Powers to the East gave rise to the hope that, though Protestantism might not immediately secure a strong foothold, the power of the Mohammedans at least would be broken, and an opening be made for Christian influences on the inhabitants of the sacred land. The great ambition of king Frederick William IV of Prussia was to establish a Protestant bishopric in the holy city; and when, at the ratification (July 15, 1840) of the treaty between the Christian and Mussulman Powers, he failed to obtain the desired support for his propitiation in favor of entire religious liberty for Eastern Christians, he dispatched a special embassy to the queen of England, the archbishop of Canterbury, and the bishop of London (recognizing in them the spiritual heads of the English Church), and proposed a plan for these two great Protestant nations Prussia and England — to establish and support in common a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem, which should be equally shared in (i.e. alternately) by both the German Evangelical and the Anglican churches. “It was anticipated,” says Dr. Hagenbach (Church Hist. 18th and 13th Cent. 2, 397 sq.), “that by this means Protestantism would be more firmly established, and an important center formed for missionary labors.

While Prussia had formally united with England in the attainment of great ecclesiastical ends, it now seemed that England, by the position which Providence hall given her, was adapted to the realization of this plan; and the influence which she had gained as a European Power in the East and in Jerusalem, encouraged the hope without, while it was inwardly strengthened by the fixed forms of her ecclesiastical character, and by the halo of her episcopal dignity.” Of course, people differed in their opinion concerning the proposition. There were many eminent German theologians who doubted the wisdom of affiliating with the English Church, which they decried as one of exterior formalism, etc., while, amongst the English,  many hesitated to cast in their lot with German rationalistic divines. But the plan was, after all, adopted by the higher clergy of England, as well it might be, for it secured to them not only the first selection, but Prussia also stipulated that the bishopric to be formed at the Church of St. James, in Jerusalem, should be after the plan of the Established Church in England, and that the stationed bishop, though he be a German, should receive his appropriate consecration at the hands of the primate of the Anglican Church (the archbishop of Canterbury), and subscribe to the 39 articles of the Establishment. The plea which the English clergy made on its adoption was that it gave rise to the hope of bringing about by this means a reconciliation between the two denominations: the archbishop even expressed, on the occasion, the hope that this would lead to “a unity of discipline as well as of doctrine between our own Church and the less perfectly constituted of the Protestant churches of Europe.” The endowment of the bishopric was fixed at £30,000 sterling, to insure the bishop a yearly income of £1200. The bishop was to be named alternately by England and Prussia, the primate of England, however, having the right to veto the nomination of the latter.

The protection to be afforded to the German Evangelists is provided for by the ordinances of 1841-2, containing the following specifications: 1st. The bishop will take the German congregation under his protection, and afford them all the assistance in his power. 2d. He will be assisted by competent German ministers, ordained according to the ritual of the Church of England, and required to yield him obedience. 3d. The liturgy is to be taken from the received liturgies of the Prussian Church, carefully revised by the primate. 4th. The rite of confirmation is to be administered according to the form of the English Church. In the meanwhile, an act of Parliament, under date of Oct. 5, 1841, decided that persons could be consecrated bishops of the Church of England in foreign countries without thereby becoming subjects of the crown, but that such would also take the oath of allegiance to the archbishop, in order that they, and such deacons and ministers as they might ordain, may have the right to fulfill the same functions in England and Ireland.

In consequence, Dr. M'Caul, of Ireland, having declined the appointment, Dr. Michael Salomon Alexander, professor of Hebrew and Rabbinical literature at Christ's College, London, a converted Jew, and formerly a Prussian subject (having been born in Polish Prussia in 1799), was made first incumbent of the new bishopric. He died Nov. 23, 1845, near Cairo. His successor was Samuel Gobat, of Cremine, canton Berne, a student of the Basle Mission House, nominated by Prussia, and experienced  for missionary labors by his residence in Abyssinia. Since then, the news from Jerusalem has been gratifying. Jan. 21, 1849, a newly-created Evangelical church, called Christ Church, situated on Mount Zion, was dedicated. The Gospel is preached there in Hebrew, English, German, French, Spanish, and Arabic. Belonging to it are a burial ground; a school attended by the children of Jews, Mohammedans, and different Christian denominations; a hospital for the Jews, in which they have an opportunity of hearing the Scriptures; a hospital for proselytes, etc., which is attended to by deaconesses; a house of industry for proselytes, and an industrial school for Jewish females. The number of Jewish converts averages from seven to nine annually. In consequence of the firman granting to Protestants the same rights as are possessed by other churches, they have established small schools in Bethlehem, Jaffa, Nablus, and Nazareth.

For accurate accounts, see Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 503 sq.; Abeken, Das evangelische Bisthum in Jerusalem (Berlin, 1842). (J.H.W.)

## Jerusha[[@Headword:Jerusha]]

             (Heb. Yerusha', יְרוּשָׁא, possession; Sept. Ι᾿ερουσά), the daughter of Zadok, and mother of king Jothan, consequently wife of Uzziah, whom she appears to have survived (2Ki 15:33); written JERUSHAH (יְרוּשָׁה, Yerushah', id.; Sept. ῾Ιερουσά) in the parallel passage (2Ch 27:1). B.C. 806.

## Jerushah[[@Headword:Jerushah]]

             (2Ch 27:1). SEE JERUSHA.

## Jerushalmi Tanchum[[@Headword:Jerushalmi Tanchum]]

             SEE TANCHUM OF JERUSALEM.

## Jervis, William Henley[[@Headword:Jervis, William Henley]]

             a minister of the Church, of England, was born in 1813, and educated at Harrow, where he won some of the first prizes in the school at the unusually early age of fifteen, and at Christ Church, Oxford, where he took a second class in 1835. He was for some years rector of St. Nicholas, Gniildford, and held up to his death, a prebendal stall at Heytesbury, abolished by recent legislation, so that the dignity died with him, January 27, 1882. Mr. Jervis, who took his wife's name some years ago, was a son of the late dean Pearson of Salisbury, and elder brother of canon Pearson of Windsor. To the general public he is best known as the author of a learned and interesting work on the History of the Church of France, from the Concordat of Boulogne to the Close of the First Empire (London, 1872-82, 3 volumes). (B.P.)

## Jesaiah[[@Headword:Jesaiah]]

             [many Jesai'ah] (a, Neh 11:7, b, 1Ch 3:21). SEE JESHAIAH.

## Jeshaiah[[@Headword:Jeshaiah]]

             [many Jeshai'ah] (Hebrew Yeshayah', יְשִׁעְיָה, deliverance of Jehovah;' 1Ch 3:21; Ezr 8:7; Ezr 8:19; Neh 11:7; elsewhere in the paragogic form יְשָׁעְיָהוּ, Yeshaya'hu), the name of several men.

1. (Sept: ᾿Ωσαίας v.r. Ι᾿ωσίας , Vulg. Iasajas, Author. Ver. “Jeshaiah.”) Son of Rehabiah, and father of Joram, of the Levitical family of Eliezer (1Ch 26:25). B.C. considerably ante 1014.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿εεία v.r. Ι᾿σαές; Ι᾿σίας v.r. Ι᾿ωσιά; Vulg. Jesejas, Auth. Vers. “Jeshaiah.”) One of the sons of Jeduthun, appointed under him among the sacred harpers (1Ch 25:3), at the head of the eighth division of Levitical musicians (1Ch 25:15). B.C. 1014.

3. SEE ISAIAH.

4. (Septuag. Ι᾿εσσεία v.r. Ι᾿εσίας, Vulg. Isaja, Auth. Vers. “Jesaiah.”) Father of Ithiel, a Benjamite, whose descendant Sallu resided in Jerusalem after the exile (Neh 9:7). B.C. long ante 539.

5. (Septuagint Ι᾿εσεία v.r. Ι᾿εσίας, Vulgate Jesejas, Auth. Vers. “Jesaiah.”) The second of the three sons of Hananiah, son of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:21; see Strong's Harmony and Expos. of the Gosp. p. 17). B.C. post 536.

6. (Septuag. ῾Ησαϊvα v.r. Ι᾿σαϊvας, Vulg. Isajas, Auth. Vers. “Jeshaiah.”) Son of Athaliah, of the “sons” of Elam, who returned with 70 male relatives from Babylon (Ezr 8:7). B.C. 459.

7. (Sept. Ι᾿σαϊvα, Vulg. Isajas, Author. Vers. “Jeshaiah.”) A Levite of the family of Merari, who accompanied Hashabiah to the river Ahava, on the way from Babylon to Palestine (Ezr 8:19). B.C. 459.

## Jeshanah[[@Headword:Jeshanah]]

             [many Jesh'anah] (Heb. Yeshanah', יְשָׁנָה, old, q.d. Παλαιόπολις; Sept. Ι᾿εσυνά v.r. Α᾿νά), a city of the kingdom of Israel, taken with its suburbs from Jeroboam by Abijah, and mentioned as situated near Bethel and Ephraim (2Ch 13:19). It appears to be the “village Isanas” (Ι᾿σάνας), mentioned by Josephus as the scene of Herod's encounter with Pappus, the general of Antigonus, in Samaria (Ant. 14, 15, 12; compare  Ι᾿σανά, Ant. 8,11, 3). It is not mentioned by Jerome in the Onomasticon, unless we accept the conjecture of Reland (Paloest. p. 861). that “Jethaba, urbs antiqua Judaea” is at once a corruption and a translation of the name Jeshana. According to Schwarz (Palestine, p. 158), it is the modern village al-Sanin, two miles west of Bethel; but no such name appears on Zimmermann's map, unless it be Ain Sinia, a village surrounded by vineyards and fruit trees, with vegetable gardens watered from a well, situated at a fork of the valley about a mile N.E. of Jufila (Robinson's Researches, 3, 80).

## Jesharelah[[@Headword:Jesharelah]]

             [some Jeshare'lah] (Heb. Yeshare'lah, יְשִׁרְאֵלָה, upright towards God; some copies read, יְשִׂרְאֵלָה, Yesare'lah; Septuag. Ι᾿σρεηλά v.r. Ι᾿σεριήλ; Vulg. Isreela), the head of the seventh division of Levitical musicians (1Ch 25:14); elsewhere called by the equivalent name ASARELAH (1Ch 25:2). B.C. 1014.

## Jeshebeab[[@Headword:Jeshebeab]]

             (Heb. Yeshebab', יֶשֶׁבְאָב. seat of his father; Sept. Ι᾿σβαάλ v.r. Ι᾿εσβαάλ, Vulg. Ishbaab), the head of the fourteenth division of priests as arranged by David (1Ch 24:13). B.C. 1014.

## Jesher[[@Headword:Jesher]]

             (Heb. Ye'sher, יֵשֶׁר. upright; Sept. Ι᾿ωασάρ v.r. Ιασάρ), the first named of the three sons of Caleb (son of Hezron) by his first wife Azubah (1Ch 2:18). B.C. ante 1658. SEE JERIOTH.

## Jeshimon[[@Headword:Jeshimon]]

             is the rendering in the Auth. Version (Num 21:20; Num 23:28; 1Sa 23:1; 1Sa 23:9; 1Sa 23:24; 1Sa 26:1; 1Sa 26:3) of יְשַׁימוֹן(yeshinon'), which simply denotes a wilderness, as in the margin (so the Sept.), and elsewhere in the text (Deu 22:10; Psa 68:7; “desert;” Psa 78:40; Psa 107:14; Isa 43:16; Isa 43:20, “solitary” way, Psa 107:4). SEE DESERT.

## Jeshimoth[[@Headword:Jeshimoth]]

             SEE BETH-JESHIMOTH.

## Jeshishai[[@Headword:Jeshishai]]

             [many Jeshish'ai', some Jeshisha'I] (Heb. Yeshishay', יְשַׁישִׁי, grayish, perh. q.d. born of an old man, Sept. Ι᾿εσσαϊv v.r. Ι᾿εσαϊv), the son of Jahdo and father of Michael, of the ancestry of Abihail, a Gadite chief in Bashan (1Ch 5:14). B.C. long ante 782.

## Jeshua[[@Headword:Jeshua]]

             (Heb. Yeshu'a, יְשׁוּעִ, a contracted form of JOSHUA, i.q. JESUS; Sept. Ι᾿ησοῦς), the name of several men, also of a place.

1. (Neh 8:17.) SEE JOSHUA.

2. The head of the ninth sacerdotal “class” as arranged by David (1Ch 24:11, where the name is Anglicized “Jeshuah”). B.C. 1014. He is thought by some to be the Jeshua of Ezr 2:36. But see No. 6.

3. One of the Levites appointed by Hezekiah to distribute the sacred offerings in the sacerdotal cities (2Ch 31:15). B.C. 726.

4. A descendant (or native) of Pahath-moab (q.v.) mentioned along with Joab as one whose posterity, to the number of 2812 (2818), returned from Babylon (Ezr 2:6; Neh 7:11). B.C. ante 536.

5. A Levite named along with Kadmiel as one whose descendants (called “children” [? inhabitants] of Hodaviah or Hodeviah), to the number of 74, returned from Babylon (Ezr 2:40; Neh 7:43). B.C. ante 536. See Nos. 9 and 10.

6. Jeshua (or JOSHUA as he is called in Hag 1:1; Hag 1:12; Hag 2:2; Hag 2:4; Zec 3:1; Zec 3:3; Zec 3:6; Zec 3:8-9), the “son” of Jozadak or Jozedech, and high priest of the Jews when they returned, under Zerubbabel, from the Babylonian exile (Neh 7:7; Neh 12:1; Neh 12:7; Neh 12:10; Neh 12:26; Ezr 2:2; Ezr 10:18). B.C. 536. He was doubtless born during the exile. His presence and exhortations greatly promoted the rebuilding of the city and Temple (Ezr 5:2). B.C. 520-446. The altar of the latter being first erected  enabled him to sanctify their labor by the religious ceremonies and offerings which the law required (Ezr 3:2; Ezr 3:8-9). Jeshua joined with Zerubbabel in opposing the machinations of the Samaritans (Ezr 4:3); and he was not found wanting in zeal (comp. Ecclesiastes 49:12) when the works, after having been interrupted, were resumed in the second year of Darius Hystaspis (Ezr 5:2; Hag 1:12). Several of the prophet Haggai's utterances are addressed to Jeshua (Hag 1:1; Hag 2:2), and his name occurs in two of the symbolical prophecies of Zechariah (Zec 3:1-10; Zec 6:11-15). In the first of these passages, Jeshua, as pontiff, represents the Jewish people covered at first with the garb of slaves, and afterwards with the new and glorious vestures of deliverance. In the second he wears for a moment crowns of silver and gold, as symbols of the sacerdotal and regal crowns of Israel, which were to be united on the head of the Messiah. — Kitto. SEE HIGH PRIEST. He is probably the person alluded to in Ezr 2:36; Neh 7:39. SEE JEDIAH.

7. Father of Jozabad, which latter was one of the Levites appointed by Ezra to take charge of the offerings for the sacred services (Ezr 8:33). B.C. ante 459.

8. The father of Ezer, which latter is mentioned as “the ruler of Mizpah” who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem after the exile (Neh 3:19). B.C. ante 446.

9. A Levite, son of Azaniah (Neh 10:9), who actively cooperated in the reformation instituted by Nehemiah (Neh 8:7; Neh 9:4-5; Neh 12:8). B.C. cir. 410. He was possibly identical with No. 5.

10. Son of Kadmiel, one of the Levites in the Temple on its restoration after the captivity, in the time of Eliashib (Neh 12:24). B.C. cir. 406. Perhaps, however, “son” is here a transcriber's error for “and;” so that this Jeshua will be the same as No. 5.

11. A city of Judah inhabited after the captivity, mentioned in connection with Jekabzeel, Moladah, and other towns in the lowlands of Judah (Neh 11:26). According to Schwarz (Palest. p. 116), it is the village Yesue, near Khulda, five English miles east of Ekron; doubtless the village Yeshua [locally pronounced Eshwa] seen by Dr. Robinson (new edit. of Researches, 3, 154,155), and laid down on Van de Velde's Map on wady Ghurab, between Zorah and Chesalon.

## Jeshua (2)[[@Headword:Jeshua (2)]]

             For this Biblical site Lieut-Conder proposes (Tent Work, 2:338) the ruin and tell es-Saweh, four and a quarter miles north-west of Tell-Milh (Moladah), which is thus described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (3:409): "A prominent hill-top, crowneds with ruins, consisting of foundations and heaps of stones. The hill is surrounded by a wall built of large blocks of flint conglomerate. Other rocks of a similar kind exist in the valley beneath." The place proposed by Schwarz is probably Eshuia, one and a half miles north-east of Surah (Zorah), and two and a quarter south-west of Kesla (Chesalon), "a small village near the foot of the hill, with a well to the west, and olive-trees beneath" (Memoirs to Ordnance Survey, 3:25); but this is probably Eshtaol (q.v.).

## Jeshua (Ha-Lewi) Ben-Josef[[@Headword:Jeshua (Ha-Lewi) Ben-Josef]]

             a Jewish writer of the 15th century, is the author of הֲלַיכוֹת עוֹלָם, or a methodology of the Talmud (Constantinople, 1510, and often since). It  was translated into Latin by L'Empereur, under the title, Clavis Talmudica (Leyden, 1635); also by Bashuysen, Clavis Talumudica Maxima (Hanau, 1714); and by Struve, Logicae Hebraica Rudimenta (Jena, 1697). See First, Bibl. Jud. 2:64 sq. (B.P.)

## Jeshuah[[@Headword:Jeshuah]]

             (1Ch 24:11). SEE JESHUA, 2.

## Jeshurun[[@Headword:Jeshurun]]

             (Heb. Yeshurun', יְשֻׁרוּן), a poetical appellation of the people of Israel, used in token of affection and tenderness, occurring four times (Deu 32:15, Sept. Ι᾿ακώβ,Vulg. dilectus; Deu 33:5; Deu 33:26, and Isa 44:2 [A. Vers. in this latter passage “Jesurun”]; Sept. ἠγαπημένος, Vulgate rectissimus). The term is (according to Mercer in Pagnini, Thes. 1, p. 1105; Mich. in Suppl., and others) a diminutive (after the form of Zebulun, Jeduthun, etc.) from יָשׁוּר i.q. יָשָׁר (compare שָׁלוּם and שָׁלֵם), q.d. rectulus, a ‘rightling,” i.e. the dear upright people. Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion have in Isaiah εὐθύς, elsewhere εύθύτατος; Kimchi says, “Israel is so called as being just among the nations;” so also Aben-Ezra and Saadias (in the Pent.) interpret. Others, as Grotius, understand the word as a diminutive from “Israel” itself, and so apparently the Chald., Syriac, and Saadias (in Isaiah), but against the analogy of derivation. Ilgen (D)e imnbre lapideo, p. 25, and in Paulus, Memoreabil. 6, p. 157) gives a far fetched derivation from the Arabic, and other fanciful explanations may be seen in Jo. Olpius's Diss. de ישרון (praeside Theod. Hasaeo, Breme, 1730). The passages where it is employed seem to express the idea that in the character of righteous Jehovah recognized his people in consideration of their covenant relation to him, whereby, while they observed the terms of that covenant, they stood legally justified before him and clean in his sight. It is in this sense that the pious kings are said to have done הִיָּשָׁר, “that which was right” in the eyes of Jehovah, i.e. what God approved (1Ki 11:34, etc.).

## Jesiah[[@Headword:Jesiah]]

             (a, 1Ch 12:6; b, 1Ch 23:20). SEE ISHIAH, 2, 4.

## Jesimiel[[@Headword:Jesimiel]]

             (Heb. Yesimiel', יְשַׂימַיאֵל, appointed of God; Sept. Ι᾿σμαήλ), apparently one of the chief Simeonites who migrated to the valley of Gedor in search of pasture (1Ch 4:36). B.C. cir. 711.  Jessaeans.

According to Epiphanius, the first distinctive appellation of Christians was Ιεσσαῖοι, Jessaeans, but it is doubtful from whom the title was derived, or in what sense it was applied. Some suppose it was from Jesse, the father of David; others (and with far greater probability of accuracy) trace it to the name of the Lord Jesus. Philo is known to have written a work on the first Church of St. Mark at Alexandria, which he himself entitled περὶ Ι᾿εσσαίων, which is now extant under the title of περἱ βίου θεωρητικοῦ (of the contemplative life), and so is cited by Eusebius even: Jerome, however, knew the work intimately, and for this reason gave Philo a place in his list of ecclesiastical writers. Eusebius also mentions the name Jessaeans as a distinctive appellation of the early Christians. Comp. Bingham, Antiq. bk. 1, ch. 1, § 1; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 181.

## Jesse[[@Headword:Jesse]]

             (Heb. Yishay', יַשִׁי, perhaps firm, otherwise living; once אַשִׁי, Ishay', either by prosthesis, or manly, 1Ch 2:13; Sept. and N.T. Ι᾿εσσαί; Josephus ῾Ιεσσαῖος, Ant. 6, 8, 1), a son (or descendant) of Obed, the son of Boaz and Ruth (Rth 4:17; Rth 4:22; Mat 1:5-6; Luk 3:32; 1Ch 2:12). He was the father of eight sons (1Sa 17:12), from the youngest of whom, David, is reflected all the distinction which belongs to the name, although the latter, as being of humble birth, was often reproached by his enemies with this parentage (1Sa 20:27; 1Sa 20:30-31; 1Sa 22:7-8; 1Sa 25:10; 2Sa 20:1; 1Ki 12:16; 2Ch 10:16). “Stem of Jesse” is used poetically for the family of David (Isa 11:1), and “Root [ i.e. root-shoot, or sprout from the stump, i.q. scion] of “Jesse” for the Messiah (Isa 11:10; Rev 5:5; comp. Rev 22:16). He seems to have been a person of some note and substance at Bethlehem, his property being chiefly in sheep (1Sa 16:1; 1Sa 16:11; 1Sa 17:20; comp. Psa 78:71). It would seem from 1Sa 16:10, that he must have been aware of the high destinies which awaited his son, but it is doubtful if he ever lived to see them realized (see 1Sa 17:12). The last historical mention of Jesse is in relation to the asylum which David procured for him with the king of Moab (1Sa 22:3). B.C. cir. 1068-1061. SEE DAVID.

“According to an ancient Jewish tradition, recorded in the Targum on 2Sa 21:19, Jesse was a weaver of the vails of the sanctuary; but as there  is no contradiction, so there is no corroboration of this in the Bible, and it is possible that it was suggested by the occurrence of the word oregim, ‘weavers,' in connection with a member of his family. SEE JAARE- OREGIM. Who the wife of Jesse was we are not told. The family contained, in addition to the sons, two female members — Zeruiah and Abigail; but it is uncertain whether these were Jesse's daughters, for, though they are called the sisters of his sons (1Ch 2:16), yet Abigail is said to have been the daughter of Nahash (2Sa 17:25). Of this, two explanations have been proposed.

(1.) The Jewish: that Nahash was another name for Jesse (Jerome, Quoest. Hebr. on 2Sa 17:25, and the Targum on Rth 4:22).

(2.) Prof. Stanley's: that Jesse's wife had formerly been wife or concubine to Nahash, possibly the king of the Ammonites (Jewish Church, 2, 5, 51).” SEE NAHASH.

## Jesse, Tree Of[[@Headword:Jesse, Tree Of]]

             in ecclesiastical architecture, is a representation of the genealogy of Christ on scrolls of foliage so arranged as to represent a tree, and was quite a common subject for sculpture, painting, and embroidery. In ancient churches, the candlesticks often took this form, and was therefore called a Jesse. See Parker, Gloss. Archit. s.v.; Walcott, Sacred Archoeology, p. 333.

## Jesseans[[@Headword:Jesseans]]

             according to Epiphanius, a name given to the early Christians. either from Jesse, the father of David, or, more probably, from the name of the Lord Jesus.

## Jesses Tomb[[@Headword:Jesses Tomb]]

             is traditionally shown on a corner of a ruined monastery on the hillside between Hebron and Abraham's Oak (Conder, Tent Work, 2:84).

## Jessue[[@Headword:Jessue]]

             (Ι᾿εσσουέ v.r. Ι᾿ησουέ and Ι᾿ησοῦς, 1Es 5:26), or Je'su (Ι᾿ησοῦς, 1Es 8:63), corrupt forms (see Ezr 2:40; Ezr 8:33) of the name of JESHUA SEE JESHUA (q.v.).

## Jestohaiah[[@Headword:Jestohaiah]]

             (Heb. Jeshochayah', יְשׁוֹחָיָה, worshipper of Jehovah; Sept. Ι᾿ασουϊvα), a chief Simeonite, apparently one of those who migrated to the valley of Gedon (l Chronicles 4:36). B.C. prob. cir. 711.

## Jesu[[@Headword:Jesu]]

             is likewise used in modern poetry for the name of JESUS, our Savior, especially as a vocative or genitive.

## Jesu Dulcis Memoria[[@Headword:Jesu Dulcis Memoria]]

             SEE BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX'S HYMNS.

## Jesuates[[@Headword:Jesuates]]

             a monastic order, so called because its members frequently pronounced the name of Jesus. The founders were John of Colombini, gonfaloniere, and  Francis Mino Vincentini of Sienna. This institution was confirmed by Urban V in the year 1368, and continued till the seventeenth century, when it was suppressed by Clement IX. The persons belonging to it professed poverty, and adhered to the institute of Augustine. They were not, however, admitted to holy orders, but professed to assist the poor with their prayers and other offices, and prepared medicine for them, which they distributed gratuitously: we find them, for that reason, called sometimes Apostolic Clerks. They were also known as the Congregation of Saint Hieronymus, their patron. Having become largely interested in the distillery of brandies, etc., they were by the people called Padri dell aqua vitoe. A female order of the same name, and a branch of the male order, was founded by Catharina Colombina. They still continue to exist in Italy as a branch organization of the Augustinian order. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Farrar, Ecclesiast. Dict. p. 340; Helyot, Geschichte d. Koster und Ritterorden, 3, 484 sq.

## Jesui, Jesuite[[@Headword:Jesui, Jesuite]]

             (Num 26:44). SEE ISHUI, 1.

Jesuits,

or the Society of Jesus (Societas Jesu), the most celebrated among the monastic institutions of the Roman Catholic Church.

I. Foundation of the Order. — It was founded by the Spanish nobleman Don Inigo (Ignatius) of Loyola (q.v.). Thirst for glory caused him at an early age to enter the army. Having been wounded, May 20, 1521, during the siege of Pamplona by the French, he turned during the slow progress of his recovery from his former favorite reading of knights' novels to the study of the life of Jesus and the saints. His heated imagination suggested to him an arena in which even greater distinction could be won than in military life, and he resolved henceforth to devote his life to the service of God and of the Church. Having recovered, he first went to the Benedictine abbey of Montserrat, where after a general confession, he took the vow of chastity, hung up his sword and dagger on the altar, and then proceeded to Manresa, where, after a short stay in the hospital, he hid himself in a rocky cavern near the town, in order to devote himself wholly to prayer and ascetic exercises. Here he is believed to have made his first draft of the “Spiritual Exercises” (Exercitia Spiritualia), a work which in 1548 a brief of pope Paul III warmly commended to all the faithful, and to which the  thorough soldier-like discipline that characterizes the order of the Jesuits, and the ultra papal system of which they have been the pioneers, are greatly due. As Ignatius himself subsequently states, the idea of a new religious order which was to take a front rank under the banner of Christ in the combat against the prince of darkness likewise originated with him at this time. During a brief pilgrimage which Ignatius made in 1523 to Palestine, he became aware that he utterly lacked the necessary literary qualification for carrying out the plans which he had conceived. Accordingly, when he had returned to Spain, he entered a grammar school at Barcelona, and subsequently visited the universities of Alcala and Salamanca, and at last went to Paris, where he studied from 1528 to 1535, and in 1533 acquired the title of doctor of philosophy.

In Paris Ignatius gradually gathered around himself the first members of the order he intended to found. His first associates were Lefevre (Petrus Faber), from Savoy, Francis of Xavier, from Navarre, and the Spaniards Jacob Lainez, Alfons Salmeron, Nicolaus Bobadilla, and Simon Rodriguez. They were for the first time called together by Ignatius in July, 1534, and soon after, on August 15, the festival of the Assumption of Mary, they took the vows of poverty, chastity, and of making a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, in order to labor in the Holy Land for the conversion of the infidels. In case they should be unable to carry out this project within one year after their arrival in Venice, they would go to Rome and place themselves at the disposal of the pope. On Jan. 6, 1537, Ignatius was joined in Venice by all of his disciples and three more Frenchmen — Le Jay, Codure, and Brouet. All took, two months later, holy orders, but their plan to go to Jerusalem they could not execute, as the republic of Venice was at war with sultan Soleiman II. They consequently went to Rome to await the orders of the pope. Paul III received them kindly, gave to Faber and Lainez chairs in the Sapienza, and requested Ignatius to labor as a city missionary for the improvement of the religious life. In March 1538, the other associates also arrived in Rome, and it was now formally resolved to establish a new religious order. Ignatius was elected to submit their plan to the pope, and to obtain his sanction. This was given on Sept. 27, 1540, in the bull Regimini Militantis ecclesioe, which, however, restricted the number of professi to forty. Three years later (March 14, 1543), another bull, Injunctum Nobis, removed this restriction. Reluctantly Ignatius accepted the dignity of the first general of the order, to which he had been unanimously elected. He entered upon his office on April 17, 1541; and soon after, in accordance with the request of Paul III, the draft of the constitution of the new order  was made by him (not, as is often maintained, by Lainez; see Genelli, Leben des heil. Ignatius, p. 212). Before being finally sanctioned, the constitution was to undergo several revisions; but before these were made, Ignatius died, July 31, 1556.

II. Constitutions and Form of Government. — The laws regulating the order are contained in the so-called Institutum (official edition, Prague, 1757, 2 vols.; new edit. Avignon, 1827-38). The work opens with a collection of all the bulls and decrees of the apostolic see concerning the new society. This is followed by a list of the privileges which have been granted to the order, and by the General Examination, which serves as an introduction to the constitutions, and is laid before every applicant for admission. The most important portion of the code, the constitutions, consists of ten chapters, to each of which are added explanations (Declarationes), which, according to the intentions of the founder, are to be equally valid as the constitutions. Next follow the decrees and canons of the general congregations; the plan of studies (Ratio Studiorum), which, however, in 1832 was considerably changed by the general John Roothahn; the decrees of the generals (Ordinationes Generalium), as they were revised by the eighth General Congregation in 1615; and, in conclusion, by three ascetic writings — the Industrioe ad curandos animoe morbos of general Claudius Aquaviva, the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius, and the Directorium, an official instruction for the right use of these exercises. At the head of the order is a general (Proepositus Generalis), who is elected for life, must reside at Rome, and is only subject to the pope. His power is unlimited, as the Council of Assistants has only a deliberative vote. He is, however, bound to the constitutions, which he can neither change nor set aside.

The constitution provides for the deposition of a general in particular cases by the General Congregation, but the case has not yet occurred. For the administration of the provinces into which the order is divided the general appoints provincials for the term of three years. Several provinces are united into an assistentia, which is represented in the council of the general by an assistant. There were in 1871 five assistants for Italy, France, Spain, England, and Germany. The assistants are appointed by the General Congregation, but in case of the death or a long absence of an assistant the general can substitute another, with the consent of the majority of the provincials. Subordinate to the provincial are the praepositi, who govern the houses of the professed, and the rectors, who govern the colleges and the novitiates. They are likewise appointed by the general. At the head of  the minor establishments (residentioe) are “superiors.” Each of these officers has by his side a consultor to advise, and a monitor to watch and admonish him.

As in every religious order, the members are divided into priests and lay brothers (Coadjutores temporales). The latter take the simple vows after a two-years' novitiate, and the solemn vows after having been in the order for at least ten years. Those candidates who, on entering the order, leave their future employment entirely to the disposition of their superiors, are called Indifferentes; but, according to a decree of the General Congregation, their final destination must be assigned to them at least within two years. The candidates for the priesthood are, during the first two years, Novitii scholastici; then, after binding themselves to the order by taking simple vows, they become Scholastici approbati, devote themselves for several years to classical and philosophical studies, and are for some time employed as teachers or educators in the colleges, before they begin the study of theology, which lasts for four years. After the completion of the theological course they are ordained priests, and now enter into a third novitiate, the sole object of which is to increase their zeal. At the end of this novitiate the candidate is admitted to the solemn profession of the vows, and enrolled either in the class of the professed or that of the spiritual coadjutors. Only the former class, the professed, who take the fourth vow of an unconditional obedience to the pope, possess the full rights of members of the society.

The professed of a province every third year meet in a provincial congregation, and out of their midst choose a procurator, who has to make a report on the affairs and condition of the province to the general. On the death of a general the Provincial Congregation elects two deputies, who, together with the provincials, constitute the General Congregation, which elects the new general. In this General Congregation the supreme legislative power is vested; it can be called together on extraordinary occasions by the general, and, in case the latter neglects his duty, by the assistants. Thus the order bears the aspect of military aristocracy, and never, during the whole history of the Church of Rome, have the popes had in their service a body of men so thoroughly disciplined. “Before any one could become a member, he was severely and appropriately tested in the novitiate. Of the actual members, only a few choice spirits reached the perfect dignity of the professed, from whom alone were chosen the principal officers, the superiors and the provincials, constituting a well-organized train of authorities up to the general. Every individual was powerful in his appropriate sphere, but in every act he was closely watched and guarded lest he should transcend his proper limits. So  perfect was the obedience inculcated by a long course of discipline, and strengthened by every spiritual means, that a single arbitrary but inflexible will controlled every movement of the order in all parts of the world. Although every individual possessed no more will of his own than the particular members of the human body, he expected to be placed in precisely that position in which his talents would be best developed for the common benefit: in exercises of monastic devotion, in literary and scientific pursuits, in the secular life of courts, or in strange adventures and eminent offices among savage nations” (Hase, Church History, § 383).

III. History from 1540 to 1750. — On the death of Ignatius the General Congregation could not meet immediately, as the Spaniards, who were at war with the pope, blocked up the roads to Rome. On June 19, 1557, Jacob Lainez, the most gifted member of the order, was elected the second general of the order. The constitutions were once more revised, and unanimously adopted; but the pope (Paul IV) disliked several of its provisions, and in particular wished to have the general elected for a term of only three years, and an observance of the canonical hours. The Jesuits had to submit in the latter points, but when the aged pope soon after died they returned to their original practice. The society spread rapidly, and numbered at the death of Lainez (Jan. 19, 1565) eighteen provinces and 130 houses. During the administration of the two following generals, the Spaniard Francis Borgia (1565-72) and the Belgian Mercurian (1572-80), the order was greatly favored by the popes, and new provinces were organized in Peru, Mexico, and Poland. The fourth General Congregation, on Feb. 19, 1581, elected as general the Neapolitan Claudius Aquaviva (1581-1615), a man of rare administrative genius, who successfully carried the society through the only internal commotion of importance through which it has passed, and who, next to its founder, has done more than any other general in molding its character.

The leading Spanish Jesuits, mortified at seeing the generalship, which they had begun to regard as a domain of their nationality, pass into the hands of an Italian, meditated an entire decentralization of the order and the hegemony of the Spaniards at the expense of the unity and the monarchical principle. The plan met with the approval of Philip II; but the energy of pope Sixtus V, who took sides with Aquaviva, foiled it. Under Clement VIII the Spaniards renewed their scheme, and the commotion produced by them became so great that in 1593 the fifth General Congregation (the first extraordinary one) was convoked. The Spaniards hoped that Aquaviva would be removed, but  again their designs were defeated, and the centralistic administration of the general sustained. The administrative crisis was followed by violent doctrinal controversies. The book of the Portuguese Jesuit Molina involved the order in a quarrel with the Dominicans, and a work (published in 1599) in which the Spanish Jesuit Mariana justified tyrannicide raised a storm of indignation against the society throughout Europe, although Aquaviva, in 1614, strictly forbade all members of the order to advance this doctrine. During the administration of Aquaviva (about 1680) the order numbered 27 provinces. 21 houses of professed, 287 colleges, 33 novitiates, 96 residences, and 10,581 members. During the administration of the Roman Mutius Vitelleschi (1615-45) the order celebrated its first centenary (1640).

The eighth General Congregation, on Jan. 7, 1646, elected as general the Neapolitan Vincenz Caraffa. On January 1 of this year pope Innocent X had issued a brief, according to which a General Congregation was to be held every ninth year, and the administration of the superiors was limited to three years. The latter provision was repealed by Alexander VII (Jan. 1, 1663); the former did not take effect until 1661, as the short administration of the generals Vincenz Caraffa († June 8, 1649), Francis Piccolomini († June 17, 1651), and Aloys Gottifredi had practically suspended it. On March 17, 1652, the General Congregation for the first time elected as general a German, Goswin Nickel, of Julich, to whom, on account of his great age, the eleventh Congregation, on June 7, 1661, gave Paul Oliva as coadjutor, with the right of succession. Oliva was general for more than seventeen years, and was succeeded by the Belgian Noyelle (1682-86) and the Spaniard Thyrsus Gonzalez (1687-1705). Pope Innocent XI was unfavorable to the order, and in 1684 the Congregation of the Propaganda forbade it to receive any more novices; but in 1686 this decree was cancelled by Innocent himself. Gonzalez caused considerable excitement by publishing a work against the doctrine of Probabilism, which had been generally taught by the theologians of the society. He was succeeded by the generals Tamburini (1706-30), Retz (1730-50), Visconti (1751-55), Centurione (1755-57), Ricci (175873); under the latter the order was suppressed (1773). The order during all this time had steadily, though not rapidly increased in strength. It numbered in 1720, 5 assistants, 37 provinces, 24 houses of professed, 612 colleges, 59 novitiates, 340 residences, 157 seminaries, 200 missions, and 19,998 members, among whom were 9957 priests. In 1762, the order had increased to 39 provinces, 669 colleges, 61 novitiates, 176 seminaries, 335 residences, 223 missions, and 22,787 members, among whom were 11,010 priests.

Soon after the establishment of the order, the pope, the bishops, and those monarchs who were opposed to the Reformation recognized the Jesuits as the most efficient organization for saving the old Church. Thus the spread of the order was rapid. At the Council of Trent the Spanish ambassadors declared that their king, Philip II, knew only two ways to stay the advance of the Reformation, the education of good preachers, and the Jesuits. Calls were consequently received from various countries for members of the order, but, as they not only opposed Protestantism, but defended the most excessive claims of the popes with regard to secular governments, they soon encountered a violent resistance on the part of those governments which refused a servile submission to the dictates of the papacy. In many cases the bishops sided against them, as the Jesuits were found to be always ready to extend the papal at the cost of the episcopal authority. This was especially the case in the republic of Venice, where the patriarch Trevisani showed himself their decided opponent. Subsequently, when they defended the interdict which Paul V had pronounced against Venice, they were expelled (in 1606), and not until 1656 did pope Alexander VII succeed in obtaining from the republic a reluctant consent to their return. At the beginning of the 18th century the Piedmontese viceroy in Sicily, Maffei, expelled them from that island, because they were again the most eager among the clergy to enforce a papal interdict. Nowhere did the order render to the Church of Rome so great services as in Germany and the northern countries of Europe, where Protestantism had become predominant. While taking part in all the efforts against the spread of Protestantism, they labored with particular zeal for the establishment of educational institutions, and for gaining the confidence of the princes. In both respects they met with considerable success. Their colleges at Ingolstadt, Munich, Vienna, Prague. Cologne, Treves, Mentz, Augsburg, Ellwangen, and other places became highly prosperous, and attracted a large number of pupils, especially from the aristocratic families, most of whom remained throughout life warm supporters of all the schemes of the order. Under emperor Rudolph II the Jesuits established themselves in all parts of Germany. At most of the courts Jesuits were confessors of the reigning princes, and invariably used the influence thus gained for the adoption of forcible measures against Protestantism.

At the instigation of the Jesuits a counter reformation was forcibly carried through in a number of provinces in which Protestantism, before their arrival, appeared to be sure of success. Thus, in particular, Austria, Syria, Bavaria, or Baden, were either gained back by them or preserved for the Church of Rome, and from  1648 to 1748 they are said to have persuaded no less than forty-five princes of the empire to join the Roman Catholic Church. As advisors of the princes, they became to so high a degree involved in political affairs that frequently even the generals of the order and the popes deemed it necessary to recommend to them a greater caution. They were called into Hungary by the archbishop of Gran as early as 1561, but there, as well as in Transylvania, the vicissitudes of the religious wars for a long time prevented them from gaining a firm footing. When, however, the policy of the Austrian government finally succeeded in breaking the strength of the Protestant party, the Jesuits became all powerful. In 1767 they had in these two countries 18 colleges, 20 residences, 11 missionary stations, and 990 members.

In Poland, Petrus Canisius appeared in 1558 at the Diet of Petrikau; about twenty years later the favor of king Stephen Bathori empowered the Jesuits to found a number of colleges, and to secure the education of nearly the whole aristocracy. John Casimir, the brother of Vladislav IV, even entered the order on Sept. 25,1643, and, although not yet ordained priest, was appointed cardinal in 1647; yet, after the death of his brother, he became king of Poland (1648-68). The Jesuit Possevin was in 1581 sent as ambassador of Gregory XIII to Ivan IV of Russia, and subsequently the Jesuit Vota made a fruitless attempt to unite the Greek with the Roman Catholic Church. Peter the Great, in 1714, expelled the few Jesuits who at that time were laboring in his dominions. In Sweden, in 1578, the Jesuits induced the king, John III, to make secretly a profession of the Roman Catholic faith; and queen Christina, the daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, was likewise prevailed upon in 1654, by the Jesuits Macedo and Casati, to join the Church of Rome; but, with regard to the people at large, the efforts of the Jesuits were entirely fruitless. To England, Salmeron and Brouet were sent by Ignatius. They were unable to prevent the separation of the English Church from Rome, but they confirmed James V of Scotland in the Roman Catholic faith, encouraged the people of Ireland in their opposition to the English king and the Anglican reformation, and, having returned to the Continent, established several colleges for the education of Roman Catholic priests for England. Elizabeth expelled all the Jesuits from her dominions, and forbade them, upon penalty of death, to return.

During her reign the Jesuit Campion was put to death. In 1605 father Garnet was executed, having been charged with complicity in the Gunpowder Plot, which had been communicated to him in the confessional. In 1678 the Jesuits were accused by Titus Oates of having entered into a conspiracy against Charles II and the state, in consequence of which six members of  the order were put to death. The first Jesuits who were brought to the Netherlands were some Spanish members of the order, who, during the war between France and Charles V, were ordered to leave France. The bishops showed them, on the whole, less favor than in the other countries, and the magistrates in the cities, on whose consent the authorization to establish colleges was made contingent, generally opposed them; but they overcame the opposition, and in the southern provinces (Belgium) soon became more numerous and influential than in most of the other European countries. They attracted great attention by their attacks upon Bajus and the Jansenists, both of whom were condemned at Rome at their instigation. In the northern provinces (Holland) stringent laws were repeatedly passed against them, and they were charged with the assassination of William of Orange, as well as with the attempt against the life of Maurice of Nassau, but both charges were indignantly denied by the order. In France, where the Jesuits established a novitiate at Paris as early as 1540, they encountered from the beginning the most determined opposition of the University and the Parliament, and the bishop of Paris forbade them to exercise any priestly functions. In 1550 the cardinal of Lorraine obtained for them a favorable patent from Henry II, but the Parliament refused to record it. In 1561 Lainez received from the Synod of Poissy the concession that the Jesuits should be permitted to establish themselves at Paris under the name of “Fathers of the College of Clermont.”

This college, which was sanctioned by Charles IX in 1565, and by Henry III in 1580, attained a high degree of prosperity, and in the middle of the 17th century numbered upwards of 2000 pupils. In the south of France the Jesuits gained a greater influence than in the north, and were generally regarded as the leaders in the violent struggle of the Catholic party for the arrest and suppression of Calvinism. They were closely allied with the Ligue, but general Aquaviva disapproved the openness of this alliance, and removed fathers Matthieu and Sommier, who had been chiefly instrumental in bringing about the alliance, to Italy and Belgium. The Jesuit Toletus brought about the reconciliation between the Ligue and Henry IV, who remained a warm protector of the order. Nevertheless, Jesuits were charged with the attempts made upon the life of Henry by Chastel (1594) and Ravaillac (1610), as they had before been charged with complicity in the plot of Clement (1589) against Henry III. The Parliament of Paris instituted, accordingly, proceedings against the Jesuit Guignard, who had been the instructor of Chastel, sentenced him to death, deprived the Jesuits of their goods, and exiled them from France. Henry IV was, however. prevailed  upon to recall them, continued to be their protector, and again chose a Jesuit as his confessor. The same office was filled by members of the order during nearly the whole reigns of Louis XIII, Louis XIV, and Louis XV, and through the royal confessors the order therefore did not cease to exercise a very conspicuous influence upon the policy of the kings both at home and abroad. The connivance of these confessors with the scandalous lives of the kings did more than anything else to undermine the respect for the Roman Catholic Church, and for religion in general, among the educated classes.

To Rome, however, they rendered invaluable services by heading the opposition against Louis XIV and the bishops when the latter conjointly tried to enforce throughout the Catholic Church of France submission to the four Gallican articles, and after effecting a full reconciliation between Rome and Louis, by securing the aid of the secular arm for arresting the progress and averting a victory of Jansenism, which had obtained full control of the best intellects in the Church of France. In Spain, which had been the cradle of the order, its success was remarkably rapid. As early as 1554 three provinces of the order (Castile, Aragon, and Andalusia) had been organized. They were, however, opposed by the learned Melchior Canus; in Saragossa they were expelled by the archbishop, and the Inquisition repeatedly drew them before their tribunal as suspected of heresy. But the royal favor of the three Philips (Philip II, III, and IV) kept their influence unimpaired. In Portugal, Francis Xavier and Simon Rodriguez visited Lisbon on their way to India. They were well received by the king, and Rodriguez was induced to remain, and became the founder of a province, which soon belonged to the most prosperous of the order.

IV. Suppression of the Order (1750-73). — In the middle of the 18th century the order was at the zenith of its power. As confessors of most of the reigning prince and a large number of the first aristocratic families, and as the instructors and educators of the children, they wielded a controlling influence on the destinies of most of the Catholic states. At the same time they had amassed great wealth, which they tried to increase by bold commercial speculations. Both influence and wealth they used with untiring energy, and with a consistency of which the history of the world hardly knows a parallel, for the development of their ultra papal system. In point of doctrine, extermination of Protestantism, and every form of belief opposed to the Church of Rome, and within the Church blind and immediate submission to the doctrinal decision of the infallible pope; in  point of ecclesiastical polity, the weakening of the episcopal for the benefit of the papal authority, the defense of the most exorbitant claims of the popes with regard to secular government, and a controlling influence upon the popes by the order — these were the prominent features of the Jesuit system. As the Jesuits were anxious to crush out everything opposed to the Roman Catholic system, as they understood it, it was natural that all these elements should, in self defense, combine for planning the destruction of so formidable an antagonist. As the Jesuits had attained their influential position chiefly through the favor of the princes, the same method was adopted for crushing them.

The first great victory was won against them in Portugal. Sebastian Jose Calvalho, better known under the title (which he received in 1770) of marquis of Pombal, probably the greatest statesman which Portugal has ever had, was fully convinced that commerce and industry, and all the material interests of the country, could be successfully developed only when the monarchy and the nation were withdrawn from the depressing connection with the hierarchy and the nobility, and that the first step towards effecting such a revolution was the removal of the Jesuits. Opportunities for disposing the king against the order soon offered. In Paraguay, a portion of which had in 1753 been ceded by Spain to Portugal, an insurrection of the natives broke out against the new rule. The Jesuits, according to their own accounts, had established in Paraguay a theocratic form of government, which gave them the most absolute power over the minds of the natives. They were therefore opposed to the cession of a portion of this territory to Portugal, and spared no efforts to prevent it. When, therefore, the natives rose generally in insurrection, it was the general opinion that an insurrection in a country like Paraguay was impossible without at least the connivance of the order.

The Jesuits themselves denied, however, all participation in the insurrection, and asserted that the provincial of the order in Paraguay, Barreda, in loyal compliance with the order of the general, Visconti, had endeavored to induce the natives to submit to the partition of the country. Pope Benedict XIV was prevailed upon to forbid the Jesuits to engage in commercial transactions (1758), and the patriarch of Lisbon, who was commissioned by the pope to reform them, withdrew from them all priestly functions. An attempt to assassinate the king (Sept. 3, 1758) supplied an occasion for impeaching them of high treason, as the duke of Aveiro, when tortured, named two Jesuits as his accomplices. The two accused denied the guilt, and the writers of the order generally represent the whole affair as arranged by Pombal in order to give him a new pretext for criminal proceedings  against the order. On Sept. 3, 1759, a royal decree forever excluded the order from Portugal and confiscated its property. Most of the members were, on board of government ships, sent to Italy; and one of their prominent members, Malagrida, was in 1761 burned at the stake. The pope, in vain, had interceded for them; the nuncio had to leave the country in 1760, and all connection with Rome was broken off.

In France the numerous enemies of the order found a welcome opportunity for arousing public opinion against it in the commercial speculations of the Jesuit Lavalette, the superior of the mission of Martinique. When, in the war between France and England, his ships were captured, his creditors applied for payment to father De Sacy, the procurator general of all the Jesuit missions in Paris. He satisfied them, and instructed Lavalette to abstain from speculations in future. When Lavalette disregarded these instructions, and when, consequently, new losses occurred, amounting to 2,400,000 livres, Sacy refused to hold himself responsible. The creditors applied to the Parliament, whose jurisdiction was (1760) recognized by the Jesuits. The Parliament demanded a copy of the constitution of the order for examination. On April 18, 1761, a decree of Parliament suppressed the congregations of the Jesuits; on May 8 the whole order was declared to be responsible for the debt of Lavalette; on August 6 the constitution of the order was declared to be an encroachment upon Church and State, twenty- four works of Jesuit authors were burned as heretical and dangerous to good morals, and the order was excluded from educational institutions. A protest from the king (Aug. 29, 1761), who annulled these decrees of the Parliament for one year, was as unavailing as the intercession of the majority of the French bishops and of pope Clement XIII. Other Parliaments of France followed the example given by the Paris Parliament: on April 1, 1762, eighty colleges of the order were closed; and on August 6 a decree of the Parliament of Paris declared the constitution of the Jesuits to be godless, sacrilegious, and injurious to Church and State, and the vows of the order to be null and void. In the beginning of 1764 all the members were ordered to forswear their vows, and to declare that their constitution was punishable, abominable, and injurious. Only five complied with this order; among them father Cerutti, who two years before had written the best apology of the order. On Nov. 26, 1764, Choiseul obtained the sanction of the king for a decree which banished the Jesuits from France as dangerous to the state. Clement XIII, the steadfast friend of the  order, replied to the royal decree on Jan. 8, 1765, by the bull Apostolicam, in which he again approved the order and its constitution.

In Spain, Aranda, the minister of Charles III, was as successful as Pombal in Portugal and Choiseul in France. During the night from Sept. 2 to Sept. 3, 1768, all the Jesuits of the kingdom, about 6000 in number, were seized and transported to the papal territory. When the pope refused to receive them, they were landed in Corsica, where they remained a few months, until, in 1768, that island was annexed to France. They were then again expelled, and this time found refuge in the papal territory. In Naples from 3000 to 4000 Jesuits were seized in the night from Nov. 3 to 4,1767, by order of the regent Tanucci, the guardian of the minor Ferdinand IV, and likewise transported to the States of the Church. The government of Parma seized the Jesuits on Feb. 7, 1768, because the pope, claiming to be the feudal sovereign of Parma, had issued a brief declaring an order of the Parmese government (the Pragmatic Sanction of Jan. 16, 1768) null and void, and excommunicating its authors. All the Bourbon courts took sides in this question with Parma, forbade the publication of the papal brief, and when Clement XIII refused to repeal it, France occupied Avignon, and the government of Naples Benevent and Pontecorvo. At the same time, the grand master of the Knights of St. John, Fonseca, was induced to seize the Jesuits of Malta and transport them to the Papal States. When Clement XIII, who had steadfastly refused the demand of the Bourbons to abolish the order of the Jesuits for the whole Church, died, on Feb. 2, 1769, there was a severe struggle in the conclave between the friends (Zelanti) and the enemies of the Jesuits. The demands of the French and Spanish ambassadors to pledge the new pope that he would abolish the order were firmly repelled by the College of Cardinals; but, on the other hand, the ambassadors succeeded in securing the election of cardinal Ganganelli (Clement XIV), who, while before the election he was regarded by both parties as a friend, soon disclosed an intention to sacrifice the hated order to the combined demands and threats of the Bourbon courts. The reconciliation with the courts of Portugal and Parma was obtained by making to them great concessions; the brother of Pombal was appointed cardinal; the general of the Jesuits, Ricci, was alone, among all the generals of religious orders, excluded from the usual embrace; and when he solicited the favor of an audience he was twice refused. Papal letters to Louis XV (Sept. 30, 1769) and Charles III (Nov. 20) admitted the guilt of the Jesuits and the necessity of abolishing the order, but asked for delay. When, on  July 4, 1772, the mild Azpura had been succeeded as ambassador of Spain by the more energetic Joseph Monino (subsequently count of Florida Blanca), other measures against the order followed in more rapid succession. In September the Roman college was closed, in November the college at Frascati. At last the brief Dominus ac Redemptor noster (which had been signed on July 21, at three o'clock in the morning) announced on August 16 to the whole world the abolition of the order, on the ground that the peace of the Church required such a step.

IV. From the Abolition of the Order until its Restoration, 1773-1814. — The suppression of the order in the city of Rome was carried through with particular severity by a committee of five cardinals and two prelates, all of them violent enemies of the order. The general, Ricci, his five assistants, and several other Jesuits, were thrown into prison, where they had to remain for several years. Pius VI confirmed the decree of abolition, and did not dare to release the imprisoned Jesuits; when, finally, they were released, they had to promise to observe silence with regard to their trial. Some of them took the demanded oath, but others refused. The general, Ricci, had previously died, Nov. 24, 1775, emphatically asserting his own and the order's innocence. The brief of abolition was received with great satisfaction in Portugal. Spain and Naples were dissatisfied because they wished a bull of excommunication (as a more weighty expression of the papal sentence) instead of a brief. In Germany, where the empress Maria Theresa had long opposed the abolition of the order, the brief was promulgated, but the Jesuits, after laying down the habit of the order, were allowed to live together in their former colleges as societies of secular priests. In France the brief was not officially promulgated, and the Jesuits, otherwise so ultra papal in their views of the validity of papal briefs, now inferred from this circumstance that the order had not been abolished in France at all. In Prussia Frederick II forbade the promulgation of the brief, and in 1775 obtained permission from Pius VI to leave the Jesuits undisturbed.

Soon, however, to please the Bourbon courts, the Prussian Jesuits were requested to lay aside the dress of the order, and Frederick William II abolished all their houses. In Russia Catharine II also forbade the promulgation of the brief, and ordered the Jesuits to continue their organization. The Jesuits reasoned that, since the brief in Rome itself had not been published in due form, they had a right to comply with the imperial request until the brief should be communicated to them by the bishops of the dioceses. This official communication was never made, and  Clement XIV himself, in a secret letter to the empress, permitted the continuation of the Jesuit colleges in Russia. When the archbishop of Mohilev, in 1779, authorized the Jesuits to open a novitiate, Pius VI was prevailed upon by the Bourbon courts to represent the step taken by the Russian bishop as unauthorized; orally, however, as the Jesuits maintain, he repeatedly confirmed what officially he had disowned. Thus the Jesuits attempt to clear themselves from the charge of having disobeyed the pope, by charging the latter with deliberate duplicity. The Russian Jesuits were placed under the vice-generals Czerniewicz (1782-85), Lienkiewicz (1785- 98), and Careu (1799-1802). The brief of Clement XIV was in 1801 repealed by Pius VII, so far as Russia was concerned, and the next superior of the Russian Jesuits, Gabriel Gruber (1802-5), assumed the title of a general for Russia, and since July 31, 1804, also for Naples. The successor of Gruber, Brzozowski (1805-20), lived to see the restoration of the order by the pope. Soon after (1815) the persecution of the order began in Russia; Dec. 20, 1815, they were expelled from St. Petersburg, in 1820 from all Russia. In other countries of Europe the ex-Jesuits had formed societies which were to serve as substitutes of the abolished order. In Belgium the ex-Jesuits De Broglie and Tournely established in 1794 the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, which, after its expulsion from Belgium, established its center in Austria. In accordance with the wish of the pope, and through the mediation of archbishop Migazzi, of Vienna, this society, under the successor of Tournely († 1797), father Varin, united, on April 8, 1799, with the Baccanarists (q.v.), or Fathers of the Faith of Jesus. Under this name Baccanari (or Paccanari), a layman of Trent, had, in union with several ex-Jesuits, established in 1798 a society in Italy, which, after the union with the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, made considerable progress in Italy, France, Germany, and England. Most of the members hoped gradually to smooth the way for a reunion with the Jesuits in Russia; but as Baccanari, who in the meanwhile had become a priest, did not appear to be in sincere sympathy with this project, he was abandoned by many members and by whole houses. In 1807 he was even arrested by order of Pius VII, but the French liberated him in 1809, since which year he entirely disappears. The last house of the society, that of St. Sylvester, in Rome, joined the restored Jesuits in 1814.

V. History of the Order from its Restoration in 1814 to 1871. — Soon after his return from the French captivity, Pius VII promulgated (Aug. 7, 1814) the bull Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum, by which he restored the  order of the Jesuits for the whole earth. Father Panizzone, in the name of the general of the order, Brozowski, who resided in Russia, received back from the pope the church Al Gesu, in Rome. When Brozowski died, the order had to pass through a severe trial. The vicar general, father Petrucci, in union with father Pietroboni, tried to curtail the electoral freedom of the General Congregation, and his plans were supported by cardinal Della Genga; but the other members invoked the intervention of the pope, and, freedom of election having been secured, elected as general father Fortis, of Verona (1820-29), who was succeeded by father Roothan, of Amsterdam (1829-53), and father Becks, a Belgian (elected July 2, 1853). Within a few years after the restoration the order had again established itself in all parts of Italy. Ferdinand III, in 1815, called them to Modena; and the ex-king of Sardinia, Emanuel IV, entered the order in 1815; he died in 1819. The fear which the election of cardinal Della Genga as pope in 1823 caused to the order proved to be ungrounded, for the new pope (Leo XII) was henceforth the warm patron of the Jesuits, and restored to them the Roman college (1824). They were expelled from Naples and Piedmont in consequence of the revolutionary movements in 1820 and 1821, but were soon restored. In 1836 they were admitted to the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, and in Verona cardinal Odescalchi in 1838 entered the novitiate, but died in 1841.

General Roothan witnessed the expulsion of the Jesuits from all Italy, and even from Rome, in 1848, but he lived to see their restoration in Naples and Rome in 1850. The war of 1859 again destroyed the provinces of Naples and Sicily; in 1866 also Venice. In Spain, Ferdinand VII, by decree of May 15, 1815, declared the charges which former Spanish governments had made against the Jesuits false. The revolution of 1820 drove them from their houses, and on Nov. 17, 1822, twenty-five of them were killed; but when the insurrection was in 1824 subdued by the French, the Jesuits returned. In the civil war of 1834 they were again expelled; in Madrid a fearful riot was, excited against them by the report that they had poisoned the wells, and fourteen were massacred. On July 7, 1835, the order was abolished in the Spanish dominions by a decree of the Cortes. Since 1848 they began silently to return, but the law, which had not been repealed, was again enforced against them by the revolution of 1858. Only in Cuba they remained undisturbed. To Portugal the Jesuits were recalled by Dom Miguel in 1829, and in 1832 they received the college of Coimbra, where they numbered the great-grandson of Pombal among their pupils.

After the overthrow of Dom Miguel, the laws of Pombal were again enforced against them by Dom Pedro, and ever  since they have been excluded from Portugal. In France a number of bishops expressed, immediately after the restoration of the order, a desire to place the boys' seminaries under their charge, and Talleyrand declared himself in favor of their legal restoration, but the king did not consent. Nevertheless, the number and the influence of the Jesuits steadily increased, and they labored with particular zeal for the restoration of the Church of Rome by means of holding “missions.” They reestablished the “congregations” among the laymen, and other religious associations. In 1826 they had two novitiates, two residences, and eight colleges, the most celebrated of which was St. Acheul. La Mennais in vain endeavored to gain the Jesuits for his revolutionary ideas. As all the liberal parties, and even many Legitimists, like count Montlosier, united for combating the Jesuits, royal ordinances of July 16, 1828, took from the Jesuits all their schools, and limited the number of pupils in the boys' seminaries to 20,000. The revolution of July, 1830, dissolved all the houses of the order, and drove all the members out of France; but gradually many returned, and Ravignan, in Paris, gained the reputation of being one of the first pulpit orators of his country. On motion of Thiers, the Chamber of Deputies, in 1845, requested the government to abolish the order in France; but the government preferred to send a special ambassador (Rossi) to Rome in order to obtain the suppression of the Jesuits from the pope. Gregory XVI declined to make any direct concessions, but the general of the order deemed it best to reduce the number of members in France in order to evade the storm rising against the order. The revolution of 1848, the government of Louis Napoleon, and the revolution of 1870, left them undisturbed, and they were allowed to erect a considerable number of colleges in the four provinces into which France is divided. In England the Jesuits continued, after the abolition of the order, to live in common. In 1790 they received from Thomas Weld the castle of Stonyhurst, which soon became one of the most popular educational institutions of the English Roman Catholics. In 1803 they were allowed to join the Russian branch of the order.

In Belgium the Fathers of the Faith joined in 1814 the restored order. The Dutch government expelled the Jesuits, but they returned after the Belgian revolution of 1830, and soon became very numerous. The Jesuits who in 1820 had been expelled from Russia, came to Gallicia, and opened colleges at Tarnopol and Lemberg. Others were called to Hungary by the archbishop of Colocza, and father Landes made his appearance in Vienna. As they secured the special patronage of the emperor and the imperial family, they gained a great influence, and were, as in all other countries,  regarded by the Liberal party as the most dangerous enemies of religious and civil liberty. They were therefore expelled by the revolution of 1848, but returned again when the revolutionary movement was subdued, and received from the Austrian government in 1857 the theological faculty of the University of Innspruck. To Switzerland eight Fathers of the Faith were in 1805 called from Rome by the government of Valais. They soon broke off the connection with Baccanari, and in 1810 were incorporated with the society in Russia. After the restoration of the order, they soon established colleges in other Catholic cantons, particularly in Freiburg, Lucerne, and Schwytz. When the government of the canton of Lucerne, on Oct. 24, 1844, resolved to place the episcopal seminary of the city of Lucerne under the charge of the Jesuits, two volunteer expeditions (Dec. 1844, and March 1845) were undertaken for the purpose of overthrowing the government of Lucerne, but both were unsuccessful. As most of the Protestant cantons demanded the expulsion of the Jesuits from the whole of Switzerland, those cantons which either had called Jesuits to cantonal institutions or which patronized them (namely, Lucerne, Uri, Schwytz, Unterwalden, Zug, Freiburg, and Valais) strengthened a separate alliance (the “Sonderbund”), which had already been formed in 1843, and appointed a council of war for the emergency of a civil conflict. In September, 1847, the Federal Diet decreed the dissolution of the Sonderbund and the expulsion of the Jesuits, and when the seven cantons refused submission, the Sonderbund war broke out, which, in November, 1847, ended in the defeat of the Sonderbund and the expulsion of the Jesuits. The revised federal constitution of Switzerland forbids the establishment of any Jesuit settlement. From the German States, with the exception of Austria, the Jesuits remained excluded until the revolutionary movements of 1848 established the principle of religious liberty, and gained for them admission to all the states, in particular to Prussia, where they established in rapid succession houses in Munster, Paderborn, Aix-la-Chapelle, Cologne, Bonn, Coblentz, Treves, and other cities. They gained a considerable influence on the Catholic population in particular by holding numerous missions in all parts of Germany.

The membership of the order, during the period from 1841 to 1866, increased from 3566 to 8155. At the beginning of 1867 the numerical strength of the order was as follows:

Assistants DistrictProvinceMembersPriests

1. Italy1. Rome4832452. Naoles (scattered)3521943. Sicily (scattered)2221414. Turin (scattered)2921735. Venice (scattered)2231282. Germany1. Austria4431602. Belgium6022603. Gallicia185704. Germany6532605. Holland263953. France1. Champagne5662242. Paris6503063. Lyons7023164. Toulouse5462714. Spain1. Aragon (scattered)4921442. Castile (scattered)7081833. Mexico (scattered)18105. England1. England3121512. Ireland167773. Maryland238804. Missouri20475 Total, 21 provinces, 8331 members (3563 priests, 2332 scholastics, and 2436 brothers).

VI. The Labors of the Order in the Missionary Field. — From the beginning of the order, the extension of the Church of Rome in pagan countries constituted one of the chief aims of the Jesuits, whose zeal in this field was all the greater, as they hoped that here the losses inflicted upon the Church by Protestantism would be more than balanced by new gains. The energy which they have displayed as foreign missionaries is recognized on all sides; the spirit of devotion and self-sacrifice of many of their members, which is illustrated by the martyrdom of about 800 of the order, has also met with deserved recognition even among Protestants. On the other hand, within their own Church, charges were brought against Jesuit missions, as a class, that they received candidates for baptism too easily, and without having sufficient proofs of their real conversion, and that they  were too accommodating to pagan views and customs. These charges led to long controversies between the Jesuits and other monastic orders, and to several decisions of the popes against them. In India, the first missionary ground occupied by the Jesuits, Xavier and his companions, Camero and Mansilla, induced a large number of natives to join the Church of Rome.

In Travancore forty churches had to be built for the converts, and Francis Xavier is reported to have baptized 10,000 pagans within one month. As it was soon discovered that the chief obstacle to the mission was the rigid caste system, the Jesuits concluded to let some members of the order adopt the mode of life of the Brahmins, and others that of other castes. Accordingly, the Jesuits Fernandez, De Nobili, and others began to practice the painful penances of the Brahmins, endeavored even to outdo them in the vigor of these penances, and thus, making the people believe that they were Brahmins, or Indians of other castes, they made in some districts considerable progress. The Catholic congregations in Madura, Carnate, Mogar, and Ceylon are said to have numbered a native population of upwards of 150,000. Japan was also visited by Francis Xavier, who arrived there with two other missionaries in 1549. They gained the favor of several Daimios, and, with their efficient aid, made considerable progress. In 1575 the number of Roman Catholics was estimated at 40,000; in 1582 three Christian Daimios sent ambassadors to pope Gregory XIII; in 1613 they had houses of professed at Nagasaki, Miaco, and Fakata, colleges at Nagasaki and Arima, and residences at Oasaca and seven other places. During the persecution which broke out in the 17th century and extirpated Christianity, more than a hundred members of the order perished, together with more than a million of native Christians. The first Catholic missionaries in China were the Jesuits Roger and Ricci. The latter and several of his successors, in particular father Adam Schall, gained considerable influence upon the emperors by means of their knowledge of astronomy and Chinese literature, and the number of those whom they admitted to the Church was estimated as early as 1663 at 300,000. They showed, however, so great an accommodation with regard to the pagan customs that they were denounced in Rome by other missionaries, and several popes, in particular Benedict XIV, condemned their practices. In Cochin China the first Jesuits arrived in 1614, in Tunkin in 1627. In both countries they succeeded, in spite of cruel persecutions, in establishing a number of congregations which survived the downfall of the order. They met with an equal success in the Philippine Islands, and in the Marianas; but their labors on the Caroline Islands were a failure.

Their labors in  Abyssinia, Morocco, and other parts of Africa, likewise, did not produce any lasting results. Congo and Angola were nominally converted to Christianity by Jesuit and other missionaries, but even Roman Catholic writers must admit that the religion of the mass of the population differed but little from paganism, into which they easily relapsed as soon as they found themselves without European missionaries. In 1549, Ignatius Loyola, at the request of king John III of Portugal, sent Emanuel de Nobrega and four other Jesuits to Brazil, where they gathered many man-eating Indians in villages, and civilized them. Among the many Jesuits who followed these pioneer missionaries, Joseph de Anchieta († 1597) and the celebrated pulpit orator Anthony Vieira (about the middle of the 17th century) are the most noted. Among the Jesuits who labored in the American provinces of Spain was Peter Claver, who is said to have baptized more than 300,000 negroes, and is called the apostle of the negroes. In 1586 they were called by the bishop of Tucuman to Paraguay, which soon became the most prosperous of all their missions. The Christian tribes were gathered by the missionaries into the so-called missions, and in 1736 the tribe of the Guaranis alone numbered in thirty-two towns from 30,000 to 40,000 families. When, hi 1753, the Spaniards ceded seven reductions to Portugal, and 30,000 Indians were ordered to leave their villages, an insurrection broke out, which led to the expulsion of the Jesuits by the Spanish government. In Mexico the Jesuits joined in 1572 the other monastic orders in the missionary work. They directed their attention chiefly to the unsubdued tribes, and in 1680 numbered 500 missionaries in 70 missionary stations. The Jesuit Salvatierra and his companion Pacolo in 1697 gained firm footing in California, where they gradually established sixteen stations. In New California, which was first discovered by the Jesuit Kuhn, they encountered more than usual obstacles, but gradually the number of their stations rose to fourteen. In Florida they met with hardly any success. In New France, where the first Jesuit missionary appeared in 1611, father Brebeuf became the first apostle of the Hurons. The Abenakis were fully Christianized in 1689; subsequently nearly the whole tribe of the Illinois, on the Mississippi, was baptized. In Eastern Europe and in Asia Minor the Jesuits succeeded in inducing a number of Greeks and Armenians to recognize the supremacy of the pope. After the restoration of the order the Jesuits resumed their missionary labors with great zeal.

VII. The Work at Home. — While abroad the order was endeavoring to extend the territory of the Church, their task at home was to check the  further progress of Protestantism, and every other form of opposition to the Church of Rome, and to become within the Church the most powerful organization. They regarded the pulpit as one of the best means to establish an influence over the mass of the Catholic people, and many members gained considerable reputation as pulpit orators. Bourdaloue, Ravignan, and Felix in France, Segneri in Italy, Tolet in Spain, Vieyra in Portugal, were regarded as among the best pulpit orators in those countries; but, on the whole, the effect of their preaching was more sensational than lasting. In order to train the youth in the principles of rigid ultramontanism, the constitution of the order enjoined upon the members to cultivate with particular zeal catechetics. A large number of catechisms were accordingly compiled by Jesuit authors, among which those of Canisius and cardinal Bellarmine gained the greatest reputation and the widest circulation. In modern times the gradual introduction of the catechism of the Jesuit Deharbe by the ultramontane bishops is believed to have been one of the chief instruments in the revival of ultramontane principles among the German people. As confessors, the Jesuits were famous for their indulgent and lax conduct not only towards licentious princes, but towards all who, in their opinion, might be expected to benefit the order. In their works on moral theology they developed a comparatively new branch, casuistry; and many of their writers developed on the theory of Probabilism (q.v.) ideas which a large portion of the Church indignantly repudiated as dangerous innovations, and which, in some instances, even the popes deemed it necessary to censure.

In order to effect among their adherents as strict an organization as the order itself possessed, so-called “congregations” were formed among their students, and among all classes of society, who obeyed the directions of the order as absolutely as its own members. Wherever there were or are houses of Jesuits, there is a Jesuitic party among the laity which pursues the same aims as the order. Thus the Jesuits have become a power wherever they have established themselves, while, on the other hand, the fanaticism invariably connected with their movements has always and naturally produced against them a spirit of bitterness and hatred which has never manifested itself to the same degree against any other institution of the Roman Catholic Church. The importance of schools for gaining an influence upon society was appreciated by the Jesuits more highly than had ever before been the case in the Roman Catholic Church. The most famous of their educational institutions was the Roman College (Collegium Romanum). Paul IV conferred upon it in 1556 the rank and privileges of a university; Gregory XIII, in 1581, a princely dotation. In 1584 it numbered  2107 pupils. Eight of its pupils (Urban VIII, Innocent X, Clement IX, Clement X, Innocent XII, Clement XI, Innocent XIII, and Clement XII) ascended the papal throne; several others (Aloysius of Gonzaga, Camillus of Lellis, Leonardo of Porto Maurizio) were enrolled among the canonized saints.

In 1710 the Jesuits conferred the academical degrees at 24 universities and 612 colleges, and 157 boarding schools were under their management. After the restoration of the order the Jesuits displayed the same zeal in establishing schools and colleges, and have revived their reputation of strict disciplinarians, who know how to curb the impetuosity and passions of youth; but neither in the former nor in the present period of their history have they been able to raise one of their schools to that degree of eminence which, as in the case of some of the German universities, must be admitted by friend and foe. The number of writers which the order has produced is immense. As early as 1608 Ribadeneyra published a catalog of the writers of the order containing 167 pages. Alegambe (1643) and Southwell (1675) extended it into a large volume in folio. More recently the Belgian Jesuits Augustine and Aloys de Backer began a bibliography of the order, which, though not yet completed, numbered in 1870 seven volumes (quarto). A new edition of this work, to be published in three volumes (in folio), is in the course of preparation. The following writers of the order belong among those who are best known: Bellarmine, Less, Molina, Petavius, Suarez, Tolet, Vasquez, Maldonat, Salmeron, Cornelius a Lapide, Hardouin, Labbe, Sirmond, the Bollandists, Mariana, Perrone, Passaglia, Gury, Secchi (astronomer). Quite recently the order has also attempted to establish its own organs in the province of periodical literature. Publications of this kind are the semi-monthly Civilta Cattolica of Rome, which is generally regarded as the most daring expounder of the principles of the most advanced ultramontane school; Etudes historiques of France, The Month in England, and the Stimmen von Maria Laach (a monthly published by the Jesuits of Maria Laach since August, 1871) in Germany.

VIII. Some Errors concerning the Jesuits. — As the Jesuits, by their systematic fanaticism, provoked a violent opposition on the part of all opponents of ultramontane Catholicism, it is not to be wondered at that occasionally groundless charges were brought against them, and that some of these were readily believed. Among the erroneous charges which at one time have had a wide circulation, but from which the best historians now acquit them, are the following: 1. That they are responsible for the  sentiments contained in the famous volume Monita Secreta (q.v.). This work was not written by a Jesuit, but is a satire, the author of which was, however, as familiar with the movements of the Jesuits as with their history (see Gieseler, Kirchengesch. 3, 2, 656 sq.). 2. That the superior of the order has the power to order a member to commit a sin. It is now generally admitted that the passage of the constitution on which the charge is based (visum est nobis nullas constitutiones declarationes vel ordinem ullum vivendi posse obligationem ad peccatum inducere, nisi Superior ea juberet) has been misunderstood. 3. That the order holds to the maxim that “the end justifies the means.” Although many works of Jesuits (in particular those on tyrannicide) were well calculated to instill such an opinion into the minds of the reader, the order has never expressly taught it.

9. Literature. — The number of works on the Jesuits is legion. The titles of most may be found in Carayon, Bibliographie hist. de la Comp. de Jesus (Paris, 1864). The most important work in favor of the Jesuits is Cretineau- Joly, Hist. de la Comp. de Jesus (3d ed. Par. 1859, 6. vols.). The best that has been written on the subject are the chapters concerning the Jesuits in Ranke's work on the Roman popes. (A.J.S.)

## Jesurun[[@Headword:Jesurun]]

             (Isa 44:2). SEE JESHURUN.

## Jesus[[@Headword:Jesus]]

             (Ι᾿ησοῦς, Gen., Dat., and Voc. οῦ, Acc. οῦν; from the Heb. יֵשׁוִּ, Yeshu'a, “Jeshua” or “Joshua;” Syr. Yeshu), the name of several persons (besides our Savior) in the New Testament, the Apocrypha, and Josephus. For a discussion of the full import and application of the name, SEE JESUS CHRIST.

1. JOSHUA SEE JOSHUA (q.v.) the son of Nun (2Es 7:37; Ecclesiastes 46:1; 1Ma 2:55; Act 7:45; Heb 4:8; so also Josephus, passim).

2. JOSHUA, or JESHUA SEE JESHUA (q.v.) the priest, the son of Jehozadak (1Es 5:5; 1Es 5:8; 1Es 5:24; 1Es 5:48; 1Es 5:56; 1Es 5:68; 1Es 5:70; 1Es 6:2; 1Es 9:19; Ecclesiastes 49:12; so also Josephus, Ant. 11, 3, 10 sq.).

3. JESHUA SEE JESHUA (q.v.) the Levite (1Es 5:58; 1Es 9:48).  4. JESUS, THE SON OF SIRACH (Ι᾿ησοῦς υἱὸς Σειράχ; Vulgate Jesus filius Sirach), is described in the text of Ecclesiasticus (1, 27) as the author of that book, which in the Sept., and generally in the Eastern Church, is called by his name — the Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach, or simply the Wisdom of Sirach, but in the Western churches, after the Vulgate, the Book of Ecclesiasticus. The same passage speaks of him as a native of Jerusalem, and the internal character of the book confirms its Palestinian origin. The name JESUS was of frequent occurrence (see above), and was often represented by the Greek Jason (see Josephus, Ant. 12, 5, 1). In the apocryphal list of the seventy-two commissioners sent by Eleazar to Ptolemy it occurs twice (Aristophanes, Hist. ap. Hody, De Text. p. 7), but there is not the slightest ground for connecting the author of Ecclesiasticus with either of the persons there mentioned. The various conjectures which have been made as to the position of the son of Sirach from the contents of his book as, for instance, that he was a priest (from 7, 29 sq.; 45; 49, 1), or a physician (from 38, 1 sq.) — are equally unfounded. The evidences of a date B.C. cir. 310-270, are as follows: 1. In ch. 44, 1-1,21. the praises of the ancient worthies are extolled down to the time of Simon, who is doubtless Simon I, or “the Just” (B.C. 370-300). 2. The Talmud most distinctly describes the work of Ben-Sira as the oldest of the apocryphal books (comp. Tosefoth Idaim, ch. 2). 3. It had a general currency, and was quoted at least as early as the 2d century B.C. (comp. Aboth, 1, 5; Jerusalem Nazier, 5, 3), which shows that it must have existed a considerable period to have obtained such circulation and respect; and, 4. In the description of these great men, and throughout the whole of the book, there is not the slightest trace of those Hagadic legends about the national worthies which were so rife and numerous in the second century before Christ. On the other hand, the mention of the “38th year of king Euergetes” (translator's prologue) argues a later date. SEE ECCLESIACTICUS.

Among the later Jews the “Son of Sirach” was celebrated under the name of Ben-Sira as a writer of proverbs, and some of those which have been preserved offer a close resemblance to passages in Ecclesiasticus; but in the course of time a later compilation was substituted for the original work of Ben-Sira (Zunz).

According to the first prologue to the book of Ecclesiasticus, taken from the Synopsis of the Pseudo-Athanasius (4, 377, ed. Migne), the translator of the book bore the same name as the author of it. If this conjecture were  true, a genealogy of the following form would result: 1. Sirach 2. Jesus, son (father) of Sirach (author of the book). 3. Sirach 4. Jesus, son of Sirach (translator of the book). It is, however, most likely that the last chapter, “The prayer of Jesus, the Son of Sirach,” gave occasion to this conjecture. The prayer was attributed to the translator, and then the table of succession followed necessarily from the title attached to it.

As to the history and personal character of Ben-Sira, this must be gathered from his book, as it is the only source of information which we possess upon the subject. Like all his coreligionists, he was trained from his early life to fear and love the God of his fathers. He traveled much both by land and sea when he grew up, and was in frequent perils (Sir 34:11-12). Being a diligent student, and having acquired much practical knowledge from his extensive travels, he was intrusted with some office at court, and his enemies, who were jealous of him, maligned him before the king, which nearly cost him his life (Sir 51:6-7). To us, however, his religious life and sentiments are of the utmost importance, inasmuch as they describe the opinions of the Jews during the period elapsing between the O.T. and N. Test. Though deeply penetrated with the fear of God, which he declared was the only glory of man, rich, noble, or poor (Sir 10:22-24), still the whole of Ben-Sira's tenets may be described as limited, and are as follows: Resignation to the dealings of Providence (Sir 11:21-25); to seek truth at the cost of life (4, 28); not to use much babbling in prayer (7, 14); absolute obedience to parents, which in the sight of God atones for sins (Sir 3:1-16; Sir 7:27-28); humility (Sir 3:17-19; Sir 10:7-18; Sir 10:28); kindness to domestics (Sir 4:30; Sir 7:20-21; Sir 33:30-31); to relieve the poor (Sir 4:1-9); to act as a father to the fatherless, and a husband to the widow (Sir 4:10); to visit the sick (Sir 7:35); to weep with them that weep (Sir 7:34); not to rejoice over the death of even the greatest enemy (Sir 7:7), and to forgive sins as we would be forgiven (Sir 28:2-3). He has nothing in the whole of his book about the immortality of the soul, a future judgment, the existence of spirits, or the expectation of a Messiah. SEE SIRACH.

5. SEE BARABBAS.

6. (Col. 4, 11). SEE JUSTUS. JESUS is also the name of several persons mentioned by Josephus, especially in the pontifical ranks. SEE HIGH PRIEST.

1. A high priest displaced by Antiochus Epiphanes to make room for Onias (Ant. 12, 5, 1; 15, 3, 1).  2. The son of Phabet, deprived by Herod of the high priesthood in order to make way for his own father-in-law Simon (Ant. 15, 9,4).

3. Son of Sie, successor of Eleazar (Ant. 17, 13, 1).

4. The son of Damnaeus, made high priest by Agrippa in place of Ananus (Ant. 20, 9, 1).

5. The son of Gamaliel, and successor of the preceding in the high priesthood (Ant. 20, 9, 4; compare War, 4, 4,3).

6. Son of Ananus, a plebeian, and the utterer of the remarkable doom against Jerusalem, which was fulfilled during the last siege simultaneously with his own death (War, 6, 5, 3).

7. A priest, son of Thebuthus, who surrendered to Titus the sacred utensils of the Temple (War, 6, 8, 3).

8. Son of Sepphias, one of the chief priests and governor of Tiberias (War, 2, 20, 4).

9. Son of Saphat, a ringleader of the Sicarii during the last war with the Romans (War, 3, 9, 7).

## Jesus (Holy Child), Congregation Of, The Daughters Of The[[@Headword:Jesus (Holy Child), Congregation Of, The Daughters Of The]]

             is the name of a society existing in Rome, and was founded by Anna Moroni, of Lucca, who in early years went to Rome, and there amassed a fortune, which she decided to devote to a religious purpose. In its character, she made it an institution similar to that of the “Hospital Sisters,” for the education of young women, so as to enable them to earn a livelihood. The congregation was confirmed by pope Clement X in 1673. The number of the members is set down at thirty-three, corresponding with the years Jesus spent on earth; they assume the vow of poverty, chastity, and obedience. The novitiate lasts three years, but they may withdraw before taking the vow, leaving, however, to the congregation whatever they may have brought there on their admission. The discipline of the congregation is strict; the dress is a full dark brown garment and white cowl. There existed also a similar order under the name of “Sisters of the good Jesus” early in the 15th century. Their main object was the promotion of a life of chastity among females. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 615. SEE HOSPITAL SISTERS.

## Jesus Christ[[@Headword:Jesus Christ]]

             (Ι᾿ησοῦς Χριστός, Ι᾿ηοῦς ὁ Χριστός; sometimes by Paul in the reverse order “Christ Jesus”), the ordinary designation of the incarnate Son of God and Savior of mankind. This double designation is not, like Simon Peter, John Mark, Joses Barnabas, composed of a name and a surname, but, like John the Baptist, Simon Magus, Bar-Jesus Elymas, of a proper name and an official title. JESUS was our Lord's proper name, just as Peter, James, and John were the proper names of three of his disciples. To distinguish our Lord from others bearing the name, he was termed Jesus of Nazareth (Joh 18:7, etc., strictly Jesus the Nazarene, Ι᾿ησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος), and Jesus the son of Joseph (Joh 6:42, etc.).

I. Import of the name. — There can be no doubt that Jesus is the Greek form of a Hebrew name, which had been borne by two illustrious individuals in former periods of the Jewish history — the successor of Moses and introducer of Israel into the promised land (Exo 24:13), and the high priest who, along with Zerubbabel (Zec 3:1), took so active a part in the reestablishment of the civil and religious polity of the  Jews on their return from the Babylonish captivity. Its original and full form is Jehoshua (Num 13:16). By contraction it became Joshua, or Jeshua; and when transferred into Greek, by taking the termination characteristic of that language, it assumed the form Jesus. It is thus that the names of the illustrious individuals referred to are uniformly written in the Sept., and the first of them is twice mentioned in the New Testament by this name (Act 7:45; Heb 4:8).

The original name of Joshua was Hoshea (הוֹשֵׁע, saving), as appears in Num 13:8; Num 13:16, which was changed by Moses into Jehoshua (יְהוֹשֻׁעִ, Jehovah is his salvation), as appears in Num 12:16; 1Ch 7:27, being elsewhere Anglicized “Joshua.” After the exile he is called by the abridged form of this name, Jeshua (יֵשׁוּע, id.), whence the Greek name Ι᾿ησοῦς, by which this is always represented in the Sept. This last Heb. form differs little from the abstract noun from the same root, יְשׁוּעָה, yeshuah', deliverance, and seems to have been understood as equivalent in import (see Mat 1:22 comp. Ecclesiastes 46:1). The “name of Jesus” (Php 2:10) is not the name Jesus, but “the name above every name” (Php 2:9); i.e. the supreme dignity and authority with which the Father has invested Jesus Christ as the reward of his disinterested exertions in the cause of the divine glory and human happiness; and the bowing ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ι᾿ησοῦ is obviously not an external mark of homage when the name Jesus is pronounced, but the inward sense of awe and submission to him who is raised to a station so exalted.

The conferring of this name on our Lord was not the result of accident, or of the ordinary course of things, but was the effect of a direct divine order (Luk 1:31; Luk 2:21), as indicative of his saving function (Mat 1:21). Like the other name Immanuel (q.v.), it does not necessarily import the divine character of the wearer. This, however, clearly results from the attributes given in the same connection, and is plainly taught in numerous passages (see especially Rom 1:3-4; Rom 9:5). for the import and application of the name CHRIST, SEE MESSIAH.

For a full discussion of the name Jesus, including many fanciful etymologies and explanations, with their refutation, see Gesenius, Thes. Heb. 2, 582; Simon. Onom. V. T. p. 519 sq.; Fritzsche, De nomine Jesu (Freiburg, 1705); Clodius, De nom. Chr. et Marioe Arabicis (Lips. 1724); Hottinger, Hist. Orient. p. 153,157; Seelen, Meditat. exeg. 2, 413; Thiess, Krit.  Comment. 2, 395; A. Pfeiffer, De nomine Jesu, in his treatise De Talmude Judoeorum, p. 177 sq.; Baumgarten, Betracht. d. Namens Jesu (Halle, 1736); Chrysander, De vera forma atque emphasi nominis Jesu (Rintel. 1751); Osiander, Harmonia Evangelica (Basil. 1561), lib. 1, c. 6; Chemnitius, De nomine Jesu, in the Thes. Theol. Philol. (Amst. 1702), vol. 2, p. 62; Canini, Disquis. in loc. aliq. N.T., in the Crit. Sac. ix; Gass, De utroque J.C. nomine, Dei filii et nominis (Vratistl. 1840); and other monographs cited in Volbeding's Index, p. 6, 7; and in Hase's Leben Jesu, p. 51.

II. Personal Circumstances of our Lord. — These, of course, largely affected his history, notwithstanding his divinity. —

1. General View. — The following is a naked statement of the facts of his career as they may be gathered from the evangelical narratives, supposing them to be entitled simply to the credit due to profane history. (For literature, see Volbeding, p. 56; Hase, p. 8.) The founder of the Christian religion was born (B.C. 6) at Bethlehem, near Jerusalem, under the reign of the emperor Augustus, of Mary, at the time betrothed to the carpenter (τέκτων) Joseph, and descended from the royal house of David (Mat 1:1 sq.; Luk 3:23 sq.; comp. Joh 7:42). Soon after his birth he was compelled to escape from the murderous designs of Herod the Great by a hasty flight into the adjacent parts of Egypt (Mat 2:13 sq.; according to the tradition at Matarea, see Evangel. infant. Arab. c. 24; apparently a place near old Heliopolis, where is still shown a very old mulberry tree under which Mary is said to have rested with the babe, see Prosp. Alpin, Rer. AEg. 1, 5, p. 24; Paulus, Samml. 3, 256 sq.; Tischendorf, Reisen, 1, 141 sq.; comp. generally Hartmann, Erdbeschr. v. Africa, 1, 878 sq.). SEE EGYPT; SEE HEROD.

But immediately after the death of this king his parents returned to their own country, and settled again (Luk 1:26) in Nazareth (q.v.), in Lower Galilee (Mat 2:23; comp. Luk 4:16; Joh 1:46, etc.), where the youthful Jesus so rapidly matured (Luk 2:40; Luk 2:52), that in his twelfth year the boy evinced at the metropolis traits of an uncommon religious intelligence, which excited astonishment in all the spectators (Luk 2:41 sq.). With this event the history of his youth concludes in the canonical gospels, and we next find him, about the thirtieth year of his age (A.D. 25), in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, at the Jordan, where he suffered himself to be consecrated for the introduction of the new divine dispensation (βασίλεια τοῦ θεοῦ) by the symbol of water baptism at the hands of  John the Baptist (Mat 3:13 sq.; Mar 1:9 sq.; Luk 3:21 sq.; Joh 1:32 sq.). He now began, after a forty-days' fast (comp. 1Ki 19:8) spent in the wilderness of Judea (Mat 4:1-11; Mar 1:12 sq.; Luk 4:1-13) in quiet meditation upon his mission, to publish openly in person this “kingdom of God,” by earnestly summoning his countrymen to repentance, i.e. a fundamental reformation of their sentiments and conduct, through a new birth from the Holy Spirit (Joh 3:3 sq.).

He repeatedly announced himself as the mediator of this dispensation, and in pursuance of this character, in correction of the sensual expectations of the people with reference to the long hoped for Redeemer (comp. Luk 4:21), he chose from among his early associates and Galilaean countrymen a small number of faithful disciples (Matthew 10), and with them traveled, especially at the time of the Paschal festival and during the summer months, in various directions through Palestine, seizing every opportunity to impress pure and fruitful religious sentiments upon the populace or his immediate disciples, and to enlighten them concerning his own dignity as God's legate (υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ), who should abolish the sacrificial service, and teach a worship of God, as the. common Father of mankind, in spirit and in truth (Joh 4:24). With these expositions of doctrine, which all breathe the noblest practical spirit, and were so carefully adapted to the capacity and apprehension of the hearers that in respect to clearness, simplicity, and dignified force they are still a pattern of true instruction, he coupled, in the spirit of the Old Testament prophets, and as his age expected from the Messiah, wonderful deeds, especially charitable cures of certain diseases at that time very prevalent and regarded as incurable, but to these he himself appears to have attributed a subordinate value. By this means he gathered about him a considerable company of true adherents and thankful disciples, chiefly from the middle class of the people (Joh 7:49; and even from the despicable publicans, Mat 9:9 sq. Luk 5:27 sq.); for the eminent and learned were repelled by the severe reproofs which he uttered against their corrupt maxims (Mar 12:38 sq.), their sanctimonious (Luk 12:1; Luk 18:9 sq.) and hypocritical punctiliousness (Luk 11:39 sq.; Luk 18:9 sq.), and against their prejudices, as being subversive of all true religion (Joh 8:33; Joh 9:16), as well as by the slight regard which (in comparison with their statutes) he paid to the Sabbath (Joh 5:16); and as he in no respect corresponded to their expectations of the Messiah, full of animosity, they made repeated attempts to seize his person (Mar 11:18; Joh 7:30; Joh 7:44). At last they succeeded, by the assistance of the traitor Judas, in taking him prisoner in  the very capital, where he had just partaken of a parting meal in the familiar circle of his friends (the Passover), upon which he engrafted the initiatory rite of a new covenant; and thus, without exciting any surprise on his part, in surrendering him into the hands of the Roman authorities as a popular insurrectionist. He was sentenced to death by crucifixion, as he had often declared to his disciples would be his fate, and suffered himself, with calm resignation, to be led to the place of execution between two malefactors (on their traditional names, see Thilo, Apocryph. 1, 580 sq.; comp. Evang. infant. Arab. c. 23); but he arose alive on the third day from the grave which a grateful disciple had prepared for him, and after tarrying forty days in the midst of his disciples, during which he confidently intrusted the prosecution of the great work into their hands, and promised them the divine help of a Paraclete (παράκλητος), he finally, according to one of the narrators, soared away visibly into the sky (A.D. 29). (See Volbeding, p. 6.)

2. Sources of Information. — The only trustworthy accounts respecting Jesus are to be derived from the evangelists. (See Volbeding, p. 5.) SEE GOSPELS, SPURIOUS. They exhibit, it is true, many chasms (Causse, De rationibus ob quas non plura quam quoe extant ad J.C. vitam pertinentia ab Evang. literis sint consignata, Franckf. 1766), but they wear the aspect of a true, plain, lively narrative. Only two of these derive their materials from older traditions, doubtless from the apostles and companions of Jesus; but they were all first written down a long time after the occurrences: hence it has often been asserted that the historical matter was even at that time no longer extant in an entirely pure state (since the objective and the subjective, both in views and opinions, are readily interchanged in an unscientifically formed style); but that after Jesus had been so gloriously proved to be the Messias, the incidents were improved into prodigies, especially through a consideration of the Old Testament prophecies (Kaiser, Bibl. Theol. 1, 199 sq.).

Yet in the synoptical gospels this could only be shown in the composition and connection of single transactions; the facts themselves in the respective accounts agree too well in time and circumstances, and the narrators confine themselves too evidently to the position of writers of memoirs, to allow the supposition of a (conscious) transformation of the events or any such developments from Old Testament prophecy: moreover, if truth and pious poetry had already become mingled in the verbal traditionary reports, the eyewitnesses Matthew and John would have known well, in a fresh narration, how to distinguish between  each of these elements with regard to scenes which they had themselves passed through (for memory and imagination were generally more lively and vigorous among the ancients than with us) (Br. ub. Rationalismus, p. 248 sq.; compare Heydenreich, Ueb. Unzulassigkeit d. myth. Auffassung des Histor. im N.T. und im Christenth. Herborn, 1831-5; see Hase, p. 9). Sooner would we suppose that the fertile-minded John, who wrote latest, has set before us, not the pure historical Christ, but one apprehended by faith and confounded with his own spiritual conceptions (Br. über Rational. p. 352). But while it is altogether probable that even he, by reason of his individuality and spiritual sympathy with Jesus, apprehended and reflected the depth and spirituality of his Master more truly than the synoptical evangelists, who depict rather the exterior phenomena of his character, at the same time there is actually nothing contained in the doctrinal discourses of Jesus in John, either in substance or form, that is incompatible with the Christ of the first three evangelists (see Heydenreich, in his Zeitschr fur Predigermiss. 1, pt. 1 and 2); yet these latter represent Jesus as speaking comparatively seldom, and that in more general terms, of his exaltation, dignity, and relation with the Father, whereas that Christ would have explained himself much more definitely and fully upon a point that could not have remained undiscussed, is of itself probable (see Hase, p. 10). Hence also, although we cannot believe that in such representations we are to understand the identical words of Christ to be given (for while the retention of all these extended discourses in the memory is improbable, on the other hand a writing of them down is repugnant to the Jewish custom), yet the actual sentiments of Jesus are certainly thus reported. (See further, Bauer, Bibl. Theol. N.T. 2, 278 sq.; B. Crusius, Bibl. Theol. p. 81; Fleck, Otium theolog. Lips. 1831; and generally Krummacher, Ueber den Geist und die Form der evang. Gesch. Lpz. 1805; Eichhorn, Einleit. 1, 689 sq.; on the mythicism of the evangelists, see Gabler, Neuest. theol. Journ. 7, 396; Bertholdt, Theol. Journ. 5, 235 sq.)

In the Church fathers, we find very little that appears to have been derived from clearly historical tradition, but the apocryphal gospels breathe a spirit entirely foreign to historical truth, and are filled with accounts of petty miracles (Tholuck, Glaubwurdigkeit, p. 406 sq.; Ammon, Leb. Jesu, 1, 90 sq.; compare Schmidt, Einl. ins N.T. 2, 234 sq., and Biblioth. Krit. u. Exegese, 2, 481 sq.). The passage of Josephus (Ant. 18, 3, 3; see Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. § 24), which Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiastes 1, 11; Demonstr. Ev. 3, 7) was the first among Christian writers to make use of, has been shown (see  Hase, p. 12), although some have ingeniously striven to defend it (see, among the latest, Bretschneider, in his Diss. capita theolog. Jud. dogmat. e Josepho collect. Lips. 1812; Bohmert, Ueber des Jos. Zeugniss von Christo, Leipz. 1823; Schodel, Fl. Joseph. de J. Chr. testatus, Lips. 1840), to be partly, but not entirely spurious (see Eichstadt, Flaviani de Jesu Christo testimonii αὐθεντία quo jure nuper rursus defensa sit, Jena, 1813; also his 6 Progr. m. einenz auctar, 1841; Paulus, in the Heidelberg Jahrb. 1813, 1, 269 sq.; Theile, in the N. kritisch. Journ. d. theolog. Lit. 2, 97 sq.; Heinichen, Exc. 1 zu Euseb. H.E. 3, 331 sq.; also Suppl. notarius ad Eusebium, p. 73 sq.; Ammon, Leben Jesu, 1, 120 sq.). SEE JOSEPHUS. (See Volbeding, p. 5.) The Koran (q.v.) contains only palpable fables concerning Jesus (Hottinger, Histor. Or. 105 sq.; Schmidt, in his Bibl. f. Krit. u. Exegese, 1, 110 sq.; D'Herbelot, Biblioth. Orientale, 2, 349 sq.; compare Augusti, Christologioe Koran lineam. Jena, 1799), and the Jewish History of Jesus (תּוֹלְדוֹת יְשׁוּע, edit. Huldrici, Lugd. Bat. 1703; and in Wagenseil, Tela ign. Satan. Altdorf, 1681) betrays itself as an abortive fabrication of Jewish calumny, destitute of any historical value (see Ammon, Bibl. Theol. 2, 263), while the allusions to Jesus in the Talmud and the Rabbins have only a polemical aim (see Meelfuhrer, Jesus in Talmude, Altdorf, 1699, 2, 4; Werner, Jesus in Talmude Stadae, 1731; comp. Bynaeus, De natali J.C. 2, 4). (See Volbeding, p. 5.) The genuine Acts of Pilate (“Acta Pilati,” Eusebius, Chron. Arm. 2, 267; compare Henke, Opusc. p. 199 sq.) are no longer extant, SEE PILATE; what we now possess under this title is a later fabrication (see Ammon, 1, 102 sq.). In the Greek and Roman profane authors, Jesus is only incidentally named (Tacitus, Annal. 15, 44, 3; Pliny, Epist. 10, 97; Lamprid. Vit. Alex. Sev. c. 29, 43; Porphyry, De philosoph. ex. orac. in Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. 3, 7; Liban. in Socr. Hist. Ev. 3, 23; Lucian, Mors peregr. c. 11, 13). On Suidas, s.v. Ιησοῦς see Walter, Codex in Suida mendax de Jesu (Lips. 1724). Whether by Chrestus in Suetonius (Claud. p. 25) is to be understood Christ, is doubted by some (comp. Ernesti and Wolf, ad loc.; SEE CLAUDIUS ), but the unusual name Christus might easily undergo this change (see also Philostr. Soph. 2, 11) in popular reference (see generally Eckhard, Non-Christianor. de Christo testimonia, Quedlinb. 1737; Koecher, Hist. Jesu Christo ex scriptorib. profan. eruta, Jena, 1726; Meyer, Versuche Vertheid. u. Erlaut. der Geschichte Jesu u. d. Apostol. a. griech. u. rom. Profanscrib. Hannov. 1805; Fronmüller, in the Studien der wurtemb. Geistl. 10, 1. On the Jesus of the book of Sirach , 43, 25, see  Seelen, De Jesu in Jesu Sirac. frustra quoesito, Lubec. 1724; also in his Medit. exeg. 1, 207 sq.).

3. The scientific treatment of the life of Jesus belongs to the modern period of theological criticism. Among earlier contributions of a critico- chronological character is that of Offerhaus (De vita J. C. privata et publica, in his Spicil. histor. chronol. Groningen, 1739). Greiling (Halle, 1813) first undertook the adjustment in a lively narrative, of the recent (rationalistic) exposition that has resulted, to the actual career of Christ. An independent but, on the whole, unsatisfactory treatise is that of Planck (Gesch. d. Christenth. in der Periode seiner ersten Einfuhr. in die Welt durch Jesum u. die Apostel, Göttingen, 1818). Kaiser has attempted an analysis (Bibl. Theol. 1, 230 sq.). Still more severe in his method of criticism is Paulus (Das Leben Jesu als Grundlage einer reinen Gesch. d. Urchristenth. Heidelb. 1828), and bold to a degree that has alarmed the theological world is D.F. Strauss (Leben J. krit. bearbeit. Tubing. 1835, and since). The latter anew reduced the evangelical histories (with the exception of a few plain transactions) to a mythical composition springing out of the Old Test. prophecies and the expectations of the Messiah in the community, and, in his criticism upon single points, generally stands upon the shoulders of the preceding writers. In opposition to him, numerous men of learning and courage rose up to defend the “historical Christ,” some of them insisting upon the strictly supernatural interpretation (Lange; Harless; Tholuck, Glaubwurdigkeit der evangel. Gesch. Hamb. 1838; Krabbe, Vorles. über das Leben Jesu, Hamb. 1839), while others concede or pass over single points in the history (Neander, Leben J. Chr. Hamburg, 1837). Into this controversy, which grew highly personal, a philosophical writer (Weisse, Evang. Geschichte Krit. u. philosoph. Bearbeitung, Leipz. 1840) became involved, and attempted, by an ingenious but decidedly presumptuous criticism, to distinguish the historical and the unhistorical element in the evangelical account. At the same time, Theile (Zur Biographie Jesu, Leipzig, 1837) gave a careful and conciliatory summary of the materials of the discussion, but Hase has published (in the 4th ed. of his Leben Jesu, Leipz. 1840) a masterly review, showing the gradual rejection of the extravagances of criticism since 1829. The substance of the life of Jesus has thus now become established in general belief as historical truth; yet Bauer (Krit. der evangel. Gesch. d. Synoptiker, Leipz. 1841), after an analysis of the gospels as literary productions, calls the original narrative concerning Jesus “a pure creation of the Christian consciousness,”  and he pronounces the evangelical history generally to be “solved.” Thenius has met him with a proof of the evangelical history, drawn from the N. Test. epistles, in a few but striking remarks (Das Evang. ohne die Evangelien, Leipz. 1843), but A. Ebrard (Viss. Krit. d. evang. Gesch. Frankf. 1842) has fully refuted him in a learned but not unprejudiced work (see also Weisse, in the Jen. Lit.-Zeit. 1843, No. 7-9, 13-15). But this heartless and also peculiarly insipid criticism of Bauer which, indeed, often degenerates into the ridiculous appears to have left no impression upon the literary world, and may therefore be dismissed without further consideration (comp. generally Grimm, Glaubwurdigkeit d. evangel. Gesch. in Bezug auf Strauss und Bauer, Jena, 1845). Lately, Von Ammon (Gesch. d. Leb. Jesu; Leipz. 1842) undertook, in his style of combination, carefully steering between the extremes, a narrative of the life of Jesus full of striking observations. Whatever else has been done in this department (Gfrorer, Geschichte des Urchristenth. Stuttg. 1838; Salvador, Jesus Christ et sa doctrine, Par. 1838) belongs rather to the origin of Christianity than to the data of the life of Jesus. In Catholic literature little has appeared on this subject (Kuhn, Leben Jesus wissensch. bearbeitet, Mainz, 1838; of a more general character are the works of Francke, Leipz. 1838, and Storch, Leipz. 1841). (On the bearing of subjective views upon the treatment of the gospel history, there are the monographs cited in Volbeding, p. 6.) See literature below, and compare the art. SEE CHRISTOLOGY.

4. Chronological Data. —

a. The year of Christ's birth (for the general condition of the age, see Knapp, De statu temp. nato Christo, Hal. 1757; and the Church histories of Gieseler, Neander, etc.; on a special point, see Masson, Jani templ. Christo nascente reseratum, Rotterdam, 1700) cannot, as all investigations on this point have proved (Fabricii Bibl. antiquar. p. 187 sq., 342 sq.; Thiess, Krit. Comment. 2, 339 sq.; comp. especially S. van Tilde, de anno, mense et die nati Chr. Lugd. Bat. 1700, praef. J.G. Walch, Jena, 1740; K. Michaeles, Ueber das Geburts- u. Sterbejahr J.C. Wien, 1796, 2, 8), be determined with full certainty (Reccard, Pr. in rationes et limites incertitudinis circa temp. nat. Christi, Reg. 1768); yet it is now pretty generally agreed that the vulgar era (Hamberger, De epochoe Dionys. ortu et auctore, Jen. 1704; also in Martini Thes. Diss. 3, 1, 341 sq.), of which the first year corresponds to 4714 of the Julian Period, or 754 (and latter part of 753; see Jarvis, Introd. to Hist of the Church, p. 54, 610) of Rome  (Sanclemente, De vulg. oeroe emendat. Rom. 1793; Ideler, Chronol. 2, 383 sq.), has assigned it a date too late by a few years (see Strong's Harm. and Expos. Append. 1), since the death of Herod the Great (Mat 2:1 sq.), according to Josephus (Ant. 17, 8, 1; comp. 14, 14, 5; 17, 9, 3), must have occurred before Easter in B.C. 4 (see Browne's Ordo Soeclorum, p. 27 sq.). Hence Jesus may have been born in the beginning of the year of Rome 750, four years before the epoch of our era, or even earlier (Uhland, Christum anno ante oer. Vulg. 4 exeunte nature esse, Tubing. 1775; so Bengel, Anger, Wieseler, Jarvis), but in no case later (comp. also Offerhaus, Spicileg. p. 422 sq.; Paulus, Comment. 1, 206 sq.; Vogel, in Gabler's Journ. f. auserl. theolog. Lit. 1, 244 sq.; and in the Studien der wurtemberg. Geistlichk. 1, 1, 50 sq.). A few passages (as Luk 3:1; Luk 3:23; Mat 2:2 sq.) afford a closer determination, SEE CYRENIUS; the latter gave occasion to the celebrated Kepler to connect the star of the Magi with a planetary conjunction (of Jupiter and Saturn), and more recent writers have followed this suggestion (Wurm, in Bengel's Archiv. 2, 1, 261 sq.; Ideler, Handb. d. Chronol. 2, 399 sq., and Lehrb. d. Chronol. p. 428 sq.; compare also Munter, Stern der Weisen, Copenh. 1827; Klein's Oppositionsschr. 5, 1, 90 sq.; Schubert, Lehrb. d. Sternkunde, p. 226 sq.), fixing upon B.C. 6 as the true year of the nativity. SEE NATIVITY.

But Mat 2:16 seems to state that the Magi, who must have arrived at Jerusalem soon after the birth of Jesus, had indicated the first appearance of the phenomenon as having occurred a long time previously (probably not exactly two years before), and on that view Jesus might have been born earlier than B.C. 6, the more so inasmuch as the accession of Mars to the same conjunction, occurring in the spring of B.C. 6, according to Kepler, may have first excited the full attention of the Magi. Lately Wieseler (Chronolog. Synopse, p. 67 sq.) has brought down the nativity to the year B.C. 4, and in additional confirmation of this date holds that a comet, which, according to Chinese astronomical tables, was visible for more than two months in this year, was identical with the star of the wise men, at the same time adducing Luk 2:1 sq.; Luk 3:23, as pointing to the same year. But if the Magi had first been incited to their journey by the appearance of that comet, they could not well have designated to Herod as the Messianic star the planetary conjunction of A.U.C. 747 or 748, then almost two years ago, seeing this was an entirely distinct phenomenon. Under this supposition, too, Herod would have made more sure of his purpose if he had put to death children three years old. According to this view, then, we should place Christ's birth rather in B.C.  7 than B.C. 4. Some uncertainty, however, must always attend the use of these astronomical data. SEE STAR IN THE EAST.

As an element in determining the year of the nativity, Luk 3:1, comp. 23, must also be taken into the account. Jesus is there positively stated to have entered upon his public ministry at thirty years of age, and indeed soon after John the Baptist, whose mission began in the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius, so that by reckoning back about thirty years from this latter date (August, 781, to August, 782, of Rome, A.D. 28-29), we arrive at about B.C. 3 as the year of Christ's birth, which corresponds to the statements of Irenaeus (Hoeret. 3, 25), Tertullian (Adv. Jud 1:8), and Eusebius (Hist. Ev. 1, 5), that Jesus was born in the year 41 (42) of the reign of Augustus, i.e. 751 of Rome, or B.C. 3 (Ideler, Chronolog. 2, 385). As Luke's language in that passage is somewhat indefinite (“about,” ώαεί), we may presume that Christ was rather over than under thirty years of age; and this will agree with the computation of the fourth year before the Dionysian era, i.e. 750 of Rome. If, however, we suppose (but see Browne, Ordo Soeclorum, p. 67) the joint reign of Tiberius with Augustus, i.e. his association with him in the government especially of the provinces (Vell. Paterc. Hist. Rom. 2, 121; Sueton. 3, 20, 21; Tacitus, Annal. 1, 3; Dio Cass. Hist. Rom. 2, 103), three and a half years before his full reign (Janris, Introd. p. 228-239), to be meant, we shall again be brought to about B.C. 6, or possibly 7, as the year of the nativity. The latest conclusion of Block (Das wahre Geburtsjahr Christi, Berl. 1843), that Jesus was born in the year 735 of Rome, or nineteen years before the beginning of the vulgar era, based upon the authority of the later Rabbins, does not call for special examination (yet see Wieseler, Chronol. Synopse, p. 132). SEE ADVENT.

The month and day of the birth of Christ cannot be determined with a like degree of approximation, but it could not, at all events, have fallen in December or January, since at this time of the year the flocks are not found in the open fields during the night (Luk 2:8), but in pens (“ the first rain descends the 17th of the month Marchesvan [November], and then the cattle returned home; nor did the shepherds any longer lodge in huts in the fields,” Gemara, Nedar. 63); moreover, a census (ἀπογραφή), which made traveling necessary (Luk 2:2 sq.), would not have been ordered at this season. We may naturally suppose that the month of March is the time for driving out cattle to pasture, at least in Southern Palestine (Suskind, in Bengel's Archiv. 1, 215; comp. A.J. u. d. Hardt, De momenteis quibusd. hist. et chron. ad determin. Chr. diem natal. Helmst. 1754; Korner, De die  natali Servatoris, Lips. 1778; Funck, De die Servat. natali, Rint. 1735; also in his Dissert. Acad. p. 149 sq.; Minter, Stern der Weisen, Copenh. 1827, p. 110 sq.). If we can rely upon a statement of the Jewish Rabbins, that the first of the twenty-four courses of priests entered upon their duties in the regular cycle the very week in which the Temple was destroyed by the Romans (Mishna, 3, 298, 3), we are furnished with the means, by comparison with the time of the service of Zachariah (Luk 1:5; Luk 1:8), who belonged to the eighth division (1Ch 24:10), of determining with considerable certainty (Browne's Ordo Soeclorum, p. 33 sq.) the date of the nativity as occurring, if in B.C. 6, about the month of August (Strong's Harm. and Expos. Append. 1, p. 23). The attempts of Scaliger and Bengel to determine the month of the nativity from this element (compare Maurit. De sortit. p. 334 sq.) are unsatisfactory (see Van Til, ut sup. p. 75 sq.; Allix, Diatr. de anno et mense J.C. nat. p. 44 sq.; Paulus, Comment. 1, 36 sq.). Lately Jarvis (Introd. p. 535 sq.) has endeavored to maintain the traditionary date of Christmas of the Latin Church; and Seyffarth has anew adopted the conclusion (Chronoloq. Sacra, p. 97 sq.) that John the Baptist was born on the 24th of June, and consequently Jesus on the 25th (22d in his Summary of recent Discoveries in Chronology, N. York, 1857, p. 236) of December, based on the supposition that the Israelites reckoned by solar months: this pays no regard to Luk 2:8 (see Hase, p. 67). SEE CHRISTMAS.

b. The year of Christ's crucifixion is no less disputed (comp. Paulus, Comment. 3, 784 sq.). The two extreme limits of the date are the above- mentioned 15th year of Tiberius, in which John the Baptist began his career (Luk 3:1), i.e. Aug. 781 to Aug. 782 of Rome (A.D. 28-29), and the year of the death of that emperor, 790 of Rome (A.D. 37), in which Pilate had already left the province of Judaea. Jesus appears to have begun his public teaching soon after John's entrance upon his mission; for the message of the Sanhedrim to John, which is placed in immediate connection with the beginning of Christ's public ministry (Joh 1:19; comp. Joh 2:1), and comes in just before the Passover (Joh 2:12 sq.), must have been within a year after John's public appearance. This being assumed, a further approximation would depend upon the determination of the number of Passovers which Jesus celebrated during his ministry; but this itself is quite a difficult question (see under No. 5, below). It is now generally conceded that he could not well have passed less than three Paschal festivals, and probably not more than four (i.e. one at the  beginning of each of Christ's three years, and a fourth at the close of the last); thus we ascertain as the terminus a quo of these festivals the year A.D. 28, and as the probable terminus ad quem the year A.D. 32; or, on the supposition (as above) that the joint reign of Tiberius is meant, we have as the limits of the Passovers of Jesus A.D. 25-29. This result would be rendered more definite and certain if we could ascertain whether in the last of these series of years (A.D. 29 or 32) the Jewish Passover fell on a Friday (Thursday evening and the ensuing day), as this was the week day on which the death of Christ is generally held to have taken place. There have been various calculations by means of lunar tables (Linbrunn, in the Abhandlung der bayerschen Akademie der Wiss. vol. 6; Wurm, in Bengel's Archiv. 2, 1, 292 sq.; Anger, De temporumn in Act. Apost. ratione ciss. 1, Lips. 1830, p. 30 sq.; Browne, Ordo Soeclorum. Lond. 1844, p. 504), to determine during which of the years of this period the Paschal day must have occurred on Friday (see Strong's Harm. and Exposit. Append. 1, p. 8 sq.); but the inexactness of the Jewish calendar makes every such computation uncertain (Wurm, ut sup. p. 294 sq.). Yet it is worthy of notice that the two most recent investigations of Wurm and Anger both make the year A.D. 31, or 784 of Rome, to be such a calendar year as we require. Wieseler, Chronol. Synops. p. 479), on the other hand, protests against the foregoing computations, and insists that in A.D. 30 alone the Paschal day fell on Friday. According to other calculations, A.D. 29 and 33 are the only years of this period in which the Paschal eve fell on Thursday (see Browne, Ordo Soeclorum, p. 55), while so great discrepancy prevails between other computations (see Townsend's Chronological N.T. p. \*159) that little or no reliance can be placed upon this argument (see Strong's Harm. and Exposit. Append. 1, p. 8 sq.). SEE PASSOVER.

The opinion of some of the ancient writers (Irelenus, 2, 22, 5), that Jesus died at 40 or 50 years of age (compare Joh 8:57), is altogether improbable (see Pisanski, De errore Irenoei in determinanda oetate Christi, Regiom. 1777). The most of the Church fathers (Tertull. Adv. Jud 1:8; Lactantius, Institut. 4, 10; Augustine, Civ. dei, 18, 54; Clem. Alex. Stromn. 1, p. 147, etc.) assign but a single year as the duration of Christ's ministry, and place his death in the consulship of the two Gemini (VIII Cal. April. Coss. C. Rubellio Gemino et C. Rufio Gemino), i.e. 782 of Rome, A.D. 29, the 15th year of Tiberius's reign, which Ideler (Chronology, 2, 418 sq.) has lately (so also Browne, Ordo Soeclorum, p. 80 sq.) attempted to reconcile with Luk 3:1 (but see Seyffarth, Chronol. Sacra, p. 115 sq.; Eusebius, in his Chronicles Armen. 2, p. 264, places the death of Jesus in the 19th year of  Tiberius, which Jerome, in his Latin translation, calls the 18th; on the above reckoning of the fathers, see Petavius, Animadvers. p. 146 sq.; Thilo, Cod. Apocr. 1, 497 sq.). On the observation of the sun at the crucifixion (Mat 27:45; Mar 15:33; Luk 23:44), SEE ECLIPSE, (On the chronological elements of the life of Jesus, see generally Hottinger, Pentas dissertat. bibl.-chronol. p. 218 sq.; Voss, De annis Christi dissertat. Amst. 1643; Lupi, De notis chronolog. anni mortis et nativ. J.C. dissertat. Rom. 1744; Horix, Observat. hist. chronol. de annis Chr. Mogunt. 1789; compare Volbeding, p. 20; Hase, p. 52.) SEE CHRONOLOGY.

5. The two family registers of Jesus (Matthew 1 and Luke 3), of which the first, is descending and the latter ascending, vary considerably from each other; inasmuch as not only entirely different names of ancestors are given from Joseph upwards to Zerubbabel and Salathiel (Mat 1:12 sq.; Luk 3:27), but also Matthew carries back Joseph's lineage to David's son Solomon (Luk 3:6 sq.), while Luke refers it to another son Nathan (Luk 3:31). Moreover, Matthew only goes back as far as Abraham (as he wrote for Jewish readers), but Luke (in agreement with the general scope of his gospel) as far as Adam (God). This disagreement early engaged the attention of the Church fathers (see Eusebius, Hist. Ev. 1, 7), and later interpreters have adopted various hypotheses for the reconcilement of the two evangelists (see especially Surenhus. Βίβλος καταλλαγῆς, p. 320 sq.: Rus, Harmon. evang. 1, 65 sq.; Thiess, Krit. Commentar, 2, 271 sq.; Kuinol, Proleg. in Matt. § 4). There are properly only two general representations possible. For the history of Christ's parents, SEE JOSEPH; SEE MARY.

(a) Matthew traces the lineage through Joseph, Luke gives the maternal descent (comp. also Neander, p. 21); so that the person called Eli in Luk 3:23, appears to have been the father of Mary (see especially Helvicus, in Crenii Exercitat. philol. hist. 3, p. 332 sq.; Spanheim, Dubia evang. 1, 13 sq.; Bengel, Heumann, Paulus, Kuinol, in their Commentaries; Wieseler, in the Studien u. Krit. 1845, p. 361 sq.; on the contrary, Bleek, Beitrage z. Evangelienkrit. p. 101 sq.). But, in the first place, in that case Luke would hardly have written so expressly “the son of Eli” (τοῦ ᾿Ηλί), since we must understand all the following genitives to refer to the actual fathers and not to the fathers-in-law (the appeal to Rth 1:11 sq., for the purpose of showing that a daughter-in-law could be called daughter among the Hebrews, is unavailing for the distinction in question); although,  in the second place, we need not understand the Salathiel and Zerubbabel named in one genealogy to have been both different persons from those mentioned in the other (Paulus, Comment. 1, 243 sq.; Robinson, Gr. Harmony, p. 186), which is a very questionable expedient (see especially Hug, Einleitung, 2:266; Methodist Quarterly Review, Oct. 1852, p. 602 sq.). Aside from the fact that Luke does not even mention the mother of Jesus (but only Mat 1:16), and from the further fact that the Jews were not at all accustomed to record the genealogies of women (Baba Bathra, f. 110, “The father's family, not the mother's, is accounted the true lineage;” compare Wetstein, 1, 231), we might make an exception in the case of the Messiah, who was to be descended from a virgin (compare also Paulus, Leben J. 1, 90). A still different explanation (Voss, ut sup.; comp. also Schleyer, in the Theol. Quartalschr. 1836, p. 403 sq., 539 sq.), namely, that Eli; although the father of Mary, is here introduced as being the grandfather of Joseph (according to the supposition that Mary was an heiress, Num 27:8), proceeds upon an entirely untenable interpretation (see Paulus, Comment. 1, 243, 261). Notwithstanding the foregoing objection to the view under consideration, it meets, perhaps better than any other, the difficulties of the subject. SEE GENEALOGY.

(b) Some assume that the proper father of Joseph was Eli: he, as a brother, or (as the difference of the names up to Salathiel necessitates) as the nearest relative (half-brother?), had married Mary, the wife of the deceased childless Jacob, and according to the Levirate law (q.v.) Joseph would appear as the son of Jacob, and would, in fact, have two fathers (so Ambrosius); or conversely, we may suppose that Jacob was the proper father of Joseph, and Eli his childless deceased uncle (comp. Julius Afric. in Eusebius, Hist. Ev. 1, 7; Calixtus, Clericus). This hypothesis, which still conflicts with the Levirate rule that only the deceased is called father of the posthumous son (Deu 25:6), Hug (Einl. 2, 268 sq.), has been so modified as to presume a Levirate marriage as far back as Salathiel, by which the mention of Salathiel and Zerubbabel in both lists would be explained; and Hug also introduces such a marriage between the parents of Joseph, and still another among more distant relatives. This is ingenious, but too complicated (see generally Paulus, ut sup. p. 260). If a direct descent of Jesus could have been laid down from David, there remains no reason why, when the natural extraction of the Messiah straight from David was so important, the very evangelist who wrote immediately for Jewish readers should have traced the indirect lineage. But if so many as three  Levirate marriages had occurred together (as Hug thinks), we should suppose that Matthew, on account of the infrequency of such a case, would have given his readers some hint, or at least not have written (Deu 25:16) “begat” (ἐγέννησε) in a manner quite calculated to mislead. Moreover, this hypothesis of Hug rests upon an interpretation of 1Ch 3:18 sq., which that scholar himself could only have chosen in a genealogical difficulty. SEE LEVIRATE LAW

(c) If both the foregoing explanations be rejected, there remains no other course than to renounce the attempt to reconcile the two family lines of Jesus, and frankly acknowledge a discrepancy between the evangelists, as some have done (Stroth, in Eichhorn's Repert. 9, 131 sq.; Ammon, Bibl. Theol. 2, 266; Thiess, Krit. Comment. 2, 271 sq.; Fritzsche, ad Matthew p. 35; Strauss, 1, 105 sq.; De Wette, B. Crusius, Alford, on Luke 3). In the decayed family of Joseph it might not have been possible, especially after so much misfortune as befell the country and people, to recover any written elements for the construction of a family register back to David. Were the account of Julius Africanus (in Eusebius, 1, 7; compare Schottgen, Hor. Hebr. p. 885), that king Herod had caused the family records of the Jews to be burned, correct, the want of such information would be still more evident (but see Wetstein, 1, p. 232; Wieseler, in the Stud. u. Kritik. 1845, p. 369). In that case, after the need of such registers had arisen, persons would naturally have set themselves to compiling them from traditional recollections, and the variations of these may readily have resulted in a double lineage. But even on this view it has been insisted that both lines present the descent of Joseph and not of Mary, since it was unusual to exhibit the maternal lineage, and the Jews would not have regarded such an extraction from David as the genuine one. There are, at all events, but two positions possible: either the supernatural generation of Jesus by the Holy Spirit was admitted, or Jesus was considered a son of Joseph (Luk 3:33). In the latter case a family record of Joseph entirely sufficed for the application of the O.T. oracles to Jesus; in the former case it has been conceived that such a register would have been deemed superfluous, and every natural lineage of Jesus from David (Rom 1:3) would have thrown his divine origin into the background. This has been alleged as the reason why John gives no genealogy at all, and generally says nothing of the extraction of Jesus from the family of David (see Von Ammon, Leb. Jes. 1, 179 sq.). The force of these arguments, however, is greatly lessened by the consideration that the early Christians, in meeting the Jews, would  be very anxious, if possible, to prove Christ's positive descent from David through both his reputed and his real parent; the more so, as the former was avowed to be only nominally such, leaving the whole actual lineage to be made out on the mother's side. (See generally Baumgarten, De genealogia Chr. Hal. 1749; Durr, Genealogia Jesu, Gott. 1778; Busching's Harmon. d. Evang. p. 187 sq., 264 sq.) SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

6. The wonderful birth of Jesus through the intervention of the Holy Spirit, which only the synoptical gospels relate (Luk 1:26 sq.; Mat 1:18 sq.; the apocryphal gospels, in order to remove all idea of the conception of Mary by Joseph, make him to have been absent a long time from home at work, Histor. Josephi, c. 5; Hist. de Nativ. Marics, c. 10), has been imagined by many recent interpreters (Ammon, Biblic. Theol. 2, 251 sq., and Comm. in narrationum de primordus J.C. fontes, incrementa et nexum c. rel. Chr. Gott. 1798; also in his Nov. Opusc. p. 25 sq.; Bauer, Theol. N.T. 1, 310 sq.; Briefe über Rationalismus, p. 229 sq.; Kaiser, Bibl. Theolog. 1, 231 sq.; Greiling, p. 24 sq.) to have been a myth suggested by the O. Test. prophecies (Isa 7:14), and they have held Joseph to be the proper father of Jesus (as it is well known that many in the earliest Church, and individuals later, from time to time, have done, Unschuld. Nachr. 1711, p. 622 sq.; Walther, Vers. eines schriftmass. Beweisse dass Joseph der wahre Vater Christi sei, Berl. 1791; on the contrary, Oertel, Antijosephismus oder Kritik des Schriftm. Bew., etc., Germ. 1793; Hasse, Josephum verum patrem e Scriptura non fuisse, Reg. 1792; Ludewig, Histor. Untersuch. über die versch. Meinungen v. d. Abkunft Jes. Wolfenbuttel, 1831 ; comp. also Korb, Anticarus oder histor.-krit. Beleuchtung der Schrift; “Die naturl. Geburt Jesu u. s. w.” Leipzig, 1831) on the following noways decisive grounds:

(a) “John, who stands in so near a relation to Jesus, and must have known the family affairs, relates nothing at all of this wonderful birth, although it was very apposite to his design.” But this evangelist shows the high dignity of Jesus only from his discourses, the others from public evidences and a few astonishing miracles; moreover, his prologue (1, 1-18) declares dogmatically pretty much the same thing as the synoptical gospels do historically in this respect. (Compare also the deportment of Mary, Joh 2:3 sq.; see Neander, p. 16. sq.)  (b) “Neither Jesus nor an apostle ever appeals in any discourse to this circumstance. Paul always says simply that Jesus was born ‘of the seed of David' (Rom 1:3; 2Ti 2:8); once (Gal 4:4), more definitely, ‘of a woman' (ἐκ γυναικός, not παρθένου).” It must be admitted, however, that an appeal to a fact which only one individual could positively know by experience would be very ineffectual; and an apostle would be very likely to subject himself to the charge of irrelevancy if he resorted to such an appeal (comp. Niemeyer, Pr. ad illustrand. plurimor. N.T. scriptorum silentium de primordiis vitoe J.C. Halle, 1790). But this would be laying as improper an emphasis upon the word γυνή (Gal 4:4) as that of the older theologians upon עִלְמָה(Isa 7:14).

(c) “Mary calls Joseph, without qualification, the father of Jesus (Luk 2:48), and also among the Jews Jesus was generally called Joseph's son (Mat 13:55; Mar 6:3; Luk 3:23; Luk 4:22; Joh 1:46; Joh 6:42).” This last argument is wholly destitute of force; but Mary might naturally, in common parlance, call Joseph Jesus' father, just as, in modem phrase, a foster-father is generally styled father when definiteness of expression is not requisite.

(d) “The brothers of Jesus did not believe in him as the Messiah (Joh 7:5), which would be inexplicable if the Deity had already indicated him as the Messiah from his very birth.” Yet these brothers had not themselves personally known the fact; and it is, moreover, not uncommon that one son in a family who is a general favorite excites the ill will of the others to such a degree that they even deny his evident superiority, or that brothers fail to appreciate and esteem a mentally distinguished brother.

(e) “History shows in a multitude of examples that the birth of illustrious men has been embellished with fables (Wetstein, N.T. 1, p. 236); especially is the notion of a birth without connection with a man (παρθενογενής) wide spread in the ancient world (Georgi, Alphabet. Tibet. Rom. 1762, p. 55 sq., 369 sq.), and among the Indians and Chinese it is even applied to the founders of religion (Paul. a Bartholom. System. Brahman. p. 158; Du Halde, Beschr. d. Chines. Reichs, 3, 26).” In case it is meant by this that a wonderful generation of a holy man, effected immediately by the Spirit of God, was embraced in the circle of Oriental belief (Rosenmüller, in Gabler's Journ. ausserl. theol. Liter. 2, 253 sq.), this argument might make the purely historical character of the doctrine in question dubious, were it  capable of proof that such an idea also harmonizes with the principles of the Israelitish monotheism, or could it be made probable (Weisse, Leben Jesu, 1, 176 sq.) that this account of the birth of Jesus is a heathen production (see, on the contrary, Neander, p. 12 sq.). On the other hand, however, this statement stands so isolated in the Christian tradition, and so surpasses the range of the profane conceptions, that we can hardly reject the idea that it must have operated to enhance the estimate of Christ's dignity. It has been suggested as possible (Paulus, Leben Jesu, 1, 97 sq.) that the hope had already formed itself in the soul of Mary that she would become the mother of the Messiah (which, however, is contradicted by her evident surprise and difficulty at the announcement, Luk 1:29; Luk 1:34), and that this had drawn nourishment from a vision in a dream, as the angelic annunciation (Luk 1:26 sq.) has been (but with the greatest violence) interpreted (see, however, Van Oosterzee, De Jesu e Virgine nato, Utr. 1840). SEE CONCEPTION.

Bethlehem, too (Wagner, De loco nat. J. Chr. Colon. Brandenb. 1673), as the place of Christ's birth, has been deemed to belong to the mythical dress of the narrative (comp. Mic 5:1; see Thess, Krit. Comment. 2, 414), and it has therefore been inferred that Jesus was not only begotten in Nazareth, but also born there (Kaiser, Bibl. Theol. 1, 230) — which, nevertheless, does not follow from Joh 1:46. That Jesus was born in Bethlehem is stated in two of the evangelical accounts (Mat 2:1; Luk 2:4), as may also be elsewhere gathered from the events which follow his birth. But a more direct discrepancy between Matthew and Luke (Hase, p. 44), respecting Joseph's belonging to Bethlehem (Mat 2:22-23; Luk 1:26; Luk 2:4), cannot be substantiated (compare generally Gelpe, Jugendgesch. d. Herrn, Berne, 1841.) SEE BETHLEHEM.

7. Among the relatives of Jesus, the following are named in the N. Test.:

(a) Mary, Jesus' mother's sister (Joh 19:25). According to the usual apprehension of this passage, SEE SALOME, she was married to one Clopas or Alphaeus (q.v.), and had as sons James (q.v.) the younger (Act 1:13) and Joses (Mat 27:56; Mar 15:40). SEE MARY.

(b) Elizabeth, who is called the relative (συγγενής, “cousin”) of Mary (Luk 1:36). Respecting the degree of relationship, nothing can be determined: it has been questioned (Paulus, Comment. 1, 78) whether she was of the tribe of Levi, but this appears certain from Luk 1:5. In a  fragment of Hippolytus of Thebes (in Fabricii Pseudepimr. 2, 290) she is called Sube, the daughter of Mary's mother's sister. She was married to the priest Zacharias, and bore to him John the Baptist (Luk 1:57 sq.). SEE ELIZABETH.

(c) Brethren of Jesus (ἀδελφοί, Mat 12:46, and parallel passages; Joh 2:12; Joh 7:3; Joh 7:5; Joh 7:10; Act 1:14; ἀδελφοὶ τοῦ Κυρίου, 1Co 9:5), by the name of James, Joses (q.v.), Simon, and Judas (Mat 13:55, and the parallel passage, Mar 6:3). (On these see Clemen. in the Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 3; 329 sq.; A. H. Bloom, De τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς et , ταῖς ἀδελφ. τοῦ κυρίου, Lugd. Bat. 1839; Wieseler, in the Studien u. Kritik. 1842, 1, 71 sq.; Schaff, Das Verhaltn. des Jacob. Brud. d. Herrn zu Jacob. Alphai, Berl. 1842, p. 11 sq., 34 sq.; Grimm, in the Hall. Encycl. 2, sect. 23, p. 80 sq.; Method. Quar. Rev. Oct. 1851, p. 670-672; on their descendants, Euseb. Hist. Ev. 3, 20, 33; see Korner, De propinquor. Servatoris persecutione, Lips. 1782.) In the passages Mat 12:46; Mat 13:55; Joh 2:12; Act 1:14, are unquestionably to be understood proper brothers, as they are all together named conjointly with the mother of Jesus (and with Joseph, Mat 13:55); the same is the natural inference from the statement (Joh 7:5) that the brethren (ἀδελφοί) of Jesus had not believed in him as the Messiah. On “James, the brother of the Lord” (Ι᾿άκωβος ὁ αδελφὸς Κυρίου, Gal 1:19), SEE JAMES.

These brethren were regarded as mere relatives, or, more exactly, cousins (namely, sons of Mary, Jesus' mother's sister), by the Church fathers (especially Jerome, ad Matt. 12, 46); also lately by Jessieu (Authentic. epist. Jud. p. 36 sq.), Schneckenburger (Ep. Jac. p. 144 sq.), Olshausen (Comment. 1, 465 sq.), Glockler (Evang. 1, 407), Kuhn (Jahrb. f. Theol. und christl. Philos. 1834, 3, pt. 1), and others, partly on the ground that the names James and Joses appear among the sons of the other Mary (Mat 27:56), partly that it is not certain that Mary, after her first conception by the Holy Spirit, ever became the mother of other children by her husband (see Origen, in Matt. 3, 463. ed. de la Rue; comp. Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 2, 1). The latter argument is of no force (see Schaff, p. 29); on the former, see below. But the term “brethren” (ἀδελφοί), since it does of itself indicate blood relatives, cannot without utter confusion be used of mere cousins in immediate connection with the mother. And if it denotes proper brothers, as also Bloom and Wieseler suppose, the question still remains whether these had both parents the same with Jesus (i.e. were his full brothers), or were the sons of Joseph by a former marriage  (halfbrothers; compare Theophyl. ad 1 Corinthians 9). The latter opinion, SEE JOSEPH, which is based upon an old (Ebionitic) tradition (see Fabricius, Pseudepigr. 1, 291; Thilo, Cod. Apocr. 1, 109, 208, 362 sq.), is held as probable by Grotius (ad Jac. 1, 1), Vorstius (De Hebr. Nov. Test. ed. Fischer, p. 71 sq.), Paulus (Comment. 1, 6113), Bertholdt (Einleit. 5, 656 sq.), and others; the former by Herder (Briefe zweener Bruder J. p. 7 sq.), Pott (Proleg. in Ep. Jac. p. 90), Ammon (Bibl. Theol. 2, 259), Eichhorn (Einl. ins N.T. 3, 570 sq.), Kuinol (ad Mat 12:46), Clement (ut sup.), Bengel (in his N. Archiv, 2, 9 sq.), Stier (Andeut. 1, 404 sq.), Fritzsche (ad Matt. 481), Neander (Leb. Jesu, p. 39 sq.), Wieseler and Schaff (ut sup.), and others. An intimation that favors this last view is contained in the expression “first-born” (Mat 1:25; Luk 2:7), which is further corroborated by the statement of abstinence from matrimonial intercourse until the birth of Jesus (Mat 1:25; but see Olshausen, ad loc.), which seems to imply that the brothers in question were later sons of Joseph and Mary. The circumstance that the sister of Jesus' mother had two sons similarly named James and Joses (or three, if we understand Ιούδας Ιακώβον [Luk 6:16] to mean “brother of James”, SEE JUDAS ) — is not conclusive against this view, since in two nearly-related families it is not even now unusual to find children of the same name, especially if, as in the present case, these names were in common use. Eichhorn's explanation (ut sup. p. 571) is based upon a long since exploded hypothesis, and requires no refutation. Joh 19:26, contains no valid counter argument: the brothers of Jesus may have become convinced by his resurrection (Mat 28:10), and, even had they been so at his death, yet perhaps the older and more spiritually- kindred John may have seemed to Jesus more suitable to carry out his last wishes than even his natural brothers (see Pott, ut sup. p. 76 sq.; Clement, ut sup. p. 360 sq.). At all events, the brothers of Jesus are not only expressed as having become at length believers in him, but they even appear somewhat later among the publishers of the Gospel (Act 1:14; 1Co 9:5). SEE BROTHERS.

(d) Sisters of Jesus are mentioned in Mat 13:56; Mar 6:3 (in Mar 3:32, the words καὶ αἱ ἀδελφαί are of very doubtful authenticity). Their names are not given. That we are to understand own sisters is plain from the foregoing remarks respecting his brothers.

(e) Finally, an ecclesiastical tradition makes Salome, the wife of Zebedee, and mother of the apostles James and John (Mar 15:40; Mar 16:1, etc.), to have been a relative of Jesus. (See Hase, p. 55.) SEE SALOME.

8. Jesus was educated at Nazareth (Hase, p. 57; Weisse, De J.C. educatione, Helmst. 1698; Lange, De profectib. Christi adolesc. Altdorf, 1699), but attended no (Rabbinical) schools (Joh 7:15). He appears, according to the custom of the times, to have learned the trade of his adopted father (Justin Mart. c. Tryph. 88, p. 316, ed. Col.; comp. Theodor. Hist. Eccl. 3, 23; Sozomen, 6, 2, etc.), but this he did not continue to practice at the same time with his career of teaching, as was usual with all the Rabbins (compare Neander, p. 54). By this means he may in part have acquired his subsistence (comp. Mar 6:3; but Origen, Contra Celsum, 6, p. 299, denies this statement, and Tischendorf omits ὁ τέκτων). Besides, his followers supplied him with liberal presents, and, on his journeys, the Oriental usages of hospitality (Joh 5:45; Joh 12:2) served him in good stead (see Rau, Unde Jes. alimenta vitoe acceperit, Erlang. 1794). SEE HOSPITALITY.

A number of grateful women also accompanied him for a considerable time, who cared for his maintenance (Luk 8:2; Mar 15:41). He had a common traveling purse with the apostles (Joh 12:6; Joh 13:29), from which the stock of provisions for the journey was provided (Luk 9:13; Mat 14:17 sq., etc.). We certainly cannot regard Jesus as properly poor in the sense of indigent (see Walch, Miscell. Sacr. p. 866 sq.), for this appears (Henke's Mus. 2, 610 sq.) neither from Mat 8:20 (see Lunze, De Christi divitiis. et pautpertate, Lips. 1784), nor yet from 2Co 8:9 (see Beitrage z. vernunftigen Denk. 4, 160 sq.), and Joh 19:23, rather shows the contrary (comp. Bar-Hebraeus, Chron. p. 251); yet his parents were by no means in opulent circumstances (see Luk 2:24; comp. Lev 12:8), and he himself possessed (Mat 8:20) at least no real estate whatever (see generally Rau, De causis cur J.C. patupertati se subjecerit proecipuis, Erlang. 1787; Siebenhaar, in the Sachs. eget. Stud. 2, 168 sq.). SEE HUMILIATION. During his public career of teaching, Jesus (when not traveling) staid chiefly and of choice at Capernaum (Mat 4:13), and only on one or two occasions (Luk 4:16; Mar 6:1) visited Nazareth (see Kiesling, De J. Nazar. ingrata patria exule, Lips. 1741). In exterior he constantly observed the customs of his people (see A. Gesenius, Christ. decoro gentis suoe se accommodasse, Helmst. 1734; Gude, De Christo et discipulis ejus decori studiosis, in the Nov. miscellan. Lips. 3,  563 sq.), and, far from wishing to attract attention by singularity or austerity he took part in the pleasures of social life (Joh 2:1 sq.; Luk 7:31 sq.; Mat 11:16 sq.; compare 9:14 sq.). Nevertheless, he never married (compare Clem. Alex. Strom. 3, 191 sq.; see Schleiermacher, Der Christliche Glaube, 1st ed. 2, 526), for the supposition of Schulthess (Neutest. theolog. Nachr. 1826, 1, 20 sq.; 1828, 1, 102 sq.) that Jesus was married according to Jewish usage, with the addition that his wife (and, perhaps, several children by her) had died before his entrance upon public life, is a pure hypothesis that at least deserves no countenance from the silence in the N.T. as to any such occurrences; and the stupendous design already in the mind of the youthful Jesus afforded no motive for marriage, and, indeed, did not admit (compare Mat 19:12) such a confinement to a narrower circle (see Weisse, Leben Jesu, 1, 249 sq.; comp. Hase, p. 109). Additional literature may be seen in Volbeding, p. 17, 18; Hase, p. 59. SEE NAZARENE.

9. The length of Jesus' public ministry (beginning about the 30th year of his age, Luk 3:24; see Rosch, in the Brem. u. Verd. Bibliothl. 3, 813 sq.), as well as the chronological sequence of the single events related in the Gospels, is very variously estimated. (See Hase, p. 17.) The first three evangelists give, as the scene of their transactions (after his temptation and the imprisonment of the Baptist, Mat 4:1-13), almost exclusively Galilee (De Galilee opportuno Servatoris miraculor. theatro, Gott. 1775), inasmuch as Jesus had his residence then in the city Capernaum, especially in the winter months (Mat 4:13; Mat 8:5; Mat 17:24; Mar 1:21; Mar 2:1, etc.). For the most part, we find him in the romantic and thickly settled neighborhood of the Sea of Tiberias, or upon its surface (Mat 8:23 sq; Mat 13:1 sq; Mat 14:13; Luk 8:22), also on the other side in Peraea (Mat 8:28; Luk 8:26; Mar 7:31). Once he went as far as within the Phoenician boundaries (Mat 15:21; Mar 7:24 sq.). But in the synoptical gospels he only appears once to have visited Jerusalem, at the time of the last Passover (Matthew 21 sq.; Mark 11 sq.; Luke 19 sq.). According to this, the duration of his teaching might be limited to a single year (Euseb. 3, 24), and many (appealing to Luk 4:19; comp. Isa 61:1 sq.; see Origen, Horn. 32; comp. Tertull. Adv. Jud. c. 8; but see Kirner, p. 4) already in the ancient Church (Clem. Alex. Strom. 1, p. 147; Origen, Princip. 4, 5) only allow this space to his public mission (compare Mann, Three Years of the Birth and Death of Christ, p. 161; Priestly, Harmony of the Evangelists, London, 1774, 2, 4; Browne,  Ordo Soeclorum, p. 634 sq.); although, independently of all the others, Luk 6:1 (second-first Sabbath) affords indication of a second Passover which Jesus celebrated during his public career. SEE SABBATH.

On the other hand, John's Gospel shows (comp. Jacobi, Zur Chronol. d. Lebens J. im Evang. Joh. in the Stud. u. Krit. 1838, 4, 845 sq.) that Jesus was not only oftener, but generally in Judaea (whence he once traveled through Samaria to Galilee, Joh 4:4; compare his return, Luk 17:11), namely, in the holy city Jerusalem (but this difference agrees with the respective designs of the several gospels; see Neander, p. 385 sq.), and informs us of five Jewish festivals which Jesus celebrated at Jerusalem. The first, occurring soon after the baptism of Jesus (Joh 2:13), is a Passover; the second (Joh 5:1) is called indefinitely “a feast of the Jews” (ἑορτὴ τῶν Ι᾿ουδαίων); the third was the Festival of Tabernacles (Joh 7:2); the fourth the Feast of Dedication (Joh 10:22); and, lastly, the fifth (John 12, 13) again a Passover: mention is also made (Joh 6:4) of still another Passover which Jesus spent in Galilee. Hence it would seem that Jesus was engaged some three years (Origen, Contra Celsum, 2, p.67) as a public teacher; and if by the “feast” of Joh 5:1 we are also to understand a Passover (Paulus, Comm. 1, 901 sq.; Suskind, in Bengel's Archiv. 1, 182 sq.; B. Crusius, ad loc.; Seyffarth, Chronol. Sacra, p. 114; Robinson, Harmony, p. 193), which, however, is not certain (Lücke, ad loc.; Anger, De temp. in Act. Apost. ratione, 1, 24 sq.; Jacobi, ut sup. p. 864 sq.), we must assign a period of three and a half years (Eusebius, 1, 10, 3), as lately Seyffarth has done (Summary of recent Discoveries in Chronol. N.Y. 1857, p. 183), although on the most singular grounds (see Alford, Commentary on Joh 5:1). Otherwise the evangelists hardly afford more than two years and a few months (see Anger, ut sup. p. 28; Hase, p. 17 sq.) to the public labors of Jesus (see generally Laurbeck, De annis ministerii Chr., Altdorf, 1700; Korner, Quot Paschata Christus post baptism. celebraverit, Lips. 1779; Pries, De numero Paschatum Christi, Rostock, 1789; Lahode, De die et anno ult. Pasch. Chr. Hal. 1749; Marsh's remarks in Michaelis's Introd. 2, 46 sq.). Again, as the apostles were not uninterruptedly in company with Jesus, the time of their proper association with him might be still further reduced somewhat, although we can not (with Hanlein, De temporis, quo J.C. cume Apostol. versatus est, duratione, Erl. 1796) assume it to have been barely some nine months.

Under these three (or four) Paschal festivals writers have repeatedly endeavored, for historical and particularly apologetic  purposes, to arrange all the single occurrences which the first evangelists mention without chronological sequence, and so to obtain a complete chronological view of Jesus' entire journeys and teaching. Yet, notwithstanding so great a degree of ingenuity has been expended upon this subject, none of the Gospel Harmonies hitherto constructed can be regarded as more than a series, of historical conjectures, since the narrative of the first three evangelists presents but little that can guide to a measurably certain conclusion in such an arrangement, and John himself does not appear to relate the incidents in strictly chronological order according to these Passovers (see generally Eichhorn, Einl. ins N.T., 692 sq.). The most important of these attempts are, Lightfoot, Chronicle of the O.T. and N.T. Lond. 1655; Doddridge, Expositor of the N.T. London, 1739; Rus, Harmonia Evangelistar. Jen. 1727; Macknight, Harmony of the four Gospels, London, 1756, Latine fecit notasque adjecit Ruckersfelder, Brem. 1772; Bengel, Richt. Harmonie der 4 Evangel. 3d edit. Tubing. 1766; Newcome, Harmony of the Gospels, Dublin, 1778; Paulus, Comment. 1, 446 sq.; 2, 1 sq., 384 sq.; 3, 82 sq.; Kaiser, Ueb. die synopt. Zusammenstell. der 4 Evang. Nuremb. 1828; Clausen, Quat. evangel. tabuloe synopt. sec. rationem tempor. Copenhagen, 1829; Wieseler, Chronolog. Synopse der 4 Evang. Hamb. 1843; Townsend's Chronol Arrang. of the N. Test. Lond. 1821, Bost. 1837; Greswell, Harmonia Evang. Lond. 1830; Robinson, Harmony of the Gospels (Greek), Bost. 1845 (Engl. id.); Tischendorf, Synopsis Evangel. Leipz. 1851; Strong, Harmony of the Gospels (English), N.Y. 1852 (Greek), ib. 1854; Stroud, Greek Harmony, Lond. 1853. SEE HARMONIES.

10. Besides the twelve apostles (q.v.), Jesus also chose seventy (q.v.) persons as a second more private order (Luk 10:1 sq.), who have been supposed by some to correspond to some Jewish notion of the seventy nations of the world, inasmuch as Luke shows a tendency to such generalization; but this number was probably selected (see Kuinol, ad loc.) with reference to the seventy elders of the Jews (Num 11:16 sq.), composing the Sanhedrim, just as the twelve apostles represented the twelve tribes of Israel (compare generally Burmann, Exercit. Acad. 2, 95 sq.; Heumann, De 70 Christi legatis, Gotting. 1743). Their traditional names (see Assemani, Biblioth. Or. 3, 1, 319 sq.: Fabric. Lux, p. 115 sq.), some of which are cited by Eusebius (1, 12), might have some historical ground but for the manifest endeavor to place in the illustrious rank of the seventy every conspicuous individual of the apostolical age, concerning  whom nothing positive was known to the contrary. The account of Luke himself has sometimes been called in question as unhistorical (Strauss, 1, 566 sq.; Schwegler, Nachapost. Zeitalter, 2, 45; see, on the other hand, Neander, p. 541 sq.).

Respecting the characteristics of Jesus' teaching (see especially Winkler, Ueber J. Lehrfahigkeit und Lehrart, Leipz. 1797; Behn, Ueb. die Lehrart Jesu u. seiner Apostel, Lubeck, 1791; Hauff, Bemerkungen über die Lehrart Jesu, Offenbach, 1788; H. Ballauf, Die Lehrart Jesu als vortrefflich gezeigt, Hannov. 1817; H.N. la Cle, De Jesu Ch. instituendi methodo horn. ingenia excolente, Groning. 1835; Ammon, Bibl. Theol. 2, 328 sq.; Planck, Geschichte d. Christenth. 1, 161 sq.; Hase, Leben Jes. p. 123 sq.; Neander, p. 151 sq.; Weisse, 1, 376 sq.), we may remark that all his discourses, which were delivered sometimes in the synagogues (Mat 13:54; Luk 4:22, etc.), sometimes in public places, and even in the open field, sometimes in the Temple court, were suggested on the occasion (Joh 4:32 sq.; Joh 7:37 sq.), either by some transaction or natural phenomenon, or else by some recital (Luk 13:1), or expression of others (Mat 8:10). He loved especially to clothe his sentiments in comparisons (see Greiling, p. 201 sq.), parables (Mat 13:11 sq., Mat 13:34 sq.) (for these are preeminently distinguished for simplicity, conciseness, natural beauty, intelligibleness, and dignity; see especially Unger, De parabolar. Jesu natura, intepretatione, usu, Leipz. 1828), allegories (Joh 6:32 sq.; Joh 6:10; John 15), and apothegms (Matthew 5), sometimes also paradoxes (Joh 2:19; Joh 6:53; Joh 8:58), which exactly suited the comprehension of his audience (Mar 4:33; Luk 13:15 sq.; Luk 14:5 sq.); and he even adapted the novelty and peculiarity of his doctrines to familiar Jewish forms, which in his mouth lose that ruggedness and unaesthetic character in which they have come down to us in the Talmud (comp. Weisse, De more Domini acceptos a magistris Jud. loquedi ac disserendi modos sapienter emendandi; Viteb. 1792). SEE ALLEGORY; SEE PARABLE.

In contests with learned Jews, Jesus knew how, by simple clearness of intellect, to defeat their arrogant dialectics, and yet was able to pursue their own method of inferential argument (Mat 12:25). When they proposed to him captious questions, he brought. them, not unfrequently by similar questions, mostly in the form of a dilemma (Mat 21:24; Mat 22:20; Luk 10:29 sq.; Luk 20:3 sq.), or by appeal to the explicit written law or to their sacred history (Mat 9:13; Mat 12:3 sq.; Mat 19:4 sq.; Luk 6:2 sq.; Luk 10:26 sq.; Luk 20:28 sq.), or by analogies from  ordinary life (Mat 12:10 sq.), to maintain silence, or put them to embarrassment with all their sagacity and legal zeal (Mat 22:42 sq. Joh 8:3 sq.); sometimes he disarmed them by the exercise of his miraculous power (Luk 5:24). With a few exceptions, John alone assigns longer speeches of a dogmatic character to Jesus; nor is it any matter of surprise that the Wisdom which delivered itself to the populace in maxims and similes should permit itself to be understood, in the circle of the priests and those erudite in the law, connectedly and mystically on topics of the higher gnosis, although even in John, of course, we can not expect the ipsissima verba. In a formal treatment, moreover, his representations, especially those addressed to the people, could not be free from accommodation (P. van Hemert, Ueb. Accommod. im N.T. Dortmund and Leipz. 1797); but whether he made use of the material (not merely negative) species of accommodation is not a historical, but a dogmatic question (comp. thereon Bretschneider, Handb. d. Dogm. 1, 420 sq.; Wegschneider, Institut. p. 119 sq.; De Wette, Sittenlehre, 3, 131 sq.; Neander, p. 216 sq.). SEE ACCOMMODATION.

Like the O.T. prophets, he sometimes also employed symbolical acts (Joh 13:1 sq., Joh 13:20; Joh 13:22; comp. Luk 9:47 sq.). A dignified expression, a keen but affectionate look, a gesticulation reflecting the inward inspiration (Hegemeister, Christum gestus pro concione usurpasse, Servest. 1774), may have contributed not a little to the force of his words, and gained for him, in opposing the Pharisees and lawyers, the eulogium of eloquence (compare Joh 7:46; Joh 18:6; Mat 7:28 sq.). The tuition which Jesus imparted to the apostles (comp. Greiling, p. 213 sq.), was apparently private (Mat 13:11 sq.; see Colln, Bibl. Theol. 2, 14). SEE APOSTLE.

Finally, Jesus commonly spoke Syro-Chaldee (comp. e.g. Mar 3:17; Mar 5:41; Mar 7:34; Mat 27:47; see Malala, Chronograph. p. 13), like the Palestinian Jews generally, SEE LANGUAGE, not Greek (Diodati, De Christo Groece loquente, Neap. 1767, translated in the Am. Bibl. Repos. Jan. 1844, p. 180 sq.; comp. on the contrary, Ernesti, Neueste theol. Bibl. 1, 269 sq.), although he might have understood the latter language, or even Latin (Wernsdorf, De Christo Latine loquente, Viteb.; see generally Reiske, De lingua vern. J. C. Jen. 1670; Bh. de Rossi, Della lingua propria di Christo, Parm. 1773; Zeibich, De lingua Judoeor. temp. Christi et. Apost. Vitebsk, 1791; Wisemann, in his Hor. Syriac. Rom. 1828). No writings of his are extant (the spuriousness of the so-called letter to the king of Edessa, given by Eusebius, 1, 13, is evident; comp. also Rohr's Krit. Prediger-biblioth. 1, 161 sq. SEE ABGAR: the alleged written  productions of Jesus may be seen in Fabricii Cod. Apocr. 1, 303 sq.), nor was there need of any, since he had provided for the immediate dissemination of his doctrines through the apostles, and he wished even to turn away attention from the literature of the age to the spirit and life of a thorough piety (compare Hauff, Briefe d. Werth der schriftl. Rel.-Urkund. betreffnd, 1, 94 sq.; Sartorius, Cur Christus scripti nihil reliquerit, Leipz. 1815; Witting, Warum J. nichts Schriftl. hinterlassen, Bschw. 1822; Giesecke, Warum hat J.C. über sich u. s. Relig. nichts Schriftl. hinterlassen, Lineb. 1823; B. Crusius, Bibl. Theol. p. 22 sq.; Neander, p. 150; comp. Hase, p. 11). Jesus has been improperly entitled a Rabbi, or high rank of religious teacher (רִבַּי, ῥαββί), in the sense of the Jewish schools, as having been thus styled not only by the populace (Mar 10:51; Joh 20:16), or his disciples (Joh 1:39; Joh 1:50; Joh 4:31; Joh 9:2; Joh 11:8; Mat 26:25, etc.), but also by Nicodemus (Joh 3:2), and even his enemies (Joh 6:25) themselves (Vitringa, Synag. vet. p. 706; Paulus, Leben Jes. 1, 122 sq.; see, on the contrary, C. E. Schmid, De promotione acad. Christo ejusque discipulis perperam tributa, Lips. 1740). In the time of Jesus persons had no occasion to aspire to the formality of learned honors, as in later ages (Neander, p. 50), and Jesus had little sympathy with such an ostentatious spirit (Joh 7:15). SEE RABBI. (Additional literature may be seen in Volbeding, p. 25.) SEE PROPHET.

11. The Jews expected miracles of the Messiah (Joh 7:31; John 4 Esdr. 13:50; comp. Mat 8:17; Joh 20:30 sq.; see Bertholdt, Christologia Judoeor. p. 168 sq.), such as Jesus performed (τέρατα, σημεῖα, δυνάμεις). These all had a moral tendency, and aimed at beneficent results (on Mat 8:28 sq., see Paulus, ad loc.; Bretschneider, Handb. d. Dogm. 1, 307 sq.; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 134; on Mat 21:18 sq., see Fleck. Vertheid. d. Christenth. p. 138 sq.), in which respects they are in striking contrast with the silly thaumaturgy of the apocryphal gospels (see Tholuck, Glaubwurdigk. d. evang. Gesch. p. 406 sq.), consisting mostly of raising the dead and the cure (Mar 6:56) of such maladies as had baffled all scientific remedies (insanity, epilepsy, palsy, leprosy blindness, etc.). He asked no reward (comp. Mat 10:8), and performed no miracles to gratify curiosity (Mat 16:1 sq.; Mar 8:11 sq.), or to excite the astonishment of a sensuous populace; rather he repeatedly forbade the public report of his extraordinary deeds (Mat 9:30; Mar 1:44; Mar 7:36; Mar 8:26; Luk 5:14; Luk 8:56; Plitt, in  the Hess. Heboper, 1850, p. 890 sq., takes an erroneous view of Mar 5:19, for in Mar 5:20 Jesus bids the man relate his cure to his relatives only), and he avoided the popular outbursts of joy, which would have swelled loudly at his particularly successful achievements (Joh 5:13), only suffering these miracles to be acknowledged to the honor of God (Luk 8:39 sq.; Luk 17:16 sq.). In effecting cures he sometimes made use of some means (Mar 7:33; Mar 8:23; Joh 9:6 sq.; comp. Spinoza, Tract. theol. pol. c. 6, p. 244, ed. Paul.; Med.-herm. Untersuch. p. 335 sq.; Paulus, Leben Jesu, 1, 223), but in general he employed simply a word (Mat 8:1 sq.; Joh 5:8, etc.), even at a distance (Mat 8:5 sq.; Luk 7:6 sq.; Joh 4:50), or merely a touch of the invalid (Mat 8:3; Mat 8:15) or the afflicted member (blind eyes, Mat 9:29; Mat 20:34; see Seiler, Christ. an in operibus mirabilib. arcanis usus sit remedus, Erlang. 1795; also, Jesus an miracula suis ipsius viribus ediderit, ib. 1799); on the other hand, likewise, a cure was experienced when the infirm touched his garment (Mat 9:20 sq.; Mat 14:36), but in such a case always on the presumption of a firm faith (Mat 9:28; compare Joh 5:6), so that when this failed the miraculous power was not exercised (Mat 13:58; Mar 11:5). On this very account some moderns have asserted (Gutsmuth, Diss. de Christo Med. Jen. 1812 [on the opposite, Ammon's Theolog. Journ. 1, 177 sq.]; Ennemoser, Magnetism. p. 473 sq.; Kieser, Syst. des Tellurism. 2, 502 sq.; Meyer, Naturanalogien od. die Erschein. d. anim. Magnet. mit Hins. auf Theol. Hamb. 1839; comp. Weisse, 1, 349 sq.) that these cures were principally effected by Jesus through the agency of animal magnetism (comp. Luk 8:48; see generally Pfau, De Christo academ. N.T. medico primario, Erlang. 1743; Schulthess, in the Neuest. theol. Nachr. 1829, p. 360 sq.). SEE HEALING.

That the Jewish Rabbis and the Essenes performed, or perhaps only pretended to perform, similar cures, at least upon demoniacs, appears from Mat 12:27; Luk 11:19; Mar 9:38 sq.; comp. Josephus, War, 2, 8, 6; Ant. 8, 2, 5). The sentiments of Jesus himself as to the value and tendency of his miracles are undeniable: he disapproved that eagerness for wonders displayed by his contemporaries (Mat 16:1; Joh 2:18) which sprung from sensuous curiosity or from pure malevolence (Mat 12:39; Mat 16:4; Mar 8:11 sq.), or else had a thankless regard merely to their own advantage (Joh 4:48; Joh 6:24), but which ever desired miracles merely as such, while he regarded them as a national method for attaining his purpose of awakening and calling forth faith (Joh 11:42; comp. Mat 11:4 sq.; Luk 7:21 sq.), and hence  often lamented their ineffectualness (Mat 11:20 sq.; Luk 10:13; see especially Nitzsch, Quantum Christus miraculis tribuerit, Viteb. 1796; Schott, Opusc. 1, 111 sq.; Lehnerdt, De nonnullis Chr. effatis unde ipse quid quantumq. tribuerit miraculis cognoscetur, Regiom. 1833; comp. Paulus, in the Neu. theol. Journ. 9, 342 sq., 413 sq.; Storr, in Flatt's Mag. 4, 178 sq.; Eiseln, in the Kirchenblatter fur das Bisth. Rottenburg, 1, 161 sq.; De Wette, Biblisch. Dogm. p. 196 sq.; Strauss, Glaubenslehre, 1, 86 sq.). As an undeniably effective means of introducing Christianity, these miracles have ever retained a profound significance, of which they cannot be deprived by any efforts to explain them on natural principles (Br. ub. Rationalismus, p. 215 sq.), or to ascribe them to traditional exaggeration; for all investigations of this character have as yet generally resulted only in a contorted exegesis, and are oftentimes more difficult of belief than the miraculous incidents themselves (see on the subject generally Koster, Immanuel oder Charact. der neutest. Wundererzahlungen, Lpz. 1821; Johannsen, in Schroter and Klein's Oppositionschr. 5, 571 sq.; 6, 31 sq.; Miller, De mirac. J. Ch. nat. et necess. Marburg and Hal. 1839; Neander, p. 256 sq.). SEE MIRACLE.

12. Several of the circumstances of Christ's passion (q.v.) are explained under SEE BLOODY SWEAT, SEE CROSS, SEE LITHOSTROTON, SEE PILATE, SEE ECLIPSE, etc. (compare Merillii Notoe in passion. J. Chr. Par. 1622, Fref. and Lips. 1740; Walther, Jurist.-histor. Betracht. ub. d. Geschichte u. d. Leid. u. Sterb. Christi, Breslau, 1738, 1774; Die Leidensgesch. Jesu exegetisch und archaolog. bearbeitet, Stuttg. 1809; Hug, in the Zeitschr. f. d. Erzbisth. Freiburg, 5, 1 sq.; Friedlieb, Archaol. d. Leidensgesch. Bonn, 1843). The question of the legality or illegality of the sentence of death pronounced upon Jesus by the Sanhedrim and procurator has of late been warmly discussed (see, for the former view, Salvador, Histoire des institutions de Moise, Bruxel. 1822, 2, c. 3; also, Jesus Christ et sa doctrine, Par. 1838; Hase, Leben Jes. p. 197 sq.; on the opposite, Dupin, L'aine Jesus devant Caiphe et Pilate, Par. 1829; Ammon, Fortbild. 1, 341 sq.; B. Crusius, Opusc. p. 149 sq.; Neander, p. 683 sq.; comp. also Daumer, Syst. der specul. Philos. p. 41 sq.; and Neubig, Ist J. mit voll. Rechte den Tod eines Verbrechers gestorben? Erl. 1836). The Sanhedrim condemned Jesus as a blasphemer of God (Mat 26:65 sq.; Mar 14:64; compare Joh 19:7), for which the Law prescribed capital punishment (Lev 24:16); but he would have been guilty of this crime if he had falsely claimed (Mat 26:63 sq.; Luk 22:67  sq.) to be the Messiah (Son of God), and the fact of this profession was substantiated indirectly by witnesses (Mat 26:60 sq.; Mar 14:57 sq.), and directly by Jesus' own declaration (Mat 26:63 sq.; Mar 14:61 sq.). So far the transaction might seem to be tolerably regular, except that swearing the prisoner as to his own crime is an unheard of process in law. Moreover, there was more than a single superficial examination of witnesses (Mat 26:60), and Jesus had really uttered (Joh 2:19) what the deponents averred. But that Jesus could not be the Messiah was presupposed by the Sanhedrim on the ground of their Christological views; and here were they chiefly to blame. More exact inquiries concerning the teachings and acts of Jesus would have surely corrected their impression that Jesus was a blasphemer, and perhaps led them to a rectification of their expectations respecting the Messiah. Another point is entitled to consideration in estimating their judicial action. The Sanhedrim's broader denunciation of Jesus before Pilate as a usurper of royal power, and their charging him with treason (crimen loesoe majestatis) (Mat 27:11; Mar 15:2; Luk 23:2; Joh 18:33), is explained by the fact that the Messiah was to be a theocratic king, and that the populace for a few days saluted Jesus with huzzas as the Son of David (Matthew 21; John 12). Jesus certainly did not aspire to royalty in the political sense, as he declared before Pilate (Joh 18:36 sq.): this the Sanhedrim, if they had been dispassionate judges, must have been assured of, even if they had not previously inquired or ascertained how far Jesus was from pretensions to political authority. The sentence itself is therefore less to be reprobated than that the high court did not, as would have been worthy itself, become better informed respecting the charges; their indecorous haste evinces an eagerness to condemn the prisoner at all hazards, and their vindictive manner clearly betrays their personal malice against him. That Pilate passed and executed the sentence of death contrary to his better judgment as a civil officer is beyond all doubt. SEE PILATE.

That Jesus passed through a merely apparent death has been supposed by many (see especially Bahrdt, Zwecke Jesu, 10, 174 sq.; Paulus, Comment. 3, 810 sq., and Leben Jesu, 1, 2, 281 sq.; on the contrary, see Richter, De morte Servatoris in cruce, Gott. 1757, also in his Diss. 4 med. p. 1 sq.; Gruner, De Jes. C. morte vera, non simulata, Jena, 1805; Schmidtmann, Medic.-philos. Beweis, dass J. nach s. Kreuzigung nicht von einer todtahnl. Ohnmacht befallen gewesen, Osnabr. 1830). The piercing of the  side of Jesus by the lance of a Roman soldier (Joh 19:34; his name is traditionally given as Longinus, see Thilo, Apocr. p. 586) has been regarded as the chief circumstance upon which everything here depends (Triller, De mirando lateris cordisque Christi vulnere, in Gruner's Tract. de doemoniacis, Jena, 1775; Eschenbach, Scripta med.-bibl. p. 82 sq.; Bartholini, De latere Christi aperto, Lugd. Bat. 1646), inasmuch as before this puncture the above cited physicians assume but a torpor and swoon, which might seem the more probable because crucifixion could hardly have caused death in so short a time (Mar 15:44). SEE CRUCIFY.

But the account of the wound in the side is not such as to allow the question to be by that means fully and absolutely determined (see Briefe über Rationalismus, p. 236 sq.), since the evangelist does not state which side (πλευρά) was pierced, nor where, nor how deeply. It is therefore surely a precarious argument to presume the left side (although the position of the soldier, holding the spear in his right hand and thrusting it opposite him, would strongly countenance this supposition), and equally so to assume a very deep incision, penetrating the pericardium and heart, thus changing a swoon into actual death; nevertheless, comp. Joh 20:25-26, in favor of this last particular. The purpose of the stab — to ascertain whether the crucified person was still alive — also demanded a forcible thrust, and the issue of blood and water vouched for by the evangelist (ἐξῆλθεν εὐθύς αϊvμα καὶ ὕδωρ, perhaps a hendiadys for bloody water) would certainly point to real death as immediately resulting. By this we must understand the clotted blood (cruor) in connection with the watery portion (serum), which both flow together from punctures of the larger blood vessels (veins) of bodies just dead (from the arteries of the breast, as supposed by Hase [Heb. Jesu, 2d ed. p. 193], no blood would issue, for these are usually empty in a corpse), and the piercing of the side would therefore not cause, but only indicate death. SEE BLOOD AND WATER. In fine, the express assertion of the evangelists, that Jesus breathed his last (ἐξέπνενσε [Mar 15:37; Luk 23:46], a term exactly equivalent to the Latin expiravit, he expired, and so doubtless to be understood in its common acceptance of death), admits no other hypothesis than that of actual and complete dissolution. SEE AGONY.

The fact of the return of Jesus alive from the grave (comp. Ammon, De vera J. C. reviviscentia, Erlang. 1808; Griesbach, De fontib. unde Evangel. suas de resurrectione Domini narrationes hauserint, Jena, 1783; Friedrich, in Eichhorn's Biblioth. 7, 204 sq.; Doderl. De J.C. in vit. reditu, Utr. 1841)  is not invalidated by Strauss's ingenious hypotheses (2, 645; see Hase, p. 212; Theile, p. 105 sq.; comp. Kihn, Wie ging Ch. durch des Grabes Thur, Strals. 1838); but if Jesus had been merely dead in appearance, so delicate a constitution, already exhausted by sufferings before crucifixion, would certainly not have revived without special — that is, medical — assistance (Neander, p. 708): in the cold rock vault, in an atmosphere loaded with the odor of aromatics, bound hand and foot with grave clothes, in utter prostration, he would, in the ordinary course of things, have rather been killed than resuscitated. His return to life must therefore be regarded as a true miracle. SEE RESURRECTION. On the grave of Jesus, SEE GOLGOTHA.

After he had risen (he lay some thirty-six hours in the grave; not three full days, as asserted by Seyffarth, Summary of Chronol. Discov. N.Y. 1857, p. 188), he first showed himself to Mary Magdalene (Mat 28:9. Mar 16:9; Joh 20:14; but about the same hour to the other women, see Strong's Greek Harmony, p. 364), then to his apostles in various places in and about Jerusalem (Luk 24:13 sq., (Luk 24:36 sq.; Joh 20:19 sq.), and was recognized by them — not immediately, it is true (for the few past days of suffering may have considerably disfigured him bodily), but yet unequivocally — as their crucified teacher (Neander, p. 715 sq.), and even handled, although with some reserve (Luk 24:37; Joh 21:12). He did not appear in public; had he done so, his enemies would have found opportunity to remove him a second time out of the way, or to represent him to the people as a sham Jesus: his resurrection could have its true significance to his believers only (see generally Jahn, Nachtrage, p. 1 sq.). After a stay of 40 days, he was visibly carried up into the sky before the eyes of his disciples (Luk 24:51; Act 1:9. Mar 16:19, is of doubtful authenticity). Of this, three evangelical witnesses (Matthew, Mark, and John) relate nothing (for very improbable reasons of this, see Flatt's Magaz. 8, 55 sq.), although the last implies it in the words of Jesus, “I ascend to my Father,” and closes his Gospel with the last interview of Jesus in Galilee, at the Sea of Tiberias (John 21; compare Mat 28:16). The apostles, in the doctrinal expositions, occasionally allude to this ascension (ἀνάληψις) of Jesus (Act 3:21; 1Ti 3:16; Rev 12:5), and often speak (Act 2:33; Act 5:31; Act 7:55-56; Rom 8:34; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1) of Christ as seated at the right hand of God (see Griesbach, Sylloge locor. N.T. ad adscens. Christi in coel. spectantium, Jena, 1793; also in his  Opuscal. 2, 471 sq.; B. Crusius, Bibl. Theol. p. 400). Over the final disposal of the body of Christ after its ascension from the earth, an impenetrable veil must ever rest. The account of the ascension (see Stud. und Krit. 1841, 3, 597 sq.) is still treated by many of the critical theologians (comp. Ammon, Ascensus J. C. in coel. histor. Bibl. Gotting. 1800, also in his Nov. opusc. theol.; Horst, in Horn's Gotting. Museum f. Theol. 1, 2, 3 sq.; Br. über Rational. p. 238 sq.; Strauss, 2, 672 sq.; Hase, p. 220) as one of the myths (molded on the well known O.T. examples, Gen 5:24; 2Ki 2:11, and serving as a basis of the expectation of his visible return from heaven, Act 1:11; for, that the Jews of that day believed in an ascension of the Messiah to heaven [comp. Joh 6:62], appears from the book Zohar [Schottgen, Horoe Hebr. 2, 596]: the comparisons with heathen apotheoses are not in point [B. Hasse, Historioe de Chr. in vitum et coel. redeunte ex narraat. Liv. de Romulo illustratio, Regiom. 1805; Gfrorer, Urchristenth. 1, 2, 374 sq.], and the theories of Bauer in Flatt's Mag. 16, 173 sq., Seller, Weichert, and Himly [see Bretschneider, Syst. Entwickel. p. 589; Otterbein, De adscensione in coelum adspectabili modo facta, Duisb. 1802; or Fogtmann, Comm. de in coelum adscensu, Havn. 1826] are as little to the purpose that originated among the Christians, or were even invented by the apostles (Gramberg, Religionsid. 2, 461) — a view that is forbidden by the close proximity of the incident in point of time (London [Wesleyan] Review, July, 1861). It can, therefore, only be regarded as a preternatural occurrence (Neander, p. 726). SEE ASCENSION.

13. Respecting the personal appearance of Jesus we know nothing with certainty. According to Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 7, 18), the woman who was cured of her hemorrhage (Mat 9:20) had erected from thankfulness a brazen statue (see Hasaei Dissertat. sylloge, p. 314 sq.; comp. Heinichen, Exc. 10 ad Eusebius, 3, 397 sq.; Thilo, Cod. apocr. 1, 562 sq.) of Jesus at Paneas (Caesarea-Philippi), which was destroyed (Sozom. Hist. Eccl. 5, 21) at the command of the emperor Julian (compare Niceph. Hist. Eccl. 6, 15). Jesus himself, according to several ancient (but scarcely trustworthy) statements (Evagr. 4:27; Niceph. 2:7), sent his likeness to Abgarus (q.v.) at Edessa (comp. Bar-Hebr. Chron. p. 118), where was also said to have been found the handkerchief of Christ with an imprint of his countenance (Cedrenus, Hist. p. 176; Bar-Hebraeus, Chron. p. 168). Still another figure of Jesus is also mentioned (Nicephorus, ut sup.; this credulous historian names the evangelist Luke as the painter successively of Jesus, Mary, and  several apostles), and a certain Publius Lentulus, a Roman officer (according to one MS. a proconsul) is reported to have composed a description of Christ's personal appearance, which (with great variation of the text) is still exhibited as extant (comp. Fabricii Cod. apocr. N, Test. 1, 301 sq.; Pseudolentuli, Joa. Damasc. et Niceph [Hist. Eccles. 1, 40] prosopograph. J. C. edit. Carpzov, Helmst. 1774). This last, according to the text of Gabler (in Latin), reads as follows: “A man of tall stature, good appearance, and a venerable countenance, such as to inspire beholders both with love and awe. His hair worn in a circular form and curled, rather dark and shining, flowing over the shoulders, and parted in the middle of the head, after the style of the Nazarenes. His forehead, smooth and perfectly serene, with a face free from wrinkle or spot, and beautified with a moderate ruddiness, and a faultless nose and mouth. His beard full, of an auburn color like his hair, not long, but parted. His eyes quick and clear. His aspect terrible in rebuke, placid and amiable in admonition, cheerful without losing its gravity: a person never seen to laugh, but often to weep,” etc. (compare Niceph. 1, 40). (See Volbeding, p. 6.) The description given by Epiphanius (Monach. p. 29, ed. Dressel) has lately been discovered by Tischendorf (Cod. Ven. cl. 1, cod. 3, No. 12,000) in a somewhat different and perhaps more original form (in Greek), as follows: “But my Christ and God was exceedingly beautiful in countenance. His stature was fully developed, his height being six feet. He had auburn hair, quite abundant, and flowing down mostly over his whole person. His eyebrows were black, and not highly arched; his eyes brown, and bright. He had a family likeness, in his fine eyes, prominent nose, and good color, to his ancestor David, who is said to have had beautiful eves and a ruddy complexion. He wore his hair long, for a razor never touched it; nor was it cut by any person, except by his mother in his childhood. His neck inclined forward a little, so that the posture of his body was not too upright or stiff. His face was full, but not quite so round as his mother's; tinged with sufficient color to make it handsome and natural; mild in expression, like the blandness in the above description of his mother, whose features his own strongly resembled.” This production bears evident marks of being a later fabrication (see Gabler, 2 Progr. in authentiam epist. Lentuli, etc., Jen. 1819, 1822; also in his Opusc. 2, 638 sq.). There is still another notice of a similar kind (see the Jen. Lit.-Zeit. 1821, sheet 40), and also an account of the figure of Jesus, which the emperor Alexander Severus is said to have had in his lararium or household shrine (see Zeibich in the Nov. Miscell. Lips. 3, 42 sq.). SEE CHRIST, IMAGES OF.

From the New Test. the following particulars only may be gathered: Jesus was free from bodily defects (for so much is implied in the type of an unblemished victim under the law, and otherwise the people would not have recognized in him a prophet, while the Pharisees would have been sure to throw any physical deformity in his teeth), but his exterior could have presented nothing remarkable, since Mary Magdalene mistook him for the gardener (Joh 20:15), and the two disciples on the way to Emmaus (Luk 24:16), as well as the apostles at his last appearance by the Sea of Gennesareth (Joh 21:4 sq.), did not at first recognize him; but his form then probably bore many permanent marks of his severe sufferings. The whole evangelical narrative indicates sound and vigorous bodily health. In look and voice he must have had something wonderful (Joh 18:6), but at the same time engaging and benevolent: his outward air was the expression of the high, noble, and free spirit dwelling within him. The assertions of the Church fathers (Clem. Alex. Poedag. 3, 92; Strom. 6, 93; Origen, Cels. 6, 327, ed. Spenc.) that Christ had an unprepossessing appearance are of no authority, being evidently conformed to Isaiah 53 (but see Piiartii Assertio de singulari J. Ch. pulchritudine, Par. 1651; see generally, in addition to the above authorities, F. Vavassor, De forma Christi, Paris, 1649; on the portraits of Jesus, Reiske, De imaginibus Christi, Jena, 1685; Jablonsky, Opusc. edit. Te Water, 3, 377; Junker, Ueber Christuskopfe, in Ieusel's Miscell. artist. Inh. pt. 25, p. 28 sq.; Ammon, Ueb. Christuskopfe, in his Magazin. f. christl. Pred. 1, 2, 315 sq.; Tholuck, Literar. Anzeig. 1834, No. 71; Grimm, Die Sage und Ursprung der Christusbilder, Berl. 1843; Mrs. Jameson, Hist. of our Lord exemplified in Works of Art [Lond. 1865]). (See further in Volbeding, p. 19; Hase, p. 65; Meth. Quart. Rev. Oct. 1862, p. 679.)

14. It might be an interesting question, had we the means of accurately determining, how and by what instrumentalities Jesus, in a human point of view, attained his spiritual power, or to what influence (aside from divine inspiration) he owed his intellectual formation as a founder of religion (Ammon, Bibl. Theolog. 1, 234 sq.; Handbuch der christl. Sittenlehre, 1, 43 sq.; Kaiser, Bibl. Theolog. 1, 234 sq.; De Wette, Bibl. Dogm. p. 185 sq.; Colln, Bibl. Theolog. 2, 8 sq.; Hase, p. 56 sq.; compare Rau, De momentis us quoe ad Jes. divinar. rerum scientia imbuendum viri habuisse, videantur, Erlang. 1796; Greiling, Leben Jesu, p. 58 sq.; Planck, 1, 23 sq.; Briefe über Rational. p. 154 sq.). But while there has evidently been on the one side a general tendency to exaggerate the difficulties which  the natural improvement of Jesus had to overcome (Reinhard, Plan Jesu, p. 485 sq.), yet none of the hypotheses proposed for the solution of the question has satisfied the conditions of the problem, or been free from clear historical difficulties. Many, for instance, suppose that Jesus had his religious education in the order of the Essenes (q.v.), and they think that in the Christian morals they especially find many points of coincidence with the doctrines of that Jewish sect (Reim, Christus und die Vernunft. p. 668 sq.; Staudlein, Gesch. d. Sittenlehre Jesu, 1, 570 sq.; see, on the contrary, Luderwald, in Helke's Magaz. 4, 378 sq.; Bengel, in Flatt's Magaz. 7, 126 sq.; J. H. Dorfmüller, De dispari Jesu Essoeorumque disciplina Wunsidel. 1803; Wegnern, in Illgen's Zeitschr. 1841, pt. 2; comp. Heubner, 5th Append. to his edit. of Reinhard's Plan Jesu). Others attribute the culture of Jesus to the Alexandrio-Jewish religious philosophy (Bahrdt, Briefe über die Bibel in Volkston, 1, 376 sq.; Gfrorer, in the Gesch. des Urchristenth.).

Still others imagine that Sadduceeism, SEE SADDUCEE , or a comparison of this with Pharisaism, SEE PHARISEE, was the source of the pure religious views of Jesus (Henke, Mgaz. 5, 426 sq.; Des Cotes, Schutzschr. fur Jesus von Nazareth, p. 128 sq.). Although single points in the teaching and acts of Jesus might be illustrated by each of these theories (as could not fail to be the case with respect to one who threw himself into the midst of the religious efforts of the age, and combined efficiency with right aims), yet the whole of his spiritual life and deeds, the high clearness of understanding, the purity of sentiment, and, above all, the independence of spirit and matchless moral power which stamp each particular with a significance that was his alone, cannot be thus explained (Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 86 sq.). A richly-endowed and profound mind is, moreover, presupposed in all such hypotheses (comp. Paulus, Leb. Jesu, 1, 89), Our object is simply to investigate the influences that aroused these spiritual faculties, unfolded them, and directed them in that path. And in determining these, it is clear at the outset that a powerful impulse must have been given to the natural development of Jesus' mind (Luk 2:52) by a diligent study of the Holy Scriptures, especially in the prophetical books (Isaiah and the Psalms, Paulus, Leben Jesu, 1, 119 sq.), which contained the germs of an improved monotheism, and are, for the most part, free from Jewish niceties.

He would also derive assistance from a comparison of the Pharisaical statutes, which were unquestionably known to Jesus, and particularly of the Jewish Hellenism, Alexandrianism; SEE ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL, with those simple doctrines of the old Mosaism, especially as spiritualized by the prophets. How much may have been derived from  outward circumstances we do not know; that the maternal training, and even the open (Luk 4:29) and romantic situation of Nazareth, had a beneficial influence in unfolding and cultivating his mind (Greiling, Leb. Jesu, p. 48), scarcely admits a doubt, nor that the neighborhood of Gentile inhabitants in the entire vicinity might have already weakened and repressed in the youthful soul of Jesus the old Jewish narrow mindedness. The age also afforded a crisis for bringing out and determining the bent of his genius. Learned instruction (see No. 6 above) Jesus had not enjoyed (Mat 13:54 sq.; Joh 7:15), although the Jewish fables (Toledoth Jesu, p. 5) assign him a youthful teacher named Elhanan (אֶלְחָנָן), and Christian tradition (Histo in Joseph, c. 48 sq.) attributes to him wonderful aptness in learning (see generally Paulus, Leben Jesu, 1, 121 sq.). In addition to all these natural influences operating upon his human spirit, there was, above all, the plenary inspiration (Joh 3:34) which he enjoyed from the intercommunication of the divine nature; for the bare facts of his career, even on the lowest view that can be taken of the documents attesting these, are incapable of a rational explanation on the ground of his mere humanity (see J. Young, Christ of History, Lond. 1855, N.Y. 1857). SEE CHRIST. (For additional literature, see Volbeding, p. 36 sq.) His prediction of future events would not of itself be an evidence of a higher character than that of other prophets. SEE PROPHECY.

15. Respecting the enterprise on behalf of mankind which Jesus had conceived, and which he undeviatingly kept in view (see especially Reinhard, Versuch. ub. d. Plan den der Stifter der chr. Rel. zum Besten der Mensch. entwarf, 5th edit. by Heubner, Wittemb. 1830 [compare the Neues theol. Journ. 14, 24 sq.]; Der Zweck Jesu geschichtl. u. seelkundl. dargestellt, Leipz. 1816; Planck, 1, 7 sq., 86 sq.; Greiling. p. 120 sq.; Strauss, 1, 463 sq.; Neander, p. 115 sq.; Weisse, 1, 117 sq.), a few observations only can here be indulged. SEE REDEMPTION.

That Jesus sought not simply to be a reformer of Judaism (Joh 4:22; Mat 15:24; compare Mat 5:17), SEE LAW, much less the founder of a secret association (Klotzsch, De Christo ab instituenda societate clandestina alieno, Viteb. 1786), but to unite all mankind in one great sacred family, is vouched for by his own declarations (Joh 4:23; Joh 10:16), by the whole tendency of his teaching, by his constant expression of the deepest sympathy with humanity in general, and finally by the selection of the apostles to continue his work; only he wished to confine himself personally to the boundaries of Judaea in the publication of the kingdom of  God (Mat 15:24), whereas his disciples, led by the Holy Spirit, should eventually traverse the world as heralds of the truth (Mat 27:19 sq.). It is evident that to Jesus himself the outline of his design was always clearly defined in the course of his labors, but, on account of the dogmatic conformity of the delineations in John's Gospel, and the loose, unchronological development of it in the synoptical gospels, it is impossible accurately to show historically the gradual realization of this subjective scheme.

But that Jesus at any moment of his life whatever had stated the political element of the theocracy as being blended with his spiritual emoluments (Hase, Leb. Jesu, p. 86 sq., 2d edit.) is an unwarrantable position (comp. Heubner, in Reinhard, ut sup. p. 394 sq.; Lücke, Pr. examinatur sententia de mutato per eventa adeogue sensim emendato Christi consilio, Gott. 1831; Neander, p. 121 sq.). The reason why he did not directly announce himself to the popular masses as the expected Messiah (indeed, he even evaded the question, Luk 20:1 sq., and forbade the spread of this report, Mat 16:20) unquestionably was, that the minds of the Jews were incapable of separating their carnal anticipations from the true idea of the Messiah (q.v.). He strove, therefore, on every occasion to set this idea itself in a right position before them, and occasionally suggested the identification of his person with the Messiah, partly by the epithet “Son of Man,” which he applied to himself (see especially Mat 12:8), partly by explicit statements (Mat 13:16 sq.; Luk 4:21). Hence it is not surprising that the opinion of the people respecting him declined, and the majority regarded him only as a great prophet, chiefly interesting for his wonder working. He decidedly announced himself as the Messiah only to individual susceptible hearts (Joh 4:26; Joh 9:36 sq.), and also to the high priest at the conclusion of his career (Mat 26:64). The disciples required it merely for the confirmation of the faith they had already attained (Mat 16:13 sq.; Luk 9:20). SEE KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

The moral and religious character of Jesus (humanly considered), which even in the synoptical gospels, that are certainly chargeable with no embellishment, appears in a high ideality, has never yet been depicted with accurate psychological skill (see Volbeding, p. 35), but usually as a model of virtue in general (yet see Jerusalem, Nachgelass. Schrift, 1, 75 sq.; Greiling, p. 9 sq.; E.G. Winckler, Vers. e. Psychocographie Jesu, Lpz. 1826; Ullmann, Sundlosig. Jes. p. 35 sq.; Ammon, Leb. Jes. 1, 240 sq.; Thiele, in the Darmst. Kirch.-Zeit. 1844, No. 92-94). (Comp. Hase, p. 62,  64.) On the (choleric) temperament of Jesus, see J.G. Walch, De temperamento Christi hom. Jen. 1753. Deep humility before God (Luk 18:19), and ardent love towards men in view of the determined sacrifice (Joh 10:18), were the distinguishing traits of his noble devotion, while the divine zeal that stirred his great soul concentrated all his virtues upon his one grand design. Jesus appears as the harmonious complete embodiment of religious resignation; but this was so far from being a result of innate weakness (although Jesus might have had a slender physical constitution), that his natural force of character subsided into it (for examples of high energy in feeling and act, see Joh 2:16 sq.; Joh 8:44 sq.; Mat 16:23; Mat 23:5, etc.). Everywhere to this deep devotion was joined a clear, prudent understanding — a combination which alone can preserve a man of sensibility and activity from the danger of becoming a reckless enthusiast or a weak sentimentalist. This is most unmistakably exhibited in the account of his passion and death.

Neither do we find in Jesus any trace of the austerity and gloomy sternness of other founders of religion, or even of his contemporary the Baptist (Mat 11:18 sq.). In the midst of eager listeners in the public streets or in the Temple, he spoke with the high dignity of a messenger of God; yet how affectionately sympathetic (Joh 11:35), how solicitous, how self-sacrificing did he exhibit himself in the bosom of the family, in the dear circle of his friends! What tender sympathy expressed itself in him on every occasion (Luk 7:13; Mat 9:36; Mat 14:14; Mat 20:34). He was both (compare Rom 12:15) tearful among the tearful (Joh 11:35), and cheerful among the cheerful (Joh 2:1 sq.; Luk 7:34). On this very account the character of Jesus has at all times so irresistibly won the hearts of the good and noble of all people, since it evinces not merely the rarest magnanimity, such as to cause amazement, but at the same time the purest, most disinterested humanity, and thus presents to the observer not simply an object of esteem, but also of love. The history of Jesus' life is equally interesting to the child and the full-grown man, and certainly his example has effected at all times not less than his precepts. In accordance with this unmistakable sum of his character, certain single passages of the Gospels (e.g. Mat 12:46 sq.; Mat 15:21 sq.; Joh 2:4), which, verbally apprehended, SEE CANA, might perplex us concerning Jesus (comp. J.F. Volbeding, Utrum Christus matrem genusque suum dissimulaverit et despexerit, Viteb. 1784; K.J. Klemm, De necessitudine J. Christo c. consanguineis intercedente, Lips. 1846), may be more correctly explained see Ammon, Leb. Jesu, 1, 243 sq.), and may be placed in harmony with  others (e.g. Luk 2:51; compare Lange, De subjectione Chr. sub parentib. Lips. 1738). SEE ENSAMPLE.

The task of the world's redemption, acting as an ever present burden upon the Savior's mind, produced that pensiveness, not to say sadness, which was a marked characteristic of all his deportment. Rarely did his equanimity rise to exuberant joy, and that only in connection with the great ruling object of his life (Luk 10:21); oftener did it experience dejection of spirit (Joh 12:27), at times to the depths of mental anguish (Mar 14:34). SEE AGONY. It was this interior pressure that so frequently burst forth in sighs and tears (Joh 11:33; Luk 19:41), and made Jesus the ready sympathizer with human affliction (Joh 11:35). It is such spiritual and unselfish trials that ripen every truly great moral character, and it was accordingly needful that God, “in bringing many sons unto glory, should make the Captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings.” The fact that Jesus was emphatically “a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief,” is the real key to the subdued and self-collected tone of his entire demeanor. SEE KENOSIS.

For an adequate explanation of the astonishing power which our Savior exercised over his auditors, and, indeed, exerted over all who came within his circle of influence, we are doubtless to look to two or three facts which have never yet been exhibited, at least in connection, with such graphic portraiture as to make his life stand out to the modern reader in its true moral grandeur, force, and vividness. These elements are partly suggested in the evangelist's statement that those who first hung upon the Redeemer's lips found in his discourses a new and divine assurance: “He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes” (Mat 7:29).

(1.) His doctrines were novel to his hearers. It was not so much because he announced to them the ushering in of a new dispensation, for upon this he merely touched in his introductory addresses and by way of arresting their attention; all details respecting that fresh era which could gratify curiosity, or even awaken it, he sedulously avoided, and he seemed anxious to divert the popular expectation from himself as the central figure in the coming scenes. It was the spiritual truths he communicated that burned upon the hearts of the listening populace with a strange intensity. True, the essential features of a religious life had been illustrated in their sacred books for centuries by holy men of old, and the most vital doctrines of the Gospel  may be said to have been anticipated in the Mosaic code and the prophetical comments; nay, living examples were not wanting to confirm the substantial identity of religious experience under whatever outward economy. Yet, at the time of our Lord's advent, the fundamental principles of sound piety seem to have been forgotten or overlooked, especially by the Pharisees whose views and practices were regarded as the models by the nation at large. When, therefore, our Lord brought back the popular attention to the simple doctrines of love to God and man, not only as lying at the foundation of the O.T. ethics, but as comprising the whole duty of man, the simplicity, pertinence, and truthfulness of the sentiment came with an irresistible freshness of conviction to the minds of the humblest hearers. For this, too, they had already been prepared by the sad contrast between the precepts and the conduct of the highest sectaries of the day, by the tedious burden of the Mosaic ritual, and, above all, by the bitter yearnings after religious liberty in their own souls, which the current system of belief failed to supply. Sin yet lay as a load of anguish upon their hearts, and they eagerly embraced the gentle invitations of the Redeemer to the bosom of their offended heavenly Father. It was precisely the resurrection of these again obscured teachings that gave such power to the preaching of Luther, Whitefield, Wesley, Edwards, and others in subsequent times, and which converted the moral desert of their day into a spiritual Eden. But there was this to enhance the effect in the Savior's promulgations, that they awakened the expectation of a millennial reign; an idea misconstrued, indeed, by many of the Jews into that of a temporal dominion, but on that very account productive of a more boundless and extravagant enthusiasm. The national spirit was roused, and Jesus even found it necessary to repress and avoid the fanatical and disloyal manifestations to which it was instantly prone. Yet in those hearts which better understood “the kingdom of heaven,” there arose the dawn of that Sabbatic day of which the Pentecostal effusion brought the meridian glory. (For the best elucidation of this difference between Christ's and his predecessors', as well as rivals' teaching, see Stier's Words of Jesus, passim.)

(2.) He spoke as God. Later preachers and reformers have felt a heroic boldness, and have realized a marvelous effect in their utterances, when fully impressed with the conviction of the divinity of their mission and the sacred character of their communications; but Jesus was no mere ambassador from the court of heaven; he was the Word of the Lord himself. Ancient prophets had made their effata by an inspired impulse, and  corroborated them by outward miracles that enforced respect, if they did not command obedience; but Jesus possessed no restricted measure of the Spirit, and wrought wonders in no other's name; in him dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and the Sheknah stood revealed in his every act, look, and breath. “Never man spake like this,” was the significant confession extorted from his very foes. He who came from the bosom of the Father told but the things he had seen and known when he unveiled eternal verities to men. His daily demeanor, too, under whatever exigency, or temptation, or provocation, was a most pungent and irrefragable comment on all he said — a faultless example reflecting a perfect doctrine. Unprecedented as were his miracles, his life itself was the greatest wonder of all. The manner, it is often truly observed, is quite as important in the public speaker as the matter; and, we may add, his personal associations with his hearers are often more influential with them than either. In all these particulars Christ has no parallel — he had no defect. (See this argument admirably treated in Bushnell's Nature and the Supernatural, chap. 10)

(3.) The author of Ecce Homo (a work which admirably illustrates the human side of Christ and his religion, although it lamentably ignores the divine element in both) forcibly points (chap. 5) to the fact that the bare miracles of Jesus, although they were so public and so stupendous as to compel the credit and awe of all, were in themselves not sufficient to command even reverence, much less a loving trust; nay, that, had they been too freely used, they were even calculated to repel men in affright (comp. Luk 5:8) and consternation (see Luk 8:37). It was the self- restraint which the Possessor of divine power evidently imposed upon himself in this respect, and especially his persistent refusal to employ his supernatural gift either for his own personal relief and comfort, or for the direct promotion of his kingdom by way of a violent assault upon hostile powers, that intensified the astonished regard of his followers to the utmost pitch of devoted veneration. This penetrating sense of attachment to one to whom they owed everything, and who seemed to be independent of their aid, and even indifferent to his own protection while serving others, culminated at the tragedy, which achieved a world's redemption at his own expense. “It was the combination of greatness and self-sacrifice which won their hearts, the mighty powers held under a mighty control, the unspeakable condescension, the Cross of Christ” (p. 57) — a topic that ever called forth the full enthusiasm of Paul's heart, and that fired it with a heroic zeal to emulate his Master.  III. Narrative of our Savior's Life and Ministry.(For the further literature of each topic, see the articles referred to at each.) SEE GOSPELS.

About four hundred years had elapsed since Malachi, the last of the prophets, had foretold the coming of the Messiah's forerunner, and nearly the same interval had transpired since Ezra closed the sacred canon, and composed the concluding psalm (119); a still greater number of years had intervened since the latest miracle of the Old Test. had been performed, and men not only in Palestine, but throughout the entire East, were in general expectation of the advent of the universal Prince (Suetonius, Vesp. 4; Tacitus, Hist. 5, 13) an event which the Jews knew, from their Scriptures (Dan 9:25), was now close at hand (see Luk 2:26; Luk 2:38). SEE ADVENT.

It was under such circumstances, at a time when the Roman empire, of which Judea then formed a part, was in a state of profound and universal peace (Orosius, Hist. 6, fin.), under the rule of Augustus (Luk 2:1), that an incident occurred which, although apparently personal and inconsiderable, broke like a new oracle the silence of ages (comp. 2Pe 3:4), and proved the dawn of the long looked for day of Israel's glory (see Luk 1:78). A priest named Zachariah was performing the regular functions of his office within the holy place of the Temple at Jerusalem, when an angel appeared to him with the announcement that his hitherto childless and now aged wife, Elisabeth, should bear him a son, who was to be the harbinger of the promised Redeemer (Luk 1:5-25). SEE ZACHARIAS. To punish and at the same time remove his doubts, the power of articulate utterance was miraculously taken from him until the verification of the prediction (probably May, B.C. 7). SEE JOHN THE BAPTIST.

Nearly half a year after this vision, a still more remarkable annunciation (q.v.) was made by the same means to a maiden of the now obscure lineage of David, resident at Nazareth, and betrothed to Joseph, a descendant of the same once-royal family, SEE GENEALOGY: namely, that she was the individual selected to become the mother of the Messiah who had been expected in all previous ages (Luk 1:26-38). SEE MARY. Her scruples having been obviated by the assurance of a divine paternity, SEE INCARNATION, she acquiesced in the providence, although she could not have failed to foresee the ignominy to which it would expose her, SEE ADULTERY, and even joined her relative Elizabeth in praising God for so high an honor (Luk 1:39-56). As soon as her condition became known, SEE CONCEPTION, Joseph was divinely apprised, through a dream, of his intended wife's innocence, and directed  to name her child Jesus (see above), thus adopting it as his own (Mat 1:18-25; probably April, B.C. 6). SEE JOSEPH.

Although the parents resided in Galilee, they had occasion just at this time to visit Bethlehem (q.v.) in order to be enrolled along with their relatives in a census now in progress by order of the Roman authorities, SEE CYRENIUS, and thus Jesus was born, during their stay in the exterior buildings of the public khan, SEE CARAVANSERAI, at that place (Luk 2:1-7), in fulfilment of an express prediction of Scripture (Mic 5:2), prob. Aug. B.C. 6. SEE NATIVITY.

The auspicious event was heralded on the same night by angels to a company of shepherds on the adjacent plains, and was recognized by two aged saints at Jerusalem, SEE SIMEON; SEE ANNA, where the mother presented the babe at the usual time for the customary offerings at the Temple, the rite of circumcision (q.v.) having been meanwhile duly performed (Luk 2:8-39; prob. Sept. B.C. 6). Public notice, however, was not attracted to the event till, on the arrival at the capital of a party of Eastern philosophers, SEE MAGI, who had been directed to Palestine by astronomical phenomena as the birthplace of some noted infant, SEE STAR OF THE WISE MEN, the intelligence of their inquiries reached the jealous ears of Herod (q.v.), who thereupon — first ascertaining from the assembled Sanhedrim the predicted locality — sent the strangers to Bethlehem, where the holy family appear to have continued, pretending that he wished himself to do the illustrious babe reverence, but really only to render himself more sure of his destruction (Mat 2:1-12). This attempt was foiled by the return of the Magi home by another route, through divine intimation, and the child was preserved from the murderous rage of Herod by a precipitous flight of the parents (who were in like manner warned of the danger) into Egypt, SEE ALEXANDRIA, under a like direction (prob. July, B.C. 5). Here they remained SEE EGYPT until, on the death of the tyrant, at the divine suggestion, they returned to Palestine; but, avoiding Judea, where Archelaus, who resembled his father, had succeeded to the throne, they settled at their former place of residence, Nazareth, within the territory of the milder Antipas (Mat 2:19-23; prob. April, B.C. 4). SEE NAZARENE.

The evangelists pass over the boyhood of Jesus with the simple remark that his obedience, intelligence, and piety won the affections of all who knew him (Luk 2:40; Luk 2:51-52). A single incident is recorded in illustration of these traits, which occurred when he had completed his twelfth year — an age at which the Jewish males were expected to take  upon them the responsibility of attaching themselves to the public worship, as having arrived at years of discretion (Luk 2:41-50; see Lightfoot and Wetstein, ad loc.). Having accompanied his parents, on this occasion, to the Passover at Jerusalem, the lad tarried behind at the close of the festal week, and was discovered by them, as they turned back to the capital from their homeward journey, after considerable search, sitting in the midst of the Rabbis in one of the anterooms of the sacred edifice, seeking information from them on sacred themes (or probably rather imparting than eliciting truth, after the manner of the Socratic questionings) with a clearness and profundity so far beyond his years and opportunities as to excite the liveliest astonishment in all beholders (April, A.D. 8). His pointed reply to his mother's expostulation for his seeming neglect of filial duty evinces a comprehension already of his divine character and work: “Knew ye not that I must be at my Father's?” (ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πατρός μου).

1. Introductory Year. — Soon after John the Baptist had opened his remarkable mission at the Jordan, among the thousands of all classes who flocked to his preaching and baptism (q.v.), Jesus, then thirty years old, presented himself for the same initiatory rite at his hands as the only acknowledged prophet extant who was empowered to administer what should be equivalent to the holy anointing oil of the kingly and priestly offices (Mat 3:13-17; Luk 3:1-18; Luk 3:23; and parallels). SEE MESSIAH.

John did not at once recognize Jesus as the Messiah, although he had just declared to the people the near approach of his own Superior; yet, being doubtless personally well acquainted with his relative, in whom he must have perceived the tokens of an extraordinary religious personage, he modestly declined to perform a ceremony that seemed to imply his own preeminence; but upon his compliance with the request of Jesus, on the ground of the propriety of this preliminary ordinance, a divine attestation, both in a visible, SEE DOVE, and an audible, SEE BATH-KOL, form, was publicly given as to the sacred character of Jesus, and in such clear conformity to a criterion which John himself had already received by the inward revelation, that he at once began to proclaim the advent of the Messiah in his person (prob. August, A.D. 25). SEE JOHN THE BAPTIST.

After this inauguration of his public career, Jesus immediately retired into the desert of Judaea, where, during a fast of forty days, he endured those interior temptations of Satan which should suffice to prove the superiority of his virtue to that power to which Adam had succumbed; and at its close  he successfully resisted three special attempts of the devil in a personal form to move him first to doubt and then to presume upon the divine care, and finally to bribe him to such barefaced idolatry that Jesus indignantly repelled him from his presence (Mat 4:1-11, and parallels). SEE TEMPTATION.

The effect of John's open testimony to the character of Jesus, as he began his preaching afresh the next season on the other side of the Jordan, was such as not only to lead to a deputation of inquiry to him from the Sanhedrim on the subject, but also to induce two of the Baptist's disciples to attach themselves to Christ, one of whom immediately introduced his own brother to his newly found Master, and to these, as he was departing for Galilee, were added two others of their acquaintance (Joh 1:19-36). On arriving at Cana (q.v.), whither he had been invited with his relatives and friends to a wedding festival, Jesus performed his first miracle by changing water into wine for the supply of the guests (Joh 2:1-11; prob. March, A.D. 26).

2. First more public Year. — After a short visit at Capernaum, Jesus returned to Judea in order to attend the Passover; and finding the entrance to the Temple choked with various kinds of merchant stalls, he forcibly expelled their sacrilegious occupants, and vindicated his authority by a prediction of his resurrection, which was at the time misunderstood (Joh 2:12-22). His miracles during the Paschal week confirmed the popular impression concerning his prophetic character, and even induced a member of the Sanhedrim to seek a private interview with him, SEE NICODEMUS; but his doctrine of the necessity of a spiritual change in his disciples, SEE REGENERATION, and his statement of his own passion, SEE ATONEMENT, were neither intelligible nor agreeable to the worldly minds of the people (Joh 2:23-25; Joh 3:1-21). Jesus now proceeded to the Jordan, and by the instrumentality of his disciples continued the inaugural baptism of the people instituted by John, who had meanwhile removed further up the river, where, so far from being jealous of Jesus' increasing celebrity, he gave still stronger testimony to the superior destiny of Jesus (Joh 3:22-36); but the imprisonment of John not long afterwards by order of Herod (Mat 14:3 sq.; Mar 6:17 sq.; Luk 3:19) rendered it expedient (Mat 4:12; Mar 1:14), in connection with the odium excited by the hierarchy (Joh 4:1-3), that Jesus should retire into Galilee (Luk 4:14). On his way thither, his conversation with a Samaritan female at the well of Jacob (q.v.), near Shechem, on the  spiritual blessings of God's true worshippers, led to her conversion, with a large number of her fellow citizens, among) whom he tarried two days (Joh 4:4-42; prob. December, A.D. 26). On his arrival in Galilee he was received with great respect (Joh 4:43-45), and his public announcements of the advent of the Messianic age (Mat 4:17; Mar 1:14-15) in all the synagogues of that country spread his fame still more widely (Luk 4:14-15). In this course of preaching he revisited Cana, and there, by a word, cured the son of one of Herod's courtiers that lay at the point of death at Capernaum (Joh 4:46-54).

Arriving at Nazareth, he was invited by his townsmen to read the Scripture lesson (Isa 61:1-2) in the synagogue, but they took such offence at his application of it to himself, and still more at his comments upon it, that they hurried him tumultuously to the brink of a precipice, and would have thrown him off had he not escaped from their hands (Luk 4:16-30). Thenceforward he fixed upon Capernaum (q.v.) as his general place of residence (Mat 4:13-16). In one of his excursions in this neighborhood, after addressing the people on the lake shore from a boat on the water, he directed the owners of the boat to a spot further out from the shore, where they caught so evidently miraculous a draft of fish as to convince both them and their partners of his superhuman character, and then invited all four of the fishermen to become his disciples, a call which they promptly obeyed (Luk 5:1-10; Mat 4:19-22; and parallels). On his return to Capernaum he restored a daemoniac among the assembly whom he addressed in the synagogue, to the astonishment of the audience and vicinity (Mar 1:21-29, and parallels), and, retiring to the house of one of these lately chosen followers, he cured his mother-in-law of a fever, as well as various descriptions of invalids and deranged persons, at sunset of the same day (Mar 1:29-34; Mat 8:17; and parallels). Rising the next morning for solitary prayer before any of the family were stirring, he set out, notwithstanding the remonstrances of his host as soon as he had discovered him, to make a general tour of Galilee, preaching to multitudes who flocked to hear him from all directions, and supporting his doctrines by miraculous cures of every species of physical and mental disease (Mar 1:35-38; Mat 4:23-25; and parallels; prob. February, A.D. 27). One of these cases was a leper, whose restoration to purity caused such crowds to resort to Jesus as compelled him to avoid public thoroughfares (Mar 1:40-45, and parallels). On his return to Capernaum his door was soon thronged with listeners to his preaching, including many of the learned Pharisees from Jerusalem; and the  cavils of these latter at his pronouncing spiritual absolution upon a paralytic whom earnest friends had been at great pains to let down at the feet of Jesus by removing the balcony roof above him, he refuted by instantly enabling the helpless man to walk home, carrying his couch (Luk 5:17-26, and parallels; prob. March, A.D. 27). On another excursion by the lake shore, after preaching to the people, he summoned as a disciple the collector of the Roman imposts (Mar 2:13-14, and parallels; probably April, A.D. 27). SEE MATTHEW.

3. Second more public Year. — The Passover now drew near, which Jesus, like the devout Jews generally, was careful to attend at Jerusalem (Saturday, April 12, A.D. 27). SEE PASSOVER.

As he passed by the pentagonal pool of Bethesda, near the sheep gate of the city, he observed in one of its porches an invalid awaiting the intermittent influx of the water, to which the populace had attributed a miraculously curative power to the first bather thereafter; but, learning that he had been thus infirm for thirty- eight years, and ascertaining from him that he was even too helpless to reach the water in time to experience its virtue, he immediately restored him to vigor by a word. SEE BETHESDA.

This, happening to occur on the Sabbath, so incensed the hierarchy that they charged the author of the cure with a profanation of the day, and thus drew from Jesus a public vindication of his mission and an exposure of their inconsistency (Joh 5:1-47). As he was preparing to return to Galilee, on the Sabbath ensuing the Paschal week (Saturday, April 19, A.D. 27), his disciples chanced to pluck, as strangers were privileged to do (Deu 23:25), a few of the ripe heads from the standing barley, through which they were at the time passing, in order to allay their hunger; and this being captiously alleged by some Pharisee bystanders as a fresh violation of the sacred day, Jesus took occasion to rebuke their over scrupulousness as being confuted by the example of David (1Sa 21:1-6), the practice of the priests themselves (Num 28:9-19), and the tenor of Scripture (Hos 6:6; compare Samuel 15:22), and, at the same time, to point out the true design of the Sabbath (q.v.), namely, man's own benefit (Mat 12:1-8, and parallels). On an ensuing Sabbath (prob. Saturday, April 26, A.D. 27), entering the synagogue (apparently of Capernaum), he once more excited the same odium by curing a man whose right hand was palsied; but  his opponents, who had been watching the opportunity, were silenced by his appeal to the philanthropy of the act, yet they thenceforth began to plot his destruction (Mar 3:1-6, and parallels). Retiring to the Sea of Galilee, he addressed the multitudes who thronged here from all quarters, and cured the sick and daemoniacs among them (Mar 3:7-12; Mat 12:17-21, and parallels). After a night spent in prayer on a mountain in the vicinity, he now chose twelve persons from among his followers to be his constant attendant and future witnesses to his career (Luk 6:12-16, and parallels). SEE APOSTLE.

Then, descending to a partial plain, he cured the diseased among the assembled multitude (Luk 6:17-19), and, seating himself upon an eminence, he proceeded to deliver his memorable sermon exhibiting the spirituality of the Gospel in opposition to the formalism of the prevalent theology (Mat 5:1-12; Luk 6:24-26; Mat 5:17-24; Mat 5:27-30; Mat 5:33-48; Mat 6:1-8; Mat 6:16-18; Mat 7:1-5; Mat 7:12; Mat 7:15-18; Mat 7:20-21; Mat 7:24-27; Mat 8:1, and parallel passages; prob. May. A.D. 27). SEE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

On his return to Capernaum, Jesus, at the instance of the Jewish elders, cured the son of a modest and pious centurion, who, although a Gentile, had built the village synagogue, and whose faith in the power of Jesus to restore by his mere word the distant invalid excited the liveliest interest in the mind of Jesus himself (Luk 7:1-10, and parallel). The ensuing day, passing near Nain, he met a large procession issuing from the village for the interment of the only son of a widow, and, commiserating her double bereavement, he restored the youth instantly to life, to the astonishment of the beholders (Luk 7:11-17). John the Baptist, hearing while in prison of these miracles, sent two messengers to Jesus to obtain more explicit assurance from his own lips as to the Messiah, which he seemed so slow plainly to avow; but, instead of returning a direct answer, Jesus proceeded to perform additional miracles in their presence, and then referred them to the Scripture prophecies (Isa 61:1; Isa 35:5-6) of these distinctive marks of the Messianic age; but as soon as the messengers had departed, he eulogized the character of John, although the introducer of an sera less favored than the period of Jesus himself, and concluded by severe denunciations of the cities (especially Capernaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida) which had continued impenitent under his own preaching (Luk 7:18-35; Mat 11:20; Mat 11:24; and parallels). About this time, a Pharisee invited him one day to dine with him, but, while he was reclining at the table, a female notorious for her immorality came penitently behind him and bedewed with her tears his unsandaled feet extended beyond the couch, then wiped them with her hair,  and finally affectionately anointed them with ointment brought for that purpose, while the host scarcely restrained his surprise that Jesus should suffer this familiarity; but, in a pointed parable of two debtors released from dissimilar amounts, Jesus at once justified the love of the woman and rebuked the sordidness of the host, who had neglected these offices of respect, and then confirmed the woman's trembling hopes of pardon for her past sins (Luk 7:36-50). He next set out on his second tour of Galilee (summer of A.D. 27), accompanied by several grateful females who bore his expenses (Luk 8:1-3).

No sooner had he returned to Capernaum (prob. Oct. A.D. 27) than such crowds reassembled at his house that his friends sought to restrain what they deemed his excessive enthusiasm to address them, while the jealous hierarchy from Jerusalem, who were present, scrupled not to attribute to collusion with Satan the cure of a blind and dumb daemoniac which he wrought. But, refuting this absurd cavil (since his act was directly in opposition to diabolical influences), he denounced it as an unpardonable crime against the Holy Spirit, who was the agent, and proceeded to characterize the rancor of heart that had prompted it; then, after refusing to gratify the curiosity of one of his enemies, who interrupted him by demanding some celestial portent in confirmation of his claims (for he declared no further miracle should be granted to them except his eventual resurrection, which he compared to the restoration of Jonah from the maw of the fish), he contrasted the obduracy of the generation that heard him with the penitence of the Ninevites and the eagerness of the queen of Sheba to listen to far inferior wisdom, and closed by comparing their aggravated condition to that of a relapsed demoniac (Mar 3:19-21; Mat 12:22-45; and parallels). A woman present pronounced his mother happy in having such a son, but he declared those rather happy who obeyed his teaching (Luk 11:27). At that moment, being informed of the approach of his relatives, and their inability to reach him through the crowd, he avowed his faithful followers to be dearer than his earthly kindred (Mat 12:46-50, and parallels). A Pharisee (q.v.) present invited him to dinner, but, on his evincing surprise that his guest did not perform the ablutions customary before eating, Jesus inveighed against the absurd and hypocritical zeal of the sect concerning externals, while they neglected the essentials of piety; and when a devotee of the law, SEE LAWYER complained of the sweeping character of these charges, he denounced the selfish and ruinous casuistry of this class likewise with such severity that the whole party determined to entrap him, if possible, into some unguarded expression against the religious or civil power (Luk 11:37-42; Luk 11:44-46; Luk 11:52-54, and parallel). SEE SCRIBE.

On his way home he continued to address the immense concourse, first against the hypocrisy which he had just witnessed, and then taking occasion from the demand of a person present that he would use his authority to compel his brother to settle their father's estate with him, which he refused on the ground of its irrelevancy to his sacred functions — he proceeded to discourse on the necessity and propriety of trust in divine Providence for our temporal wants, illustrating this duty by the parable of the sudden death of a rich worldling, by a comparison with various natural objects, by contrast with the heathen, and by the higher importance of a preparation for heaven (Luk 12:1; Luk 12:6-7; Luk 12:13-31; Luk 12:33-34, and parallels). Being informed of a recent atrocity of Herod against some Galileans, he declared that an equally awful fate awaited the impenitent among his hearers, and enforced the admonition by the parable of the delay in cutting down a fruitless tree (Luk 13:1-9). Again leaving his home the same day, he delivered, while sitting in a boat, to a large audience upon the lake shore, the several parables of the different fate of various portions of seed in a field, the true and false wheat growing together till harvest, the gradual but spontaneous development of a plant of grain, the remarkable growth of the mustard shrub from a very small seed, and the dissemination of leaven throughout a large mass of dough (Mat 13:1-9; Mat 13:24-30; Mar 4:26-29; Mat 13:31-36; and parallels); but it was only to the privileged disciples (as he informed them) in private that he explained, at their own request, the various elements of the first of these parables as referring to the different degrees of improvement made by the corresponding classes of his own hearers, adding various admonitions (by comparisons with common life) to diligence on the part of the apostles, and then, after explaining the parable of the false wheat as referring to the divine forbearance to eradicate the wicked in this scene of probation, he added the parable of the assortment of a heterogeneous draft of fish in a common net, indicative of the final discrimination of the foregoing characters, with two minor parables illustrating the paramount value of piety, and closed with an exhortation to combine novelty with orthodoxy in religious preaching, like the varied stores of a skilful housekeeper (Mat 13:10-11; Mat 13:13-23; Mat 5:14-16; Mat 6:22-23; Mat 10:26-27; Mat 13:12; Mat 13:36-43; Mat 13:47-50; Mat 13:44-46; Mat 13:51-53; and parallels). SEE PARABLE, As Jesus was setting out, towards evening of the same day, to cross the lake, a scribe proposed to become his constant disciple, but was repelled by being reminded by Jesus of the hardships to which he would expose himself in his company; two others of his  attendants were refused a temporary leave of absence to arrange their domestic affairs, lest it might wean them altogether from his service (Mat 8:18-22; Luke 11:61, 62; and parallels). While the party were crossing the lake, Jesus, overcome with the labors of the day, had fallen asleep on the stern bench of the boat, when so violent a squall took them that, in the utmost consternation, they appealed to him for preservation, and, rebuking their distrust of his defending presence, he calmed the tempest with a word (Mat 8:23-27, and parallels). SEE GALILEE, SEA OF.

On reaching the eastern shore, they were met by two frantic daemoniacs, roaming in the deserted catacombs of Gadara, who prostrated themselves before Jesus, and implored his forbearance; but the Satanic influence that possessed them, on being expelled by him, with his permission seized upon a large herd of swine feeding near (probably raised, contrary to the law, for supplying the market of the Greek-imitating Jews), and caused them to rush headlong into the lake, where they were drowned, SEE DAEMONIAC; and this loss offended the worldly-minded owners of the swine that the neighbors generally requested Jesus to return home. which he immediately did, leaving the late maniacs to fill the country with the remarkable tidings of their cure (Mar 5:1-21, and parallels). Not long afterwards, on occasion of a large entertainment made for Jesus by Matthew, the Pharisees found fault with the disciples because their Master head condescended to associate with the tax gatherers and other disreputable persons that were guests; but Jesus declared that such had most need of his intercourse, his mission being to reclaim sinners (Mat 9:10-13, and parallels). At the same time he explained to an inquirer why he did not enjoin seasons of fasting like the Baptist, that his presence as yet should rather be a cause of gladness to his followers, and he illustrated the impropriety of such severe requirements prematurely by the festivity of a marriage week, and by the parables of a new patch on an old garment, and new wine in old skin bottles (Mat 9:14-17, and parallels). In the midst of these remarks he was entreated by a leading citizen named Jairus (q.v.) to visit his daughter, who lay at the point of death; and while going for that purpose he cured a female among the crowd of a chronic hemorrhage (q.v.) by her secretly touching the edge of his dress, which led to her discovery and acknowledgment on the spot; but in the meantime information arrived of the death of the sick girl: nevertheless, encouraging the father's faith, he proceeded to the house where her funeral had already begun, and, entering the room with her parents and three disciples only, restored her to life and health by a simple  touch and word, to the amazement of all the vicinity (Mar 5:22-43, and parallels). As he was leaving Jairus' house two blind men followed him, whose request that he would restore their sight he granted by a touch; and on his return home he cured a dumb demoniac, upon which the Pharisees repeated their calumny of his collusion with Satan (Mat 9:27-34).

Visiting Nazareth again shortly afterwards, his acquaintances were astonished at his eloquence in the synagogue on the Sabbath, but were so prejudiced against his obscure family that but few had sufficient faith to warrant the exertion of his miraculous power in cures (Mar 6:1-6, and parallel). About this time (probably Jan. and Feb. A.D. 28), commiserating the moral destitution of the community, Jesus sent out the apostles in pairs on a general tour of preaching and miracle working in different directions (but avoiding the Gentiles and Samaritans), with special instructions, while he made his third circuit of Galilee for a like purpose (Mat 9:35-38; Mat 10:1; Mat 10:5-14; Mat 10:40-42; Mat 11:1; Mar 6:12-13; and parallels). Upon their return, Jesus, being apprized of the execution of John the Baptist by Herod (Mar 6:21-29; probably March, A.D. 28), and of the tetrarch's views of himself (Mar 6:14-16; SEE JOHN THE BAPTIST ), retired with them across the lake, followed by crowds of men, with their families, whom at evening he miraculously fed with a few provisions at hand (Mar 6:30-44, and parallels), an act that excited such enthusiasm among them as to lead them to form the plan of forcibly proclaiming him their political king (Joh 6:14-15); this design Jesus defeated by dismissing the multitude, and sending away the disciples by themselves in a boat across the lake, while he spent most of the night alone in prayer on a neighboring hill; but towards daylight he rejoined them, by walking on the water to them as they were toiling at the oars against the wind and tempestuous waves, and suddenly calming the sea, brought them to the shore, to their great amazement; then, as he proceeded through the plain of Gennesareth, the whole country brought their sick to him to be cured (Mat 14:22-36, and parallels), the populace whom he had left on the eastern shore meanwhile missing him, returned by boats to Capernaum (Joh 6:22-24; prob. Thursd. and Friday, March 25 and 26, A.D. 28). Meeting them in their search next day in the synagogue, he took occasion, in alluding to the recent miracle, to proclaim himself to them at large as the celestial “manna” for the soul, but cooled their political ambition by warning them that the benefits of his mission could only be received through a participation by faith in the atoning sacrifice shortly to be made in his own person; a doctrine that soon discouraged their adherence to him,  but proved no stumbling block to the steadfast faith of eleven of his apostles (Joh 6:25-71; prob. Saturday, March 27, A.D. 28).

4. Third more public Year. — Avoiding the malicious plots of the hierarchy at Jerusalem by remaining at Capernaum during the Passover (Joh 7:1; probably Sunday, March 28, A.D. 28), Jesus took occasion, from the fault found by some Pharisees from the capital against his disciples for eating with unwashed hands, SEE ABLUTION, to rebuke their traditional scrupulousness as subversive of the true intent of the Law, and to expound to his disciples the true cause of moral defilement, as consisting in the corrupt affections of the heart (Mar 7:1-16; Mat 15:12-20; and parallels). Retiring to the borders of Phoenicia, he was besought with such importunity by a Gentile woman to cure her daemoniac daughter, that, after overcoming with the most touching arguments his assumed indifference, her faith gained his assent, and on reaching home she found her daughter restored (Mat 15:21-28, and parallel; prob. May, A.D. 28). Thence returning through the Decapolis, publicly teaching on the way, he cured a deaf and dumb person, with many other invalids, and, miraculously feeding the great multitude that followed him, he sailed across to the western shore of the lake (Mar 7:31-37; Mat 15:30-39; and parallels), where he rebuked the Pharisees' demand of some celestial prodigy by referring them to the tokens of the existing sera, which were as evident as signs of the weather, and admonishing them of the coming retribution (Mat 16:1-3; Mat 5:25-26), and, again hinting at the crowning miracle of his resurrection, he returned to the eastern side of the lake, warning his disciples on the way of the pernicious doctrine of the sectaries, which he compared to leaven (Mat 16:4-12, and parallels). Proceeding to Bethsaida (in Peraea), he cured a blind man in a gradual manner by successive touches of his eyes (Mar 8:22-26), and on his way through the environs of Caesarea-Philippi, after private devotion, he elicited from the disciples a profession of their faith in him as the Messiah, and conferred upon them the right of legislating for his future Church, but rebuked Peter for demurring at his prediction of his own approaching passion, and enjoined the strictest self denial upon his followers, in view of the eventual retribution shortly to be foreshadowed by the overthrow of the Jewish nation (Mat 16:13-28, and parallels;  prob. May, A.D. 28). A week afterwards, taking three disciples only with him, he ascended a lofty mountain in the vicinity (prob. Hermon), where his person experienced a remarkable luminousness, SEE TRANSFIGURATION, with other prodigies, that at first alarmed the disciples; and, on descending the mountain, he explained the allusion (Mal 4:5-6) to Elijah (who, with Moses, had just conversed with him in a glorified state) as meaning John the Baptist, lately put to death (Mat 17:1-13, and parallels).

On his return to the rest of the disciples, he found them disputing with the Jewish sectaries concerning a daemoniac deaf mute child whom the former had vainly endeavored to cure; the father now earnestly entreating Jesus to exercise his power over the malady, although of long duration, he immediately restored the lad to perfect soundness, and privately explained to the disciples the cause of their failure as lying in their want of faith (Mar 9:14-28, and parallels), which would have rendered them competent to any requisite miracle (Luk 17:5-6, and parallel) if coupled with devout humility (Mar 9:29, and parallel). Thence passing over into Galilee, he again foretold his ignominious crucifixion and speedy resurrection to his disciples, who still failed to apprehend his meaning (Mar 9:30-32, and parallels). On the return of the party to Capernaum, the collector of the Temple tax waited upon Peter for payment from his Master, who, although stating his exemption by virtue of his high character, yet, for the sake of peace, directed Peter to catch a fish, which would be found to have swallowed a piece of money sufficient to pay for them both (Mat 17:24-27; prob. June, A.D. 28)., About this time Jesus rebuked the disciples for a strife into which they had fallen for the highest honors under their Master's reign by placing a child in their midst as a symbol of artless innocence; and upon John's remarking that they had lately silenced an unknown person acting in his name, he reprimanded such bigotry, enlarging by various similes upon the duty of tenderly dealing with new converts, and closing with rules for the expulsion of an unworthy. member from their society, adding the parable of the unmerciful servant to enforce the doctrine of leniency (Mar 9:33-40; Mar 9:42; Mar 9:49-50; Mat 18:10; Mat 18:15-35; and parallels). Some time afterwards (prob. September, A.D. 28) Jesus sent seventy of the most trusty among his followers, in pairs, through the region which he intended shortly to visit, with instructions similar to those before given to the apostles, but indicative of the opposition they would be likely to meet with (Luk 10:1-3; Mat 7:6; Mat 10:23-26; and parallels); and then, after declining to accompany his worldly minded brothers to the  approaching festival of Tabernacles at Jerusalem, to which they urged him as a favorable opportunity for exhibiting his wonderful powers, near the close of the festal week he went thither privately (Joh 7:2-10), experiencing on the way the inhospitality of the Samaritans with a patience that rebuked the indignation of one of his disciples (Luk 9:51-56), and receiving the grateful acknowledgments of a single Samaritan among ten lepers whom he cured (Luk 17:11-19).

5. Last half Year. — On the opening of the festival at Jerusalem (Sunday, Sept. 21, A.D. 28), the hierarchy eagerly inquired for Jesus among the populace, who held discordant opinions concerning him; but, on his arrival, he boldly taught in the Temple, vindicating his course and claims so eloquently that the very officers sent by his enemies to arrest him returned abashed, while the people continued divided in their sentiments, being inclined to accept his cordial invitations (Mat 11:28-30), but deterred by the specious objections of the hierarchy (Joh 7:11-53). Next morning, returning from the Mt. of Olives (prob. the residence of Lazarus at Bethany), in the midst of his teaching in the Temple he dismissed, with merely an admonition, a female brought to him as an adulteress (q.v.), with a view to embarrass him in the disposal of the case, none of his conscience-stricken accusers daring to be the first in executing the penalty of the law when allowed to do so by Jesus (Joh 8:1-11). He then continued his expostulations with his captious hearers respecting his own character, until at length, on his avowing his divine preexistence, they attempted to stone him as guilty of blasphemy, but he withdrew from their midst (Joh 8:12-59). The seventy messengers returning shortly afterwards (prob. Oct. A.D. 28) with a report of great success, Jesus expressed his exultation in thanks to God for the humble instrumentality divinely chosen for the propagation of the Gospel (Luk 10:17-21, and parallel). Being asked by a Jewish sectary the most certain method of securing heaven, he referred him to the duty, expressed in the law (Deu 6:5; Lev 19:8), of supreme love to God and cordial philanthropy, and, in answer to the other's question respecting the extent of the latter obligation, he illustrated it by the parable of the benevolent Samaritan (Luk 10:25-37). Returning at evening to the home of Lazarus, he gently reproved the impatient zeal of the kind Martha in preparing for him a meal, and defended Mary for being absorbed in his instructions (Luk 10:38-42). After a season of private prayer (prob. in Gethsemane, on his way to Jerusalem, next morning), he dictated a model  of prayer to his disciples at their request, stating the indispensableness of a placable spirit towards others in order to our own forgiveness by God, and adding the parable of the guest at midnight to enforce the necessity of urgency in prayer, with assurances that God is more willing to grant his children's petitions for spiritual blessings than earthly parents are to supply their children's temporal wants (Luk 11:1-13, and parallels).

As he entered the city, Jesus noticed a man whom he ascertained to have been blind from his birth, and to the disciples' inquiry for whose sin the blindness was a punishment, he answered that it was providentially designed for the divine glory, namely, in his cure, as a means to which he moistened a little clay with spittle, touched the man's eyes with it, and directed him to wash them in the Pool of Siloam (Saturday, Nov. 28, A.D. 28); but the hierarchy, learning the cure from the neighbors brought the man before them, because the transaction had taken place on the Sabbath, and disputed the fact until testified to by his parents, and then alleging that the author of the act, whose name was yet unknown even to the man himself, must have been a sinner, because a violator of the sacred day, they were met with so spirited a defense of Jesus by the man himself, that, becoming enraged, they immediately excommunicated him. Jesus, however, meeting him shortly after, disclosed to his ready faith his own Messianic character, and then discoursed to his captious enemies concerning the immunities of true believers in him under the simile of a fold of sheep (John 9; Joh 10:1-21). The same figure he again took up at the ensuing Festival of Dedication, upon the inquiry of the Jewish sectaries directly put to him in Solomon's portico of the Temple, as to his Messiahship, and spoke so pointedly of his unity with God that his auditors would have stoned him for blasphemy had he not hastily withdrawn from the place (cir. Dec. 1, A.D. 28), and retired to the Jordan, where he gained many adherents (Joh 10:22-42). Lazarus at this time falling sick, his sisters sent to Jesus, desiring his presence at Bethany; but after waiting several days, until Lazarus was dead, he informed his disciples of the fact (which he assured them would turn out to the divine glory), and proposed to go thither. On their arrival, he was met first by Martha and then by Mary, with tearful expressions of regret for his absence, which he checked by assurances (not clearly apprehended by them) of their brother's restoration to life; then causing the tomb to be opened (after overruling Martha's objection), he summoned the dead Lazarus forth to life, to the amazement of the spectators (Joh 11:1-46; probably Jan. A.D. 29). SEE LAZARUS.

This miracle aroused afresh the enmity of the Sanhedrim, who, after consultation, at the haughty advice of  Caiaphas, determined to accomplish his death, thus unwittingly fulfilling the destined purpose of his mission (Joh 11:47-53). Withdrawing in consequence to the city of Ephron (Joh 11:54), and afterwards to Perea, Jesus continued his teaching and miracles to crowds that gathered about him (Mar 10:1, and parallel). As he was preaching in one of the synagogues of this vicinity one Sabbath, he cured a woman of chronic paralysis of the back, and refuted the churlish cavil of one of the hierarchy present at the day on which this was done, by a reference to ordinary acts of mercy even to animals on the Sabbath (Luk 13:10-17; prob. Feb. A.D. 29). Jesus now turned his steps towards Jerusalem, teaching on the way the necessity of a personal preparation for heaven, without trusting to any external recommendations (Luk 13:22-30); and replying to the Pharisees' insidious warning of danger from Herod, that Jerusalem alone was to a destined place of peril for him (Luk 13:31-33). On one Sabbath, while eating at the house of an eminent Pharisee, he cured a man of the dropsy, and silenced all objections by again appealing to the usual care of domestic animals on that day; he then took occasion, from the anxiety of the guests to secure the chief places of honor at the table, to discourse to the company on the advantages of modesty and charity, closing by an admonition to prompt compliance with the offers of the Gospel in the parable of the marriage feast and the wedding garment (Luk 14:1-15; Mat 22:1-14, anti parallel; prob. March, A.D. 29).

To the multitudes attending him he prescribed resolute self denial as essential to true discipleship (Luk 15:25-26, and parallel), under various figures (Luk 14:28-33) ; while he corrected the jealousy of the Jewish sectaries at his intercourse with the lower classes (Luk 15:1-2), by teaching the divine interest in penitent wanderers from him (Luk 19:10, and parallel), under the parables of stray sheep (Luk 15:3-7, and parallel), the lost piece of money, and the prodigal son (Luk 15:8-32). At the same time, he illustrated the prudence of securing the divine favor by a prudent use of the blessings of this life in the parable of the fraudulent steward (Luk 16:1-12), showing the incompatibility of worldliness with devotion (Luk 16:13, and parallel); and the self sufficiency of the Pharisees he rebuked in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luk 16:14-15; Luk 16:19-31), declaring to them that the kingdom of the Messiah had already come unobserved (Luk 17:20-21). He impressed upon both classes of his hearers the importance of perseverance, and yet humility, in prayer, by the parables of the importunate widow before the unjust judge, and the penitent publican in contrast with the self-  righteous Pharisee (Luk 18:1-14). To the insidious questions of the Jewish sectaries concerning divorce, he replied that it was inconsistent with the original design of marriage, being only suffered by Moses (with restrictions) on account of the inveterate customs of the nation, but really justifiable only in cases of adultery; but at the same time explained privately to the disciples that the opposite extreme of celibacy was to be voluntary only (Mat 19:3-12, and parallels). He welcomed infants to his arms and blessing, as being a symbol of the innocence as required by the Gospel (Mar 10:13-16, and parallels). A rich and honorable young man visiting him with questions concerning the way of salvation, Jesus was pleased with his frankness, but proposed terms so humbling to his worldly attachments that he retired with, out accepting them, which furnished Jesus an opportunity of discoursing to his followers on the prejudicial influence of wealth on piety, and (in reply to a remark of Peter) of illustrating the rewards of self-denying exertion in religious duty by the parables of the servant at meals after a day's work, and the laborers in the vineyard (Mar 10:17-29; Mat 19:28-29; Luk 17:7-10; Mat 20:1-16; and parallels).

As they had now arrived at the Jordan opposite Jerusalem, Jesus once more warned the timid disciples of the fate awaiting him there (Mar 10:32-34); but they so little understood him (Luk 17:34), that the mother of James and John ambitiously requested of him a prominent post for her sons under his administration, they also ignorantly professing their willingness to share his sufferings, until Jesus checked rivalry between them and their fellow disciples by enjoining upon them all a mutual deference in imitation of his self-sacrificing mission (Mat 20:20-28). As they were passing through Jericho, two blind men implored of him to restore their sight, and, although rebuked by the by-standers, they urged their request so importunately as at length to gain the ear of Jesus, who called them, and with a touch enabled them to see (Mar 10:46-52, and parallels). Passing along, he observed a chief publican, named Zacchaeus (q.v.), who had run in advance and climbed a tree to get a sight of Jesus, but who now, at Jesus' suggestion, gladly received him to his house, and there vindicated himself from the calumnies of the insidious hierarchy by devoting one half his property to charity, an act that secured his commendation by Jesus (Luk 19:2-9), who took occasion to illustrate the duty of fidelity in improving religious privileges by the parable of the “talents” or “pounds” (Luk 19:11-28, and parallel). Reaching Bethany a week before the Passover, when the Sanhedrim were planning to seize him, Jesus was entertained at the house of Lazarus, and vindicated  Mary's act in anointing (q.v.) his head with a flask of precious ointment, from the parsimonious objections of Judas, declaring that it should ever be to her praise as highly significant in view of his approaching burial (Joh 11:55-57; Joh 12:1-11; and parallels).

6. Passion Trek. — The entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem next morning (Monday, March 14, A.D. 29) was a triumphal one, the disciples having mounted him upon a young ass, which, by his direction, they found in the environs of the city, and spread their garments and green branches along the road, while the multitude escorting him proclaimed him as the expected descendant of David, to the chagrin of the hierarchy, who vainly endeavored to check the popular declamations, SEE HOSANNA; Jesus meanwhile was absorbed in grief at the ruin awaiting the impenitent metropolis (Mat 21:19; Joh 12:16-17; Joh 12:19; Luk 19:39-44; and parallels). Arriving at the Temple amid this general excitement, he again cleared the Temple courts of the profane tradesmen, while the sick resorted to him for cure, and the children prolonged his praise till evening, when he returned to Bethany for the night (Mat 21:10-17. and parallels). On his way again to the city, early in the morning, he pronounced a curse upon a green but fruitless fig tree (q.v.) (to which he had gone, not having yet breakfasted, as if in hopes of finding on it some of last year's late figs), as a symbol of the unproductive Jewish nation, the day being occupied in teaching at the Temple (where the multitude of his hearers prevented the execution of the hierarchal designs against him), and the night, as usual, at Bethany. On the ensuing morning the fig tree was found withered to the very root, which led Jesus to impress upon the disciples the efficacy of faith, especially in their public functions (Mat 21:18-19; Luk 21:37-38; Luk 19:47-48; Mat 21:20-22). This, the last day of Jesus' intercourse with the public, was filled with various discussions (Wednesday, March 16, A.D. 29). The hierarchy, demanding the authority for his public conduct, were perplexed by his counter question as to the authority of the Baptist's mission, and he seized the occasion to depict their inconsistency and criminality by the parables of the two sons sent by their father to work, and the murderous gardeners, with so vivid a personal reference as to cover them with confusion (Mat 21:23-46, and parallels). The mooted question of the  lawfulness of tribute to a Gentile power, being insidiously proposed to him by a coalition of the Pharisees and Herodians, was so readily solved by him by an appeal to the very coin paid in tribute, that they again retired, unable to make it a ground for public charges against him (Mat 22:15-22, and parallels). The case of seven brothers successively married (under the Levirate law) to the same woman being next supposed by the Sadducees, he as easily disposed of the imaginary difficulty concerning her proper husband in the other world by declaring the non-existence of such relations there, and refuted their infidelity as to the future life by citing a passage of Scripture (Mat 22:23-33, and parallels). Seeing the Sadducees so completely silenced, one of the Pharisaical party undertook to puzzle Jesus by raising that disputed point, What Mosaic injunction is the most important? but Jesus cited the duties of supreme devotion to God and general benevolence to man as comprising all other moral enactments, to which the other so cordially assented as to draw a commendation from Jesus on his hopeful sentiments (Mar 12:28-34, and parallel).

Jesus now turned the tables upon his opponents by asking them, Whose descendant the Messiah should be? and on their replying, David's, of course, he then asked how (as in Psalm Exodus , 1) he could still be David's Lord? which so embarrassed his enemies that they desisted from this mode of attack (Mat 22:41-46). Jesus then in plain terms denounced before the concourse the hypocrisy and ostentation of the hierarchy, especially their priest craft, their sanctimony, their ambition, their extortion, their casuistry, and their intolerance, and bewailed the impending fate of the city (Mat 23:1-12; Mat 23:14-21; Mat 23:29-39, and parallels). Observing a poor widow drop a few of the smallest coins into the contribution box in the Temple, he declared that she had shown more true liberality than wealthier donors, because she had given more in proportion to her means, and with greater self-denial (Mar 12:41-44, and parallel). A number of proselytes, SEE HELENIST requesting through Philip an interview with Jesus, he met them with intimations of his approaching passion, while a celestial voice announced the glory that should thereby accrue to God, and he then retired from the unbelieving public with an admonition to improve their present spiritual privileges (Joh 12:20-50). As he was crossing the Mount of Olives, his disciples calling his attention to the noble structure of the Temple opposite, he declared its speedy demolition, and on their asking the time and tokens of this catastrophe, he discoursed to them at length, first on the coming downfall of the city and nation (warning them to escape betimes from the catastrophe), and then (by a gradual transition, in  which, under varied imagery, he represented both events more or less blended) he passed to the scenes of the final judgment (described as a forensic tribunal), interspersing constant admonitions (especially in the parable of the ten virgins) to preparation for an event the date of which was so uncertain (Mat 24:1-8; Mat 10:17-20; Mat 10:34-36; Mat 24:9-10; Mat 10:28; Mat 24:13-37; Luk 21:34-36; Mat 24:3; Mat 24:44; Luk 12:41-42; Mar 13:31; Mar 13:34; Mat 24:45-51; Luk 12:47-48; Mat 24:42; Mat 25:1-12; Luk 12:35-38; Mat 25:13; Mat 25:31-46). As the Passover was now approaching, the Sanhedrim held a secret meeting at the house of the high priest, where they resolved to get possession, but by private means, of the person of Jesus (Thursday, March 17, A.D. 29), and Judas Iscariot, learning their desire, went and engaged to betray his Master into their hands, on the first opportunity, for a fixed reward (Mat 26:1-5; Mat 26:14-16, and parallels).

The same day Jesus sent two of his disciples into the city, with directions where to prepare the Passover meal (Luk 22:7-13), and at evening, repairing thither to partake of it with the whole number of his apostles, SEE LORDS SUPPER, he affectionately reminded them of the interest gathering about this last repast with them; then, while it was progressing, he washed their feet to reprove their mutual rivalry and enforce condescension to one another by his own example, SEE WASHING THE FEET, and immediately declared his own betrayal by one of their number, fixing the individual (by a sign recognized by him alone) among the amazed disciples (Luk 22:14-17; Luk 22:24; Joh 13:1-15; Luk 22:25-30; Joh 13:17-19; Joh 13:21-22; Mat 26:22-24; Joh 13:23-26; Mat 26:25; and parallels). Judas immediately withdrew, full of resentment, but without the rest suspecting his purpose; relieved of his presence, Jesus now began to speak of his approaching fate, when he was interrupted by the surprised inquiries of his disciples, who produced their weapons as ready for his defense, while Peter stoutly maintained his steadfastness, although warned of his speedy defection (Joh 13:27-33; Joh 13:36-38; Mat 26:31-33; Luk 22:31-38; and parallels); then, closing the meal by instituting the Eucharist (q.v.) (Mat 26:26-29, and parallels), Jesus lingered to discourse at length to his disciples (whose questions showed how little they comprehended him) on his departure at  hand, and the gift (in consequence) of the Holy Spirit, with exhortations to religious activity and mutual love, and, after a prayer for the divine safeguard upon them (Joh 14:1 to Joh 15:17; Joh 13:34-35; Joh 15:18 to Joh 17:26), he retired with them to the Mount of Olives (Joh 18:1, and parallels).

Here, entering the garden of Gethsemane, he withdrew, with three of the disciples, a short distance from the rest, and, while they fell asleep, he three times prayed, in an agony (q.v.) that forced blood-tinged sweat from the pores of his forehead, for relief from the horror-stricken anguish of his soul, SEE BLOODY SWEAT, and was partially relieved by an angelic message; but Judas, soon appearing with a force of Temple guards and others whom he conducted to this frequent place of his Master's retirement, indicated him to them by a kiss (q.v.); Jesus then presented himself to them with such a majestic mien as to cause them to fall back in dismay, but while Peter sought to defend him by striking off with his sword the ear of one of the assailants (which Jesus immediately cured with a touch, at the same time rebuking his disciple's impetuosity), Jesus, after a short remonstrance upon the tumultuous and furtive manner of his pursuers' approach, and a stipulation for his disciples' security, suffered himself to be taken prisoner, with scarcely one of his friends remaining to protect him (Mat 26:36-50; Joh 18:4-9; Luk 22:49; Mat 26:51-56; Mar 14:51-52; and parallels). SEE BETRAYAL.

He was first led away to the palace of the ex-pontiff Annas, who, after vainly endeavoring to extract from him some confession respecting himself or his disciples (while Peter, who, with John, had followed after, three times denied any connection with him, SEE PETER, when questioned by the various servants in the courtyard, but was brought to pungent penitence by a look from his Master within the house), sent him for further examination to the acting high priest Caiaphas (Joh 18:13-16; Joh 18:18; Joh 18:17; Joh 18:25; Joh 18:19-23; Joh 18:26-27; Luk 22:61-62; John 23:24; and parallels). This functionary, assembling the Sanhedrim at daylight (Friday, March 18, A.D. 29), at length, with great difficulty, procured two witnesses who testified to Jesus' threat of destroying the Temple (see Joh 2:19), but with such discrepancy between themselves that Caiaphas broke the silence of Jesus by adjuring him respecting his Messianic claims, and on his avowal of his character made use of his admission to charge him with blasphemy, to which the Sanhedrim present assented with a sentence of death; the officers who held Jesus thereupon indulged in the vilest insults upon his person (Mat 26:57; Mat 26:59-63; Luk 22:67-71; Luk 22:63-65; and parallels). SEE CAIAPHAS.

After a formal  vote of the full Sanhedrim (q.v.) early in the forenoon, Jesus was next led to the procurator Pilate's mansion for his legal sanction upon the determination of the religious court, where the hierarchy sought to overcome his reluctance to involve himself in the matter (which was increased by his examination of Jesus himself, who simply replied to their allegations by giving Pilate to understand that his claims did not relate to temporal things) by charging him with sedition, especially in Galilee, an intimation that Pilate seized upon to remand the whole trial to Herod (who chanced to be in Jerusalem at the time), as the civil head of that province (Joh 18:28-38; Mat 27:12-14; Luk 23:4-7). Herod, however, on eagerly questioning Jesus, in hopes of witnessing some display of his miraculous power, was so enraged at his absolute silence that he sent him back to Pilate in a mock attire of royalty (Luk 23:8-12). The procurator, thus compelled to exercise jurisdiction over the case, convinced of the prisoner's innocence (especially after a message from his wife to that effect), proposed to the populace to release him as the malefactor which custom required him to set at liberty on the holiday of the Passover (q.v.); but the hierarchy insisted on the release of a notorious criminal, Barabbas, instead, and enforced their clamor for the crucifixion of Jesus with so keen an insinuation of Pilate's disloyalty to the emperor, that, after varied efforts to exonerate himself and discharge the prisoner (whose personal bearing enhanced his idea of his character), he at length yielded to their demands, and, after allowing Jesus to be beaten, SEE FLAGELLATION and otherwise shamefully handled by the soldiers, SEE MOCKING, he pronounced sentence for his execution on the cross (Luk 23:13-16; Mat 15:17-19; Mat 15:16; Mat 15:20-30; Joh 19:4-16; and parallels). SEE PILATE.

The traitor Judas, perceiving the enormity of his crime, now that, in consequence of his Master's acquiescence, there appeared no chance of his escape, returned to the hierarchy with the bribe, which, on their cool reply of indifference to his retraction, he flung down in the Temple, and went and hung himself in despairing remorse (Mat 27:3-10). SEE JUDAS.

On his way out of the city to Golgotha, where he was to be crucified, Jesus fainted under the burden of his cross, which was therefore laid upon the shoulders of one Simon, who chanced to pass at the time, and as they proceeded Jesus bade the disconsolate Jewish females attending him to weep rather for themselves and their nation than for him; on reaching the place of execution, SEE GOLGOTHA, after refusing the usual narcotic, he was suspended on the cross between two malefactors, while praying for his murderers; and a brief statement of his offence (which the  Jews in vain endeavored to induce Pilate to change as to phraseology) was placed above his head, the executioners meanwhile having divided his garments among themselves: while hanging thus, Jesus was reviled by the spectators, by the soldiers, and even by one of his fellow sufferers (whom the other penitently rebuking, was assured by Jesus of speedy salvation for himself, SEE THIEF ON THE CROSS ), and committed his mother to the care of John; then, at the close of the three hours' preternatural darkness SEE ECLIPSE, giving utterance (in the language of Psalms 22) to his agonized emotions, SEE SABACTHANI amid the scoffs of his enemies, he called for something to quench his thirst. which being given him, he expired with the words of resignation to God upon his lips, while an earthquake (q.v.) and the revivification of the sleeping dead bore witness to his sacred character, as the by standers, SEE CENTURION were forced to acknowledge (Mat 27:31-32; Luk 23:27-31; Mar 15:22-23; Mar 15:25; Mar 15:27-28; Luk 23:34; Joh 19:19-24; Mat 27:36; Mat 27:39-43; Luk 23:36-37; Luk 23:39; Luk 23:43; Joh 19:25-27; Mat 27:45-47; Mat 27:49; Joh 19:28-30; Luk 23:46; Mat 27:51-53; Luk 23:47-48; and parallels). SEE PASSION.

Towards evening, on account of the approaching. Sabbath, the Jews petitioned Pilate to cause the crucified persons to be killed by the usual process of hastening their death, SEE CRUCIFIXION, and their bodies removed from so public a place; and as the soldiers were executing this order, they were surprised to find Jesus already dead; one of the soldiers, however, tested the body by plunging a spear into the side, when water mixed with clots of blood issued from the wound (Joh 19:31-37). SEE BLOOD AND WATER. A rich Arimathaean, named Joseph (q.v.), a secret believer in Jesus, soon came and desired the body of Jesus for burial. and Pilate, as soon as he had ascertained the actual death of Jesus, gave him permission; accordingly, with the help of Nicodemus, he laid it in his own new vault, temporarily wrapped in spices, while the female friends of Jesus observed the place of its sepulture (Mar 15:42-44; Joh 19:38-42; Luk 23:25-26; and parallels). SEE SEPULCHRE. Next day (Saturday, March 19, A.D. 29) the hierarchy, remembering Jesus' predictions of his own resurrection, persuaded Pilate to secure the entrance to the tomb by a large stone, a seal, and a guard, SEE WATCH, at the door (Mat 27:62-66). The women, meanwhile, prepared additional embalming materials in the evening for the body of Jesus (Mar 16:1). SEE EMBALM.

Very early next morning (Sunday, March 20, A.D. 29) Jesus arose alive from the tomb, SEE RESURRECTION, which an angel opened, the guards swooning away at the sight (Mat 28:2-4, and parallel). The women soon appeared on the spot with the spices for completing the embalming, but, discovering the stone removed from the door, Mary Magdalene hastily returned to tell Peter, while the rest, entering, missed the body, but saw two angels at the entrance, who informed them of the resurrection of their Master, and. as they were returning to inform the disciples, they met Jesus himself; but the disciples, on their return, disbelieved their report (Mar 11:2-4; Joh 20:2; Luk 24:3-8; Mat 28:7-10; Luk 24:9-10; and parallels). The guard, however, had by this time recovered, and, on reporting to the hierarchy, they were bribed to circulate a story of the abreption of the body during their sleep (Mat 23:11-15). Mary Magdalene meanwhile had roused Peter and John with the tidings of the absence of the body, and, on their hastening to the tomb, they both observed the state of things there, without arriving at any satisfactory explanation of it); but Mary, who arrived soon after they had left, as she stood weeping, saw a person of whom, mistaking him for the keeper of the garden, she inquired for the body, but was soon made aware by his voice that it was Jesus himself, when she fell at his feet, being forbidden a nearer approach, but bidden to announce his resurrection to the disciples (Joh 20:11-18; Mar 16:11; and parallels). On the same day Jesus appeared to two of the disciples who were going to Emmaus, and discoursed to them respecting the Christology of the Old Test., but they did not recognize him till they were partaking the meal to which, at their journey's end, they invited him, and then they immediately returned with the news to Jerusalem, where they found that he had in the meanwhile appeared also to Peter (Luk 24:13-33, and parallels).

At this moment Jesus himself appeared in their midst, and overcame their incredulity by showing them his wounds and eating before them, and then gave them instructions respecting their apostolical mission (Luk 24:36-49; Joh 20:21; Mar 16:15-18; Joh 10:4; Joh 10:22-23; and parallels). Thomas, who had been absent from this interview, and therefore refused to believe his associates' report, was also convinced, at the next appearance of Jesus a week afterwards (Sunday evening, March 27, A.D. 29), by handling him personally (Joh 20:24-29). Some time afterwards (prob. Wednesday, March 30, A.D. 29) Jesus again appeared to his disciples on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias, as they were fishing; and, after they had taken a preternatural quantity of fish at his direction, coming ashore, they partook  of a meal which he had prepared, after which he tenderly reproved Peter for his unfaithfulness, and intimated to him his future martyrdom (Mat 28:16; Joh 21:1-23). Soon afterwards (probably Thursday. March 31, A.D. 29) he appeared to some five hundred of his disciples (1Co 15:6) at an appointed meeting on a mountain in Galilee, where he commissioned his apostles afresh to their work (Mat 28:16-20). Next he appeared to James (1Co 15:7), and finally to all the apostles together, SEE APPEARANCE (OF RISEN CHRIST), to whom, at the end of forty days from his passion (Thursday, April 28, A.D. 29), he now gave a general charge relative to their mission, SEE APOSTLE, and, leading them towards Bethany, while blessing them he was suddenly carried up bodily into the sky, SEE ASCENSION and enfolded from their sight in a cloud, SEE INTERCESSION; angels at the same time appearing and declaring to them, in their astonishment, his future return in a similar manner (Act 1:2-12, and parallels): (For a fuller explanation of the details of the foregoing narrative, see Strong's Harmony and Exposition of the Gospels, N.Y., 1852.) SEE GOSPELS.

IV. Literature. — Much of this has been cited under the foregoing heads. We present here a general summary.

1. The efforts to produce a biography of the Savior of mankind may be said to have begun with the attempts to combine and harmonize the statements of the evangelists (see Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 20). SEE HARMONIES. The early Church contented itself simply with collating the narratives of the different apostles and an occasional comment on some passages. SEE MONOTESSARON. In the Middle Ages, as also later in the Roman Catholic Church, the works written on the life of Christ were uncritical, fantastic, and fiction like, being mere religious tracts (Hase, p. 26). Even after the Reformation had given rise to speculation and religious theory, the works on the life of Christ continued to be of a like character. It was not till near the close of the 18th century, when the Wolfenbuttel Fragmentists had attacked Christianity, SEE LESSING, that the Apologists felt themselves constrained to treat the history of Christ in his twofold nature, as God and also as man. This period was therefore the first in which the life of Christ was treated in a critical and pragmatical manner (comp. Strauss, Leben Jesu, 1864, p. 1). Soon, however, these efforts degenerated into humanitarianism, and even profanity. Herder, the great German poet and theologian, wrote distinct treatises on the life of “the Son of God” and on  the life of the Son of man.” Some treated of the prophet of Nazareth (Bahrdt, Venturini; later Langsdorf); others even instituted comparisons with men like Socrates, oftentimes drawing the parallel in favor rather of the latter. Others (Paulus, Greiling), in order to suit the tendency of the age, hesitated not to strip the life of Christ of all the miraculous, and painted him simply as the humane and wise teacher. Such a theory was, of course, “the reductio ad absurdum of a rationalism pure and simple” (compare Plumptre, Christ and Christendom, Boyle Lect. 1866, p. 329). The more modern theology (we refer here mainly to German theology since Schleiermacher) attempted to crowd forward the ideal. Thus Hase proposed for his task the treatment “how Jesus of Nazareth, according to divine predestination, by the free exercise of his own mind, and by the will of his age, had become the Savior of the world.”

A still more destructive attitude (comp. Lange, 1, 10 sq.) was assumed by Strauss, who, while not denying that Jesus had lived, yet recognized in the accounts of the gospels simply a mythical reflex of what the young Christian society had invented to connect with the prophetical announcements of the old covenant, though, of course, he added that it had been done unconsciously and thoughtlessly. Thus the (poetico-speculative) truth of the ideal Christ was to be maintained, but it soon vanished in the clouds like a mist. In a modified form this mythical theory was advocated by Weisse, who, like others before him, endeavored to solve the miraculous in .the life of Christ by the introduction of higher biology (magnetism, etc.), and used Strauss's hypotheses in order to dispose of whatever he found impracticable in his own view. The Tübingen theologian, Bruno Bauer (Kritik. der evangel. Gesch. vol. 3), went further, and declaring that he could not see in the accounts of the apostles a harmless poesy, branded them as downright imposture. A much more moderate position was taken by one who utterly disbelieved the fulfilment of the prophecies, Salvador the Jew. He acknowledged the historical personality of Jesus, though the Savior, in his treatment, came to be nothing but a Jewish reformer (and, of course, a demagogue also).

It must be acknowledged, however, that these criticisms provoked a more thorough study of the subject, and that orthodox Christianity is therefore in no small measure indebted to German rationalism for the great interest which has since been manifested in the history of our Lord. The rationalistic works called forth innumerable critiques and rejoinders (most prominent among: which were those of W. Hoffman, Stuttg. 1838 sq.;  Hengstenberg. in the Evangel. Kirchenzeitung, 1836; Schweizer, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1837, No. 3; Tholuck,. Hamburg, 1838; Ullmann, Hamb. 1838); and finally resulted in the publication of a vast number of protections on the life of Jesus.

We call attention, likewise, to the efforts of the Dutch theologians, among whom are Meijboom (Groning. I861), Van Osterzee, and others. A new treatment of the-subject was promised by the late chevalier Bunsen (Preface to his Hippolytus, p. 49) but it never made its appearance. Ewald, however, continued his work on the Jews (Gesch. d. Volkes Israel), closing in a fifth volume with the life of Christ (Lebenz Christus). The author evidently is a non-believer in our Lord's godhead (compare Liddon, Bampt. Lecture, 1866, p. 505). His method of dealing with the subject has something of the same indefiniteness which characterized the work of Schleiermacher (compare Plumptre, Boyle Lecture, 1866; p. 336). Ewald views Jesus “as the fulfilment of the O.T. as the final, highest, fullest, clearest revelation of God — as the true Messiah, who satisfies all right longing for God and for deliverance from the curse-as the eternal King of the kingdom of God. But with all: this, and while he depicts our Lord's person and work in its love, activity, and majesty, with a beauty that is not often met with, there is but one nature accorded to this perfect Person, and that nature is human.” Of a very different character from all these works are the lectures of Prof. C. J. Riggenbach, of Basle, who presents us the picture of our Lord from a harmonistico-apologetic point of view.

Here deserve mention also the labors of Neander, who, “in the conviction, which runs through his Church History, that Christendom rests upon the personality of Christ,” was not a little alarmed by the production of Strauss, and “with fear and trembling, feeling that controversy was a duty, and yet also that it marred the devotion of spirit in which alone the life of his Lord and Master could be contemplated rightly,” entered the lists against rationalistic combatants. His excellent work has found a worthy translator in the late Rev. Dr. M'Clintock. We pass over men like Hare, “who reproduce more or less the rationalism of Paulus” (perhaps the first conspicuous work of the rationalistic Germans, though it failed to awaken the general interest that Strauss's work did; comp. Plumptre, Boyle Lect. 1866, p. 329); others also, who, like Ebrard and Lange, “avowedly assume the position of apologists, though their works are at least evidence (as are bishop Ellicott's Hulsean Lect., and the many elaborate commentaries on  the Gospels in our country and abroad) that orthodox theologians do not shrink from the field of inquiry thus opened.”

A time of quiet and rest seemed now to have dawned upon this polemical field of Christian theology, when suddenly, in 1863, the learned Frenchman Renan appeared with his Vie de Jesus, and stirred anew the spirits, as Strauss had done thirty years before. Most arbitrarily did Mr. Renan deal with the data upon which his work professed to be based; while theologically he proceeded throughout “on a really atheistic assumption, disguised beneath the veil of a pantheistic phraseology ... It is, however, when we look at the Vie de Jesus from a moral point of view that its shortcomings are most apparent in their length and breadth. Its hero is a fanatical impostor, who pretends to be and to do that which he knows to be beyond him, but who, nevertheless, is held up to our admiration as the ideal of humanity” (Liddon, p. 506). It is sufficient to reply to this caricature by Mr. Renan that, “If this be the founder of Christianity, and if Christianity be the right belief, then all religion must cease from the earth; for not only is this character unfit to sustain Christianity, but it is unfit to sustain any religion; it wants the bond” (Lange, 1, 18). Yet “it may be that to the thousands whose thoughts have either rested in the symbols of the infancy and the death which the cultures of the Latin Church brings so prominently before them, or who, having rejected these, have accepted nothing in their place, the Vie de Jesus has given a sense of human reality to the Gospel history which they never knew before, and led them to study it with a more devout sympathy” (Plumptre, p. 337).

Countless editions and translations were made of the work, and it was read everywhere with as much interest as if it had been simply a work of fiction; indeed German theologians, even the Rationalists, hesitated not to rank it among French novels. Innumerable are the works which were written against and in defense of this legendary hypothesis. In Germany, especially, the contest raged fiercely, and for a time it seemed as if the materialistic Frenchman was to uproot all Christian feelings in the hearts of the common people of Germany when Strauss suddenly reappeared on the stage in behalf of his mythical theory with a new edition of his Leben Jesu, this time prepared for the wants of the German people, “and the new work, more popular in form, more caustic and sneering in its hostility, has been read as widely as the old. Mustering all old objections and starting anew, he seeks to prove that the first three gospels contradict each other and the forth. Without entering into the more elaborate theories as to their origin and their relation to the several parties  and sects in early Christendom, as Baur did afterwards, he has a general theory which accounts for them. Men's hopes and wishes, their reverence and awe, tend at all times to develop themselves into myths ... The myths were not ‘cunningly devised,' but were the spontaneous, unconscious growth of the time in which they first appeared. If men asked what, then, was left them to believe in what was the idea which had thus developed itself through what had been worked on as the facts of Christianity, the answer was that God manifested himself, not in Christ, but in humanity at large humanity is the union of the two natures, the finite and the infinite, the child of the visible mother and the invisible father ... The outcry against the book was, as might be expected, enormous. It opened the eyes of those who had dallied with unbelief to see that they were naked, and it stripped off the fig leaf covering of words and phrases with which they had sought to hide their nakedness. What was offered as the compensation for all this work of destruction; if it were offered in any other spirit than that of the mockery even then, and yet more now, so characteristic of the author, was hardly enough to give warmth and shelter to any human soul” (Plumptre, p. 334). The ablest among Christian divines and scholars came forward to refute, the naked falsehoods, and up to our day the contest rages, nor can it be said how soon it will be ended; it is certain, however, that orthodox Christianity is daily gaining ground, even in the very core of the heart of Rationalism. In France it drew forth the able work of Pressense, Jesus Christ son Temps, sa Vie son (OEuvre (Paris, 1865), which has since appeared in an English dress in this country. In England, Ecce Homo, a survey of the life and work of Jesus Christ (London, 1866), was a response to French and German Rationalists, in so far as the reality of our Savior's human career is concerned. (See above, 2, 3.)

Great service has also been done for the truth by the productions of Weiss (Sechs Vortrage über die Person Jesut Christi, Ingolst. 1864), Liddon (Bampton Lecture, 1866; see Christiac Remembrancer, Jan. 1868, article 6), and particularly by Row (London, 1868; N.Y. 1871; see Princeton Rev. 1810, art. 5), Plumptre' (Boyle Lect. 1866), R. Payne Smith (Bampton Lecture, 1869), Leathes, Witness of St. John to Christ (Boyle Lect. 1870), Andrews, and Hanna. Several popular treatises on the subject were also produced in Germany, England, and America, among which are those of Abbott and Eddy. Henry Ward Beecher has just published vol. 1 of a similar work.  2. The following is a list of the most important of the very numerous works relating to the person and history of Christ, of which Germany has been especially fruitful (comp. Walch, 3, 404; Hase, p. 28, 37, 41; Andrews, Preface).

(1.) Of a general character are treatises by the following authors, respecting the proper method of investigating the career of Christ: Doderlein (Jena, 1783 sq.), Semler (Hal. 1786), Eberhard (Hal. 1787), Albers (Gbtt. 1793), Ammon (Gitt. 1794), Bruggeman (Gott. 1795), Stuckert (Francfort, 1797), Muller (Stuttg. 1785), Piper (Gott. 1835), Sextroth (Gott. 1785), Peterson (Lub. 1838), Scholten (Traj. 1840), Wiggers (Rost. 1837). On profane and apocryphal materials: Kocher (Jena, 1726), Meyer (Hamb. 1805), Augusti (Jena, 1799), Huldric (L.B. 1705), Werner (Stad. 1781). Diatessura of the Gospel history have been composed by the following: J.F. Bahrdt (Lpz. 1772), Roos (Tübingen, 1776), Mutschelle (Munch. 1784), C.F. Bahrdt (Berl. 1787), Bergen (Giessen, 1789 sq.),White (Oxon. 1800), Keller (Stuttg. 1802). Hom (Nurnburg, 1803), Sebastiani (Lpzg. 1806), Muller (Wien, 1807), Langsdorf (Mannheim, 1830), Kuchler (Lips. 1835), and others. SEE HARMONIES.

Discussions on the life of Jesus, in a more historical form; of a hostile character, are by the following: Reimar (Braunschweig, 1778 sq.), C.F. Bahrdt (Halle, 1782; Berl. 1784 sq.), J. G. Schulthess (Zur. 1783),Venturini (Kopen. 1800), Langsdorf (Mannh. 1831), D. F. Strauss (Tibing. 1835, 1837, 1838 [the work which provoked the innumerable critiques and rejoinders, as above stated], Sack (Bonn, 1836), Theile (Lpzg. 1832), Hahn (Leipzig, 1839).

Of an apologetic character [besides those in express opposition to Strauss] are the following: Reinhard (Wittenburg, 1781; 5th edition, with additions by Heubner, 1830), Hess (Zurich, 1774, rewritten 1823), Vermehren (Halle, 1799), Opitz (Zerbst, 1812), Planck (Gott. 1818), Bodent [Rom. Cath.] (Gernund. 1818 sq.), Paulus (Heidell). 1828), J. Schulthess (Zurich, 1830), Hase (Lpzg. 1829,1835), Neander (Hamb. 1837; translated M'Clintock and Blumenthal, N.Y. 1840), Kleuker (Brem. 1776; Ulm. 1793), Basedow (Lpz. 1784), Wizenman (Lpz. 1780), Herder (Riga, 1796), Hacker (Leipzig, 1801-3), Schorch (Lpzg. 1841), Kolthoff (Hafn. 1852), Hofmann (Leipzig, 1852), Keim (Zir. 1861,1864), Wisenmann (1864), Weiss (Ingolst. 1864). SEE RATIONALISM.  Among those of a more practical character are the following: Walch (Jena, 1740), Huniber (Frankf. 1763), Hoppenstedt (Hannov. 1784 sq.), Hunter (Lond. 1785), Fleetwood (Lond.), Cramer (Lpz. 1787), Marx (Munster, 1789, 1830), Gosner (Leipzig, 1797; Zurich, 1818), Sintenis (Zerbst, 1800), Meister (Basel, 1802), Reichenberger (Wien, 1793, 1826), Gerhard and Muller (Erfurt, 1801), Bauriegel (Neustadt, 1801,1821), Greiling (Halle, 1813), Jacobi (Gotha, 1817; Sonders. 1819), Pflaum (Nurnburg, 1819), Ammon (Lpzg. 1842-7, 3 vols.), Muller (Berlin, 1819,1821), Schmidt (Wien, 1822,1826), Francke (Bresl. 1823, Lpzg. 1838,1842), Buchfelner (Münch. 1826), Neavels (Aachen, 1826), Stephani (Magdeb. 1830), Onymus (Sulzb. 1831), Blunt (London, 1835), Hartmann (Stuttg. 1837), Weisse (Lpzg. 1838), Kuhn (Mainz, 1838), Lehrreich (Quedl. 1840), Hirscher (Tubing. 1839), Wurkerts (Meiss. 1840), Hug (1840), Krane (Cass. 1850), Lichtenstein (Erl. 1855), Rougemont (Paris and Lausanne, 1856), J. Bucher (Stuttgard, 1859), Krummacher (Bielf. 1854), Baumgarten (Brunsw. 1859), Uhlhorn (Hamb. 1866; Bost. 1868), Ellicott (London, 1859), Andrews (N.Y. 1862).

Among those pictorially illustrated are the works of Schleich (Munch. 1821), Langer (Stuttgart, 1823), Kitto (Loud. 1847), Abbott (N.Y. 1864), Crosby (N.Y. 1871).

Among those of a poetical character are Juvencus, ed. Arevalus (Rom. 1792),Vida (L.B. 1566, ed. Muller; Hamb. 1811), Wilmsen (Berlin, 1816, 1826), Gittermann (Hannov. 1821), Schincke (Hal. 1826), Klopstock (Hal. 1751, and often), Lavater (Winterth. 1783), Halem (Hannov. 1810), Weihe (Elberf. 1822, 1824), Wilmy (Sulzb. 1825), Kirsch (Lpz. 1825), Gopp (Lpz. 1827).

(2.) Of a more special nature are treatises on particular portions of Christ's outward history or circumstances, e.g. his relatives: Walther (Berl. 1791), Oertel (Germ. 1792), Hasse (Regiom. 1792; Berl. 1794), Ludewig (Wolfenb. 1831). Tiliander (Upsal. 1772), Gever (Viteb. 1777), Blom (L. Bat. 1839), Oosterzee (Traj. a. R. 1840); and his country: Konigsman (Slesvic. 1807). Among those on his birth: Korb (Lpz. 1831), Meerheim (Viteb. 1785), Reimer (Lubec, 1653), Oetter (Numbers, 1774); and in a chronological point of view, among others: Masson (Roterd. 1700), Maius (Kilon. 1708; id. 1722), Reineccius (Hal. 1708), Liebknecht (Giess. 1735), Hager (Chemnit. 1743), Mann (Lond. 1752), Jost (Wirceb. 1754), Haiden (Prague, 1759), Reccared (Region. 1768; id. 1766), Horix (Mogunt. 1789),  Sanclemente (Rome, 1795), Michaelis (Wien, 1797), Munter (Kopenh. 1827), Feldhoff (Frankf 1832), Mayer (Gryph. 1701), Hardt (Helmstadt, 1754), Korner (Lipsiae, 1778), Mynster (Kopenh. 1837), Huschke (Bresl. 1840), Caspari (Hamb. 1869); compare Stud. u. Krit. 1870, 2, 357; 1871, 2; Baptist Quarterly, 1871, p. 113 sq.; and see Zumpt, Das Geburtsjahr Christi (Leipzig, 1869). On his infancy, education, etc.: Niemeyer (Halle, 1790), Ammon (Gitting. 1798), Schubert (Gryph. 1813), Carpzov (Helmst. 1771), Weise (Helmst. 1798), Lange (Ald. 1699), Arnold (Regiom. 1730), Rau (Erl. 1796), Bandelin (Lub. 1809). On the duration of his ministry: Chrysander (Brunsw. 1750), Pisanski (Regiom. 1778), Loeber (Altenb. 1767), Korner (Lips. 1779), Priestley (Birmingham, 1780), Newcome (Dublin, 1780), Priess (Rost. 1789), Hinlein (Erlang. 1796). SEE APOSTLE. On his baptism, SEE JOHN THE BAPTIST. On his travels: Schmidt (Ilmenau, 1833; Paris, 1837). On his celibacy: Niedner (Schneeberg, 1815). On his teaching: Tschucke (Lipsiae, 1781), Bahrdt (Berlin, 1786), Manderbach (Elberf. 1813), Martini (Rost. 1794), Stier (Leipzig, 1853 sq.; Edinb. 1856 sq.). SEE SERMON ON THE MOUNT. On his alleged writings: Ittig (Lipsiae, 1696), Epistola apocrypha J.C. ad Petrum (Rom. 1774), Sartorius (Basil. 1817), Gieseke (Lunenb. 1822), Witting (Braunschw. 1823). SEE ABGAR On his miracles (q.v.): Heumann (Gott. 1747), Pfaff (Tübingen, 1752), Pauli (Riga, 1773), Trench (Lond. 1848; N.Y. 1850). On his transfiguration (q.v.): Reusmann (Getting. 1747), Georgi (Viteb. 1744), anonymous Essay (Lond. 1788), Haubold (Gott. 1791), Eger (1794), Rau (Erl. 1797); and his white garment, Franke (Lips. 1672), Sagittarius (Jena, 1673). On his temptation (q.v.): Baumgarten (Halle, 1755), De Saga (Gdtt. 1757), Farmer (London, 1671), Sauer (Bonn, 1789), Postius (Zweibr. 1791), Ziegenhagen (Franckfort, 1791), Domey (Upsal. 1792), Schutze (Hamb. 1793), Dahl (Upsal. 1800), Bertholdt (Erl. 1812), Gellerichts (Altenb. 1815), Richter (Viteb. 1825), Schweizer (Zurich, 1833), Ewald (Bayreuth, 1833); comp. the Zeitschr. f. wissensch. Theol. 1870, p. 188 sq. On his passion (q.v.): Iken (Brem. 1743 Tr. a. R. 1758), Baumgarten (Halle, 1757), Glanz (Stuttg. 1809), Henneberg (Lpzg. 1823), Schlegel (Lpzg. 1775), Mosche (Franckfort, 1785), Ewald (Lemgo, 1785), Fischer (Lpzg. 1794), Kindervater (Lpzg. 1797), Mosler (Eisenb. 1816), Krummacher (Berl. 1817), Jongh (Tr. a. R. 1827), Adriani (Tr. a. R. 1827),Walther (Bresl. 1738; Lpzg. 1777). On his crucifixion (q.v.): Schmidtman (Osnabr. 1830), Neubig (Erl. 1836), Hasert (Berl. 1839), Karig (Lpzg. 1842), Stroud (Lond. 1847). SEE AGONY; SEE ATONEMENT. On his words upon the cross: Hopner (Lips. 1641),  Dankauer (Arg. 1641), Luger (Jena, 1739), Scharf (Viteb. 1677), Niemann (Jena, 1671), Lokerwitz (Viteb. 1680). On his burial: Te Water [i.e. Wesseling] (Traj. a. Rh. 1761). SEE CALVARY. On his resurrection (q.v.): among others, Buttstedt (Gerae, 1749), Sherlock (London, 1751), Seidel (Helmst. 1758), Weickhmann (Viteb. 1767), Burkitt (Meining. 1774), Rehkopf (Helmstadt, 1775), Lüderwald (Helmst. 1778). Less (Gott. 1779), Scheibel (Frankf. 1779), Mosche (Frankf. 1779), Semler (Halle, 1780), Moldenhauer (Hamb. 1779), Velthusen (Helmst. 1780), Pfeiffer (Erlang. 1779,1787), Michaelis (Hal. 1783), Schmid (Jena, 1784), Plessing (Hal. 1788), Volkmar (Bresl. 1786), Henneberg (Lpzg. 1826), Frege (Hamb. 1833), Griesbach (Jena, 1784), Niemeyer (Hal. 1824), Rosenmüller (Erlang. 1780), Paulus (Jena, 1795), Pisansky. (Regiom. 1782), Zeibich (Gerae, 1784), Rusmeyer (Gryph. 1734), Feuerlein (Gott. 1752), Gutschmidt (Halle, 1753), Miller (Hafi. 1836). On his ascension (q.v.), among others: Griesbach (Jena, 1793), Seller (Erlang. 1798,1803), Ammon (Gott. 1800), Otterbein (Duisb. 1802), Flügge (Argent. 1811),Weichert (Viteb. 1811), Fogtmann (Havn. 1826), Hamna, The Forty Days after our Lord's Resurrection (London, 1863).

The following are some of the treatises on the personal traits of Jesus, e.g. his physical constitution: Weber (Hal. 1825), Engelmann (Lpz. 1834), Gieseler (Götting. 1837). On his dress: Zeibich (Witt. 1754), Gerberon (Par. 1677). His language: Reiske (Jena, 1670), Kleden (Viteb. 1739), Diodati (Neapol. 1767), Pfannkuche (in Eichhorn's Allg. Bibl. 7, 365-480), Wiseman (in his Hor. Seyr. Rome, 1828), Zeibich (Viteb. 1791), Paulus (Jena, 1803). On his mode of life: Lunze (Lips. 1784), Rau (Erl. 1787, 1796), Jacobaeus (Hafn. 1703), Schreiber (Jena, 1743), Tragard (Gryph. 1781). On his intercourse with others: Gesenius (Helmstadt, 1734), Jetze (Liegn. 1792). Respecting the inner nature of his character, the following may be named, e.g. on his (human) disposition and temperament: Woytt (Jena, 1753), Bucking (Stendal. 1793), Schinmaier (Flensb. 1774 sq.), Winkler (Lpz. 1826), Dorner (Stuttg. 1839); on his psychology, see the Biblioth. Sacra, April, 1870. On his sinlessness, among others: Walther (Viteb. 1690), Baumgarten (Hal. 1740), Erbstein (Meiss. 1787), Weber (Viteb. 1796), Ewald (Hannov. 1798; Gerae, 1799), Ullmann (Hamburg, 1833, translated in Clark's Biblical Cabinet, Edinburgh), Fritzsche (Halle, 1835). SEE MESSIAH.  Jesus Christ, Orders of.

These were formed of temporal knights in the countries paying homage to the Roman see for the protection and promotion of the Roman Catholic religion.

1. Such was the order founded under this name, also known as the Order of Dobrin, in 1213, by duke Conrad of Masovia and Kujavia, Poland. They followed the rules of St. Augustine as a religious society, and their aim was to counteract the influences of the heathenish Prussians, their western neighbors. Their stronghold was the burgh of Dobrin, in Prussia. The insignia and dress of the order were a white mantle, on the left breast a red sword, and a five-pointed red star. The order was merged into the German order in 1234.

2. In Spain such an order was founded in 1216 by Dominicus. The knights bound themselves to practice monastic duties, and to battle in defense of their Church. It was approved by pope Honorius III, and confirmed, under various names, by different popes. When Pius V founded the congregation of St. Peter the Martyr at Rome, composed of the cardinals, grand inquisitors, and other dignitaries of the Holy Office, this order was merged into it. In 1815 king Ferdinand VII commanded the members of the Inquisition to wear the insignia of the order.

3. Another of like name was started in Portugal in 1317 by king Dionysius of Portugal, in concert with pope John XXII, and was composed of the knights of the former Knights Templars (q.v.). SEE CHRIST, ORDER OF, vol. 2, p. 268.

4. Another of this class was the Order of Jesus and Mary, and was founded in 1643 by Eudes (q.v.). Their insignia are a gilded Maltese cross, enameled with blue, surrounded by a golden border, and in the center of which is the name of Jesus: it is worn at the buttonhole. The full-dress cloak is of white camlet, with the cross of the order in blue satin, with gilt border, and name on the left side. The order consists of a grand master, thirty-three commanders (in commemoration of the years of Christ's life), knights of uprightness and of grace, chaplains, and serving brethren. Sec Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 615; Pierer, Unv. Lex. 8, 809.

## Jesus Sacred Heart, Society of[[@Headword:Jesus Sacred Heart, Society of]]

             In the beginning of the 18th century, the Jesuits, fearing the suppression of their own order, actively engaged in the establishment of other orders likely to continue the same peculiar work. More particularly these were the Societies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, which they formed in nearly every part of the world where Roman Catholicism, especially Jesuitism, had a foothold. Ostensibly they were to be societies of a purely religious character, but in reality they proved to be nothing more nor less than the society of the Baccanarists — an asylum for the ex-Jesuits, a society in the Church of Rome advocating the doctrines of the Jesuits under a new name and form. Stuch was evidently the aim of this society in 1794, when the ex- Jesuit abbes Charles de Broglie, Pey, Tournely, and others of lesser note, organized it at. a country retreat near Lowen, in Belgium, with Tournely (q.v.) as superior. After the battle of Fleurus (June 26, 1794), not only the fate of Belgium seemed determined, but also that of this society, and it was post haste removed to more congenial climes. They found a protector in the elector Clemens Wenceslaus, and settled at Treves. “The Jesuits who dwelt there,” says a Roman Catholic writer, “would gladly have welcomed them as of their own number if these Frenchmen had only been masters of the German language.” They flourished at Treves for more than two years,  when the approach of the victorious French army obliged them again to pull up stakes, and they settled first at Passau, next at Vienna, and, when driven from the imperial city, removed to its very shades, entering, even after this (1797), quite frequently the limits of Vienna. In 1799 the order was merged into that of the Baccanarists (q.v.).

A female order of like name with the above, whose origin is also attributed to the Jesuits, was founded in 1800 at Paris. The first leader of it was the maiden Barat, and it was approved by Leo XII December 22, 1826. As they engage in the education of young females, they enjoy, not only in Roman Catholic countries, a favorable reputation, but are in a flourishing condition in many Protestant countries also. They have in Europe alone more than a hundred establishments. They exist also in America and Africa. Their private aims, no doubt, are those of the Jesuitical order. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 5, 116; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 4, 485 sq.; Henrian-Fehr, Mönchsorden, 2, 62 sq.; Schlör, Die Frauen v. heil. Herzen Jesu (Grätz, 1846, 8vo). SEE SACRED HEART.

## Jesus, Society of[[@Headword:Jesus, Society of]]

             SEE JESUITS.

## Jeter, Jeremiah Bell, D.D[[@Headword:Jeter, Jeremiah Bell, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Bedford County, Virginia, July 18, 1802. His early education was limited. He was converted in 1821; began to preach in 1822; was ordained May 4, 1824, at High Hills Church, Sussex County, where he remained about two years; then removed to Campbell County, and became pastor of the Hill's Creek and Union Hill churches. In the autumn of 1827 he was installed pastor of Morattico Church, in Lancaster County, and subsequently of the Wicomico Church, in Northumberland County. In the latter part of 1835 he was called to the pastorate of the First Baptist Church in Richmond, where for thirteen years and a half he was eminently successful. In the fall of 1849 he was called to the Second Baptist Church in St. Louis, where he remained three years, and then returned to Richmond to become pastor of the Grace Street Church. He resigned in 1870. He became the senior editor of the Religious Herald, the leading organ of the Baptist denomination in the south, in 1866, and occupied that position till the close of his life, February 18, 1880. Among the books of which he was the author were, Memoirs of Reverend A.W. Clopton: — Memoins of J.L. Shuch, Missionary to China: — Memoirs of Reverend Andrew Broaddus: — Memoirs of Reverend Daniel Wilt: — Campbellism Examined: — Campbellism Re-examined, both of these works placing Dr. Jeter among the first polemic writers of his  times. The Christian Mirror and the Seat of Heaven were published by the American Tract Society. See the Religious Herald, February 26, 1880. (J.C.S.)

## Jether[[@Headword:Jether]]

             (Heb. Ye'ther, יֶתֶר, surplus), the name of six men, and perhaps also of a place.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿εθέρ) A son of Jada and great-grandson of Jerahmeel, of the family of Judah; he had a brother Jonathan, but no children (1Ch 2:32). B.C. considerably post 1856.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿οθόρ, Vulg. Jethro, Auth. Vers. “Jethro.”) The father-in-law of Moses (Exo 4:18, first clause), elsewhere (last clause of the same verse) called JETHRO SEE JETHRO (q.v.).

3. (Sept. Ι᾿εθέρ) The first named of the sons of Ezra (? Ezer), of the tribe of Judah (his brothers being Mered [q.v.], Epher, and Jalon), but whose connections are not otherwise denied (1Ch 4:17). B.C. prob. cir. 1618. In the Sept. the name is repeated: “and Jether begat Miriam,” etc. By the author of the Quoest. Hebr. in Par. he is said to have been Aaron, Ezra being another name for Amram (q.v.). Miriam (q.v.) in the  second part of the verse-explained by the Targum to be identical with Efrath is taken by many to be a male name.

4. (Sept. Ι᾿εθερ) The oldest son of Gideon, who, when called upon by his father to execute the captured Midianitc kings, Zebal and Zalmunna, timidly declined on account of his youth (Jdg 8:20). B.C. 1362. According to Jdg 9:8, he was slain, together with 69 of his brothers — Jonathan alone escaping — “upon one stone” at Ophrah, by the hands of Abimelech, the son of Gideon's concubine, of Shechem. SEE GIDEON.

5. (Sept. Ι᾿έθερ, Ι᾿εθέρ) The father of Amasa, David's general (1Ki 2:5; 1Ki 2:32; 1Ch 2:17); elsewhere (2Sa 17:6) called ITHRA SEE ITHRA (q.v.). He is described in 1Ch 2:17 as an Ishmaelite, which, again, is more likely to be correct than the “Israelite” of the Hebrew in 2 Samuel 17, or the “Jezreelite” of the Sept. and Vulg. in the same passage. “Ishmaelite” is said by the author of the Quoest. Hebr. in lib. Reg. to have been the reading of the Hebrew, but there is no trace of it in the MSS. The Talmud records two divergent opinions on the subject (Jeremiah Jebam. 9, c; comp. Babli, Jeb. 77, a). According to R. Samuel bar-Nachmani, Jether was an Ishmaelite by birth, but became a proselyte: hence the two appellations. Another opinion is that, a staunch upholder of David's reign, he, when the king's descent through Ruth, a Moabitish woman, was made a pretext by some of his antagonists to deprive him of his crown, “girded his loins like an Israelite,” and threatened to uphold by the sword, if need be, the authority of the Halacha, which had decided that “a Moabitish man, but not a Moabitish woman, an Ammonitish man, but not an Ammonitish woman, should be prohibited from entering into the congregation.”

Similarly we find in the Targ. to 1Ch 2:17 (Wilkins's edition — this verse belongs to those wanting in Beck) that the father of Amasa was Jether the Israelite, but that he was called Jether the Ishmaelite because he aided David , בערכאה(=בית דין) before the tribunal [Wilkins, “cum Arabibus!”]. Later commentators (Rashi, Abrabanel, David Kimchi) assume that he was an Israelite by birth, but dwelt in the land of Ishmael. and was for this reason also called the Ishmaelite, as Obed Edom is also called the Gittite (2 Samuel 6), or Hiram's father the Zuri or Tyrian (1 Kings 6). David Kimchi also adduces a suggestion of his father, to the effect. “that in the land of Ishmael Jether was called the Israelite from his nationality, and in that of Israel they called him the Ishmaelite on account of his living in the land of Ishmael.” Josephus calls him Ι᾿εθάρσης (Ant. 7:10, 1). He married Abigail, David's  sister, probably during the sojourn of the family of Jesse in the land of Moab, under the protection of its king. SEE AMASA.

6. (Sept. Ι᾿εθέρ v.r. Ι᾿εθήρ) An Asherite (head of a warrior family numbering 26,000) whose three sons are named in 1Ch 7:38; possibly the same with ITHRAN of the preceding verse.

7. Whether the Ithrites (יתרי, Sept. Ε᾿θιραῖος, Ι᾿εθρί, Ι᾿εθερί, Τεθρίτης,Vulg. Jethrites, Jethroeus, etc.) Ira and Gareb, mentioned in 2Sa 23:38, etc., were natives of an otherwise unknown place called Jether, or of Jathir, יתיר, one of David's places of refuge (1Sa 30:27), or descendants of one Jether — the least probable suggestion — cannot now be determined. SEE ITHRITE.

## Jetheth[[@Headword:Jetheth]]

             (Heb. Yetheth', יְתֵת, prob. a peg, or fig. a prince; Sept. Ι᾿εθέθ and Ι᾿εθέρ, the last apparently from falsely reading יֶתֶר; Vulg. Jetheth), the third named of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (Gen 36:40; 1Ch 1:51). B.C. ante 1658. SEE ESAU. As to identification, El-Wetideh is a place in Nejd, said to be in the Dahna, SEE ISHBAK; there is also a place called El- Wetid, and El- Wetidat, which is the name of mountains belonging to Bene Abd-Allah Ibn-Ghatfin (Marasid. s.v.) (Smith). SEE ARABIA.

## Jethlah[[@Headword:Jethlah]]

             (Heb. Yithlah', יַתְלָה, suspended, i.e. lofty; Sept. Ι᾿εθλά v.r. Σιλαθά,Vulg. Jethela), a city on the borders of the tribe of Dan, mentioned between Ajalon and Elon (Jos 19:42). The associated names seem to indicate a locality in the eastern part of the tribe, not far from the modern el-Atrun (Ataroth), perhaps the ruined site marked on Van de Velde's Map (last ed.) as Amwas (Nicopolis). SEE EMMAUS, 2.

## Jethlah (2)[[@Headword:Jethlah (2)]]

             For this place Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work, 2:338) Beit Tul, a ruined site four and a quarter miles south-east of Yalo (Ajalon), containing "foundations and a Mukam" (Memoirs to Ordnance Survey, 3:86).

## Jetur[[@Headword:Jetur]]

             (Heb. Yeturm', יְטוּר, prob. i.q. טוּר, an inclosure, i.e. nomadic camp; Sept. Ι᾿ετούρ, Ι᾿εττούρ, but Ι᾿τουραῖοι in 1Ch 5:19), one of the twelve sons of Ishmael (Gen 25:15; 1Ch 1:31). B.C. post 2063. His name stands also for his descendants, the Ituroeans (1Ch 5:19), a people living east of the northern Jordan (Luk 3:1), where he appears to have settled. SEE ITURAEA.

## Jetzer, Johann[[@Headword:Jetzer, Johann]]

             a religious fanatic, a tailor by trade, who lived in the early part of the 16th century, was a lay brother of the Dominican convent at Berne. The order to which he belonged about this time were engaged in a controversy with the Franciscans on the doctrine of the immaculate conception. Some noted monks and priests of the former had so fiercely assailed it that they had been summoned to Rome to answer for their conduct. The Dominicans of Wimpfen thereupon determined to appear to one of their novitiates at Berne — this very Jetzer — at midnight, and, representing departed spirits, assured him that in the other world the doctrine of immaculate conception  was denied, and that those who had in this world persecuted the opponents of the doctrine were still in Purgatory, and there expiating their crime. He at first was completely duped, and created a great excitement among the masses, which was all that the monks had desired in order to secure the liberation of their comrades at Rome. But when Jetzer found that he had been imposed upon, he seriously opposed the plot at the danger of his life. For further particulars, see Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. book 4, cent. 16, sec. 1, ch. 1, § 12. SEE BERNE CONFERENCE.

## Jeuel[[@Headword:Jeuel]]

             (Heb. Yeuel', יְעוּאֵל, snatched away by God, i.e. protected; Sept. Ι᾿εήλ,Vutg. Jehuel), a descendant of Zerah, who, with his kindred to the number of 690, resided in Jerusalem after the captivity (1Ch 9:6). B.C. 536. This name is also everywhere written in the text for יְעַיאֵל. SEE JEIEL. In the Apocrypha (1Es 8:39) it stands for the Heb. Jeuel (Ezr 8:13) as the name of one of the Bene-Adonikam who returned to Jerusalem after the captivity.

## Jeush[[@Headword:Jeush]]

             (Hebrew Yeush', יְעוּשׁ, assembler; written יְעַישׁ, Yeish', in the text of Gen 36:5; Gen 36:14; 1Ch 7:10), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿εούς, but Ι᾿εούλ, in 1Ch 1:35; Vulg. Jehus). The oldest of the three sons of Esau by Aholibamah, the daughter of Anah, born in Canaan, but afterwards a sheik of the Edomites (Gen 36:5; Gen 36:14; Gen 36:18; 1Ch 1:35). B.C. post 1964.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿εώς v.r. Ι᾿αούς, Vulg. Jehus.) The first named of the sons of Bilhan, grandson of Benjamin (1Ch 7:10). B.C. considerably post 1856.

3. (Sept. Ι᾿ωάς, Vulg. Jaus.) A Levite, one of the four sons of Shimei; not having many sons, he was reckoned with his brother Beriah as the third branch of the family (1Ch 23:10-11). B.C. 1014.

4. (Sept. Ι᾿εούς, Vulg. Jehus.) One of the three sons of Rehoboam, apparently by Abihail, his second wife (2Ch 11:19). B.C. post 973.

5. (Sept. Ι᾿διάς v.r. Ι᾿άς, Vulg. Jehus, A. Vers. “Jehush.”) The second son of Eshek, brother of Azel, of the descendants of Saul (1Ch 8:39). B.C. cir. 588.

## Jeuz[[@Headword:Jeuz]]

             (Heb. Yeuts', יְעוּוֹ, counsellor, q.d. εὔβουλος; Sept. Ι᾿εούς v.r. Ι᾿εβούς, Vulg. Jehus), a chief Benjamite, one of the sons apparently of Shaharaim, born of his wife Hodesh or Baara in the land of Mloab (1Ch 8:10). B.C. perh. cir. 1618.

## Jew[[@Headword:Jew]]

             (Heb. Yehudi,  יְהוּדַיplur. יהוּדַים, sometimes יְהוּדַיַּים, Est 4:7; Est 8:1; Est 8:7; Est 8:13; Est 9:15; Est 9:18 text; femn. יְהוּדַיָּה, 1Ch 4:18; Chald. in plur. emphat. יְהוּדָיֵּי, Dan 3:8; Ezr 4:12; Ezr 5:1; Ezr 5:5; adv. יהוּדַית, Judaici, in the Jews' language, 2Ki 18:26; Neh 13:24; Sept. and N.T. Ι᾿ουδαῖος, hence verb Ι᾿ουδαϊvζω, to Judaize, Gal 2:14; adj. Ι᾿ουδαικός, Jewish; Tit 1:14 etc.), a name formed from that of the patriarch Judah, and applied in its first use to one belonging to the tribe or country of Judah, or rather, perhaps, to a subject of the separate kingdom of Judah (2Ki 16:6; 2Ki 25:5; Jer 32:12; Jer 38:19; Jer 40:11; Jer 41:3; Jer 44:1; Jer 52:28), in contradistinction from the seceding ten tribes, who retained the name of Israel or Israelites. During the captivity the term seems to have been extended (see Josephus, Ant. 11, 5, 6) to all the people of the Hebrew language and country, without distinction (Est 3:6; Est 3:9; Dan 3:8; Dan 3:12); and this loose application of the name was preserved after the restoration to Palestine (Hag 1:14; Hag 2:2; Ezr 4:12; Ezr 5:1; Ezr 5:5; Neh 1:2; Neh 2:16; Neh 5:1; Neh 5:8; Neh 5:17), when it came to denote not only every descendant of Abraham in the largest possible sense (2Ma 9:17; Joh 4:9; Act 18:2; Act 18:24, etc.), especially in opposition to foreigners (“Jews and Greeks,” Act 14:1; Act 18:4; Act 19:10; 1Co 1:23-24), but even proselytes who had no blood-relation to the Hebrews (Act 2:5; comp. 10). An especial use of the term is noticeable in the Gospel of John, where it frequently stands for the chief Jews, the elders, who were opposed to Christ (Joh 1:19; John 5, 15, 16; Joh 7:1; Joh 7:11; Joh 7:13; Joh 9:22; Joh 18:12; Joh 18:14, etc.; comp. Act 23:20). SEE JUDAH.

The original designation of the Israelitish nation was the Hebrews, by which all the legitimate posterity of Abraham were known, not only among  themselves (Gen 11:15; Exo 2:7; Exo 3:18; Exo 5:3; Exo 7:16; Exo 9:13; Jon 1:9; comp. 4 Maccabees 10 — although the name Jew was in later times prevalent; see the Targum of Jonathan on Exodus, ut sup.), but also among foreigners (as the Egyptians, Gen 39:14; Gen 41:12; Exo 1:16; the Philistines, 1Sa 4:6; 1Sa 4:9; 1Sa 13:19; 1Sa 29:3; the Assyrians, Jdt 12:11; and even the Greeks and Romans, see Plutarch, Sympos. 4, 5; Appian, Civ. 2, 71; Pausan. 1, 6, 24; 5, 7, 3; 10, 12, 5; Porphyry, Vit. Pythag. p. 185; Tacit. Hist. 5, 2). SEE ISRAELITE.

After the exile, the title Jews became the usual one (compare 1 Maccabees 8), while the term “Hebrews” fell into disuse, being still applied, however, to the Samaritans (Josephus, Ant. 11, 8, 6), or more commonly to designate the vulgar Syro- Chaldee spoken by the Palestinian Jews (comp. Act 9:29; Eusebius 3, 24), in distinction from the Hellenists (Act 6:1; comp. the title of the “Epistle to the Hebrews,” and see Bleek, Einleit. in d. Br. a. d. Hebr. p. 32 sq.; Euseb. 6, 14). SEE HELLENIST.

Yet Paul, who spoke Greek, was appropriately styled a Hebrew (2Co 11:22; Php 3:5); and still later the terms Hebrew and Jew were applied with little distinction to persons of Jewish descent (Eusebius, Hist. Ev. 2, 4; Philo, 3, 4). SEE HEBREW. (For a further discussion of these epithets, see Gesenius, Gesch. d. Hebr. Sprache, 9 sq.; Hengstenberg, Bileam, p. 207 sq.; Ewald, Krit. Gramre. p. 3, and Israel. Gesch. 1, 334; Hoffmann, in the Hall. Encyclop. 2, 3, 307 sq.; Henke's Mus. 2, 639 sq.; Carpzov, Crit. Saccra, p.170 sq.)

The history of the Jewish nation previous to the Christian era, is interwoven with that of their country and capital. SEE PALESTINE; SEE JERUSALEM. During the Biblical periods it consists mostly of the narratives of the progenitors and rulers of the people, or of the events that marked its leading epochs. SEE ABRAHAM; SEE JACOB; SEE MOSES; SEE JOSHUA; SEE JUDGES; SEE DAVID; SEE SOLOMON; SEE JUDAH; SEE ISRAEL; SEE CAPTIVITY; SEE MACCABEES; SEE HEROD; SEE JUDEA. (For further details, see list of works below.)

1. Strictly speaking, a history of the Jews ought perhaps to commence with the return of the remnant of the chosen people of God from the exile (q.v.), but this portion of their history, down even to the time of their final dispersion, A.D. 135, has already been treated at length in other parts of this work (we refer the reader to the articles SEE HADRIAN; SEE BAR- COCHEBA; SEE DISPERSED; SEE JERUSALEM ). It was the effort, under the leadership of Bar-Cocheba, to regain their independence, that brought about a repetition of scenes enacted under Titus, and resulted  actually in the depopulation of Palestine. Talmud and Midrash (especially Midrash Echa) alike exhaust even Eastern extravagance in describing the terrible consequences that followed the capture by the Romans of the last of the Jewish forts — Bither, their greatest stronghold. The whole of Judaea was turned into a desert; about 985 towns and villages were laid in ashes; fifty of their fortresses were razed to the ground; even the name of their capital was changed to AElia Capitolina, and they were forbidden to approach it on pain of death; thousands of those who had escaped death were reduced to slavery, and such as could not be thus disposed of were transported into Egypt. “The previous invasions and conquests, civil strifes and oppressions, persecution and famine, had carried hosts of Jewish captives, slaves, fugitives, exiles, and emigrants into the remotest provinces of the Medo-Persian empire, all over Asia Minor, into Armenia, Arabia, Egypt, Cyrene, Cyprus, Greece, and Italy. The Roman conquest and persecutions completed this work of dispersion;” and thus suddenly scattered abroad into almost every part of the empire, in the regions of Mt. Atlas, on both sides of the Pyrenees, on the Rhine, the Danube, and the Po, the Jews were deprived of the bond of connection which the possession of a common country only can afford. Their lot henceforth was oppression, poverty, and scorn.

Yet even in their utmost depression, their religious life asserted, as it has ever done, its superiority over all the disasters of time. No sooner had the war terminated than, as if rising from the ruins of the tomb, the Sanhedrim (q.v.) and the synagogue reappeared. Out of Palestine innumerable congregations of various sizes had long been established; but the late events in Egypt, Cyrenaica, Cyprus, and Mesopotamia, as well as Palestine, would have insured their annihilation but for the religious idiosyncrasy of the people. If but three persons were left in a neighborhood, they would rally at the trysting place of the law. The sense of their common dangers, miseries, and wants bound the Jewish people more closely to one another. A citizen of the world, having no country he could call his own, the Jew nevertheless lived within certain well-defined limits, beyond which, to him, there was no world. Thus, though scattered abroad, the Israelites had not ceased to be a nation; nor did any nation feel its oneness and integrity so truly as they. Jerusalem, indeed, had ceased to be their capital; but the school and the synagogue, and not a Levitical hierarchy, now became their impregnable citadel, and the law their palladium. The old men, schooled in sorrows, rallied about them the manhood that remained and the infancy that  multiplied, resolving that they would transmit a knowledge of their religion to future generations. They founded schools as well as synagogues, until their efforts resulted in the writing of a code of laws second only to that of Moses' system of traditionary principles, precepts, and customs to keep alive forever the peculiar spirit of Judaism (see Rule, Karaites, p. 59).

Among the first things to be accomplished by the Jews of Palestine at this period of their history was the election, in place of the late Gamaliel II (q.v.), of a patriarch from the eminent rabbins who had escaped the sword of the Roman conqueror. A synod congregated at Uscha (q.v.), and Simon ben-Gamaliel, presenting the best hereditary claims for this distinguished office, was chosen, and intrusted with the reconstruction of the synagogue and school at Jamnia (q.v.), there to reestablish with fresh efficiency a rabbinical apparatus. Soon another and more important institution was founded on the banks of the Lake Gennesareth, in the pleasant town of Tiberias (q.v.). Here also was reorganized the Sanhedrim (q.v.), until Judaism was brought to stand out even in bolder relief than it had dared to do since the calamities under Titus. In a great measure this success of the Jews was due to the Romans, who, under the government of the Antonines, mitigated their severity against this unfortunate people, restoring to them many ancient privileges, and permitting them to enjoy even municipal honors in common with other citizens. Indeed, of Antoninus Pius, Jewish writers assert that he had secretly become a convert to their faith (comp. Jost, Gesch. d. Israeliten, bk. 13, ch. 9), but for this statement there seems to be no very good reason; at least Grätz (Gesch. der Juden, 4, 225, 226) does not even allude to it. Most prominently associated with Gamaliel II in this work of reconstruction, among the Jews of the West, were Meir, Juda, Jose, Simon ben-Jochai, to whose respective biographical articles we refer for further details; also Juda Ha-Nasi, the successor of Gamaliel II. In Babylonia likewise the Jews had strained every nerve to regain their lost power and influence, and they had established a patriarchate very much like that of the West. At first they had looked to the Roman Jews for counsel, and had virtually acknowledged the superiority of their Jerusalem brethren in all spiritual matters, confining to temporal matters alone the office of the Resh Gelutha (q.v.), or, “Prince of the Captivity,” as they called their rulers; but as the chances for a rebuilding of the Temple and a return to power in the holy city grew less and less, they determined, encouraged by the growing celebrity of their own schools at Nisibis (q.v.) and Nahardea (q.v.), to establish their total independence of  the schools of Palestine, and to unite in their officer Resh Gelutha, who was chosen from those held to be descended from the house of David, both spiritual and temporal authority (see Etheridge, Introd. to Heb. Lit. p. 152, 153).

We are told of the Resh Gelutha that, after the consolidation of the temporal and spiritual offices, he exercised a power almost despotic, and, though a vassal of the king of Persia, he assumed among his own people the style of a monarch, lived in great splendor, had a bodyguard, counselors, cup bearers, etc.; in fact, his government was quite an imperium in imperio, and possessed a thoroughly sacerdotal, or at least theocratic character. His subjects were, many of them at least, extremely wealthy, and pursued all sorts of industrial occupations. They were merchants, bankers, artisans, husbandmen, and shepherds, and, in particular, had the reputation of being the best weavers of the then famous Babylonian garments. What was the condition of the Jews at this time further east we cannot tell, but it seems quite certain that they had obtained a footing in China, if not before the time of Christ, at least during the 1st century. They were first discovered by the Jesuit missionaries of the 17th century. They did not appear ever to have heard of Christ, but they possessed the book of Ezra, and retained, on the whole, a very decided nationalism of creed and character. From their language, it was inferred that they had originally come from Persia. At one time they would appear to have been highly honored in China, and to have held the highest civil and military offices. In India also they gained a foothold, and since the Russian embassies into Asia Jews have been found in many places (see North American Review, 1831, p. 244).

Reverting to the Jews of the Roman empire, we find them perfectly resigned to their fate, and comparatively prosperous, until the time of Constantine the Great (q.v.). Indeed, the closing part of the 2d and the first part of the 3d century will ever remain among the most memorable years in the annals of Jewish history. It was during this period that Judah Hakkodesh (q.v.) flourished, and it was under his presidency over the school at Tiberias that the Jews proved to the world that, though they were now left without a metropolis, without a temple, and even without a county, they could still continue to be a nation. Driven from the sacred city, they changed Tiberias into a kind of Jerusalem, where, instead of building in wood and stone, they employed workmen in rearing another edifice, which even to this day continues to proclaim the greatness of the chosen people of God after their dispersion the Mishna (q.v.), and the Gemara,  better known as the Babylonian Talmud (q.v.), the so-called Oral Law reduced to writing, arranged, commented upon, and explained, which became in the course of a few centuries a complete Digest or Encyclopedia of the law, the religion, and the nationality of the Jews. SEE RABBINIUS .

2. We have already said that under the Roman emperors of the 2d and 3d centuries the Jews were in a somewhat flourishing condition. Quite different became their fate in the 4th century, when the emperor of Rome knelt before the cross, and the empire became a Christian state. Not only were converts from Judaism protected from the resentment of their countrymen, but Christians were prohibited from becoming Jews. The equality of rights to which the pagan emperors had admitted them was by degrees restricted. In short, from the establishment of Christianity in the Roman empire dates the great period of humiliation of the Jews; hereafter they change to a condemned and persecuted sect. But if the ascendancy of Christianity became baneful to the Jews, it does by no means follow ,that Christianity is to bear the blame. Nay, the Jews of that age and country are altogether responsible for their sufferings. They appeared as the persecutors of the new religion whenever the opportunity presented itself. Thus they allied themselves to Arians during the revolution of 353 in destroying the property and lives of the Catholics. SEE ALEXANDRIA.

Yet, though decried “as the most hateful of all people,” they continued to fill, after this period, important civil and military situations, had especial courts of justice, and exercised the influence which springs from the possession of wealth and knowledge. Under the rule of Julian the Apostate everything changed again in their favor. The heathen worshipper felt that the Jew, as the opponent of the Christian, was his natural ally; and, fresh from oppression and tyranny which a Christian government had heaped upon them, the Jews hesitated not to unsheath the sword in union with the Apostate's legions. A gleam of splendor seemed to shine on their future destiny; and when Judian (q.v.) determined “to belie, if possible, the fulfilment of the prophecies,” and gave them permission to rebuild their Temple at Jerusalem, the transport which they manifested, it is said, is one of the most sublime spectacles in their history. (Comp., as to the views of Christian writers on the miracle said to have been wrought here, preventing the Jews from the rebuilding of the Temple, especially, Etheridge, Introd. to Hebrew Lit. p. 134 sq.) The attempt, as is well known, was signally defeated. The emperor suddenly died, and from that event the policy adopted by the Roman government towards the Jews was more or less  depressive, though never severe. “In short, down to the time that terminated the Western patriarchate (A. D. 415), the conduct of the emperors towards the Jews appears to have been marked by an inflexible determination to keep them in order, tempered by a wise and worthy moderation.” Thus, in the code of Theodosius II, their patriarchs and officers of the synagogue are honorably mentioned as “Viri spectatissimi, illustres, clarissimi.” They enjoyed absolute liberty and protection in the observance of their ceremonies, their feasts, and their sabbaths. “Their synagogues were protected by law against the fanatics, who, in some parts of Asia and Italy, attacked and set them on fire. Throughout the empire the property of the Jews, their slaves, and their lands were secured to them. Yet the Christians were exhorted to hold no intercourse with the unbelieving people, and to beware of the doctrines of the synagogue. The laws, however, could not prevent the zeal of several bishops from stirring up the hatred of the populace against the Jews. Even Ambrose imputed as a crime to some Asiatic bishops and monks the effort to rebuild, at their own expense, a synagogue which they had demolished.” Nor ought we to omit here the disreputable acts of another great father of the Christian Church, Cyril (q.v.), who, in A.D. 415, during the reign of Theodosius II, caused the expulsion of all Jews from the bishopric of Alexandria.

3. The condition of this people became even worse after the division of the Roman world (A.D. 395) into the Eastern and Western empires, especially in the East, under Justin I (A.D. 518-27), where they were deprived of their citizenship, which they had hitherto enjoyed, and were classed with heretics. Justinian (A. D. 527-65) went still further. He not only confirmed former enactments, but made others still more onerous, intended, no doubt, to drive the Jews into the Church. “The emperor, laying it down as a principle that civil rights could only belong to those who professed the orthodox faith, entirely excluded the Jews in his code (codex) and his edicts (novellae). Anything which could in the least interfere with the festivals of the Christian Church was strictly forbidden them; all discussion with Christians was looked upon as a crime, and all proselytism punished with death. Even their right of holding property was restricted in many ways, especially in the matter of wills. The emperor declared himself with especial severity against the traditions and precepts of the Talmud.” Such oppression naturally enough provoked the Jews to repeated rebellion, only to be subjected, after complete failure to regain their freedom, to increased bitterness of their cup of degradation SEE JUSTINIAN, until, deprived of  the last degree of political importance, many of their number quitted the Byzantine empire to seek a refuge in Persia and Babylon, where the Israelite was treated with more leniency. SEE SAMARITANS.

As we have said, their condition was more tolerable in the Western empire, where, upon the irruption of the barbarous tribes, they were more favorably regarded than their Christian neighbors. The Jews also formed a part of all the kingdoms which rose up out of the ruins of ancient Rome; but, unfortunately, our information respecting them, for a considerable period at least. is very imperfect. “In the absence of a literature of their own, we know of them only through ecclesiastical writers, who take notice of them chiefly as the objects of the converting zeal of the Catholic Church. The success of the Christian priesthood among their barbarous invaders inspired them with hopes of gaining converts among the Jews. But the circumstances of the two classes were altogether different. Among the heathen, when a prince or a successful warrior was converted to the faith, he carried along with him all his subjects or his companions in war. But the Jews moved in masses only in matters connected with their own religion; in every other respect they were wholly independent of each other. Their conversion, therefore, could only be the effect of conviction on the part of each individual. The character of the Christian clergy did not fit them. for so arduous an undertaking. Their ignorance and frequent immorality placed them at a disadvantage in regard to the Jews, who were in possession of the O.T. Scriptures, and had arguments at command which their opponents could not answer. Besides, there were no inducements of a worldly nature at this period to influence the Jews in exchanging their religion. They had no wish for the retreat of the cloister, nor did they stand in need of protection on account of deeds of violence and rapine. Their habits were of a description altogether different from those of the monk or brigand. The attempts of the clergy, however, were unremitted, and threats and blandishments were alternately resorted to, so that the struggle was constant between Catholicism and Judaism . . . till the appearance of a new religion wrought a diversion in favor of the latter.”

4. According to Grätz (Gesch. d. Juden, 5, 81), the history of the Jews in Arabia a century preceding Mohammed's appearance and during his activity presents a beautiful page in Jewish annals. Many were the Arabian chiefs and their tribes who had assimilated with the Jews or become actual converts to the Mosaic religion. Indeed, for several centuries previous to Mohammed's appearance, a Jewish kingdom had existed in the southwest  of Arabia, and some even claim that it extended back previous to the birth of Christ. Others assert that a Jew did not mount the throne of Yemen (q.v.) until about A.D. 320; while Grätz (5, 91 sq., 442 sq., especially p. 443,447) holds that the conversion of the Himyaritic kingdom to Judaism did not tale place until the 5th century.. So much, however, is now settled, that in the early part of the 6th century (about A.D. 520-530) the last king who reigned over the country Zunaan or Zu-n-Nuwas was a Jew (comp. Perron, Sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'Islamissme, in the Joeurnal Asiatique, 1838, Oct., Nov., p. 353 sq., 443 sq.), and that only with his death Judaism ceased to be the religion of the Himyarites (q.v.). SEE ARABIA. (Religion).

The influence, then, which the Jews must have exerted in the Arabian peninsula at the time of Mohammed's appearance failed not to be perceived by the prophet, and he hastened to secure the aid of these countrymen of his, who were equally, with his other Arabian brethren, the descendants of Abraham, and had with them at least the common cause of extirpating idolatry and Christianity. There was, perhaps, also another reason why the prophet of Arabia should have sought an association with the Jews. His own mother was a Jewess by descent, and had only in after life keen converted to Christianity by the Syrian monk Sergius. To her maternal instructions he is supposed to have been indebted for his first religious impressions; and though he did not remain long under her care, yet the slight knowledge of pure religion which he thus obtained must certainly have inclined him to draw the Jewish influence to his side in his attacks against the idolatrous hordes of Arabia (comp. Ockley, Saracens, 1, 98; Von Hammer, Assassins, chap. 1). The Jews, however, soon became convinced that the cause of Mohammed was not their own; that his object was a union of all forces under his sceptre, the supremacy of Islam, and the subjugation, if not ultimately utter extinction of all rival religions; and the compact so lately formed was as quickly broken by an open revolt. Mohammed, however, proved the stronger, and in the wars which he waged against the different Jewish tribes he came forth conqueror. From 624 to 628 several of the latter were subjugated or wholly destroyed, or obliged to quit the Arabian territory. In 632 all Jews were finally driven from Arabia, and they settled in Syria. A greater display of heroism than the Jews exhibited during these struggles with the Islamitish impostor has never been witnessed, and we do not wonder that a Jewish writer should point to the epoch as one of which every Jew has reason to be proud. The prophet himself very nearly paid by his life for the victories which he had gained over Mosaism; but it seems that, when  Mohammedanism had acquired sufficient strength to spread beyond Arabia, the animosity towards the Jews was forgotten, and they were kindly treated. So much is certain, that the extension of the religion of the Crescent through Asiatic Turkey, Persia, Egypt, Africa, and the south of Spain, proved, on the whole, advantageous to the Jews. Excepting accidental persecutions, such as those in Mauritania A.D. 790, and in Egypt A.D. 1010, they enjoyed, under the caliphs and Arabian princes, comparative peace.

The Jews actually entered upon a prosperous career in every country to which the Moslem arms extended. In North Africa, in Egypt, in Persia, their condition greatly improved, and in Moorish Spain, where their religion enjoyed full toleration, their numbers greatly increased, and they became famous for their learning as well as for trade. “In the new impulse given to trade by. the progress of the Moslem arms, the Jews, ever awake to their own interests, took their advantage. In the wide extent of conquest, new wants were created by the advance of victorious armies: kingdoms which had long ceased to hold intercourse with each other were brought into union, and new channels of commercial intercourse were opened up; and, leaving the pursuits of agriculture, which were placed at a disadvantage by the policy of the caliphs, the Jews became the merchants by whom the business between the Eastern and the Western world was conducted. In the court of the caliphs they were favorably received, and for centuries the whole management of the coinage was intrusted to them, from the superior accuracy and elegance with which they could execute it, and from their opportunities, by the extent and variety of their commercial relations, to give it the widest circulation, and at the same time to draw in all the previous mintages.” But, as we have already said, it was not only in commercial greatness that they flourished. Not a few of them distinguished themselves in the walks of science and literature. They were counselors, secretaries, astrologers, or physicians to the Moorish rulers; and this period may well be considered the golden age of Jewish literature. Poets, orators, philosophers of highest eminence arose, not isolated, but in considerable numbers; and it is a well-established fact, that to them is chiefly due — through the Arab medium — the preservation and subsequent spreading in Europe of ancient classical literature, more especially of philosophy. (Compare, on the efforts of Nestorian Christians in this direction, Etheridge, Syrian Churches, p. 239 sq.) Their chief attention, however, continued to be even then directed to the Talmud and its literature, especially in Babylonia. where they still had a Resh-gelutha as their immediate ruler. Here their great schools, reorganized under the Seboraim  (thinkers), were put in a still more flourishing condition by the Geonim (eminent), of whom the most prominent are Saadias (q.v.) (about 892- 942), the translator of the Pentateuch into Arabic, whom, for his great linguistic attainments, Aben-Ezra designates as the ראֹשׁ הִמְּדִבְּרַים בְּכָל מָקוֹם Sherira Gaon (q.v.) (died 997), grandson of Judah, to whom we owe our most accurate knowledge of the Jewish schools in Babylonia. In this period (from the 6th to the 8th centuries) the Masora was developed, followed by numerous commentaries on it and on the Targum of Jerusalem, besides a collection of the earlier Haggadas (e.g. Benhith- rabba), now mostly known as Midrashim. SEE MIDRASH. From Palestine, also, came about this time signs of freshness and vigor in Jewish literature: the admirable vowel system; talmudical compends and writings on theological cosmogony. SEE CABALA. The Karaites (q.v.) likewise, according to some authorities, originated about the 8th century (this is, however, disputed now by Rule, Karaite Jews, Lond. 1870, sm. 8vo, who believes them to be of much earlier date), and under their influence a whole kingdom, named Khozar, is believed to have been converted to Judaism, on the shores of the Caspian Sea. SEE JEHUDIA (HA-LEVI) BEN-SAMUEL. Here deserve mention, also, the most celebrated of the Jews in Africa under the Saracen princes, the grammarians Ibn-Koraish (q.v.), Dunash (q.v.), Chayug (q.v.); the lexicographer Hefetz, and Isaac ben-Soleyman.

Very different was the fate of the Jews under Christian rulers. Few were the monarchs of Christendom who rose above the barbarism of the Middle Ages. By considerable pecuniary sacrifices only could the sons of Israel enjoy tolerance. In Italy their lot had always been most severe. Now and then a Roman pontiff would afford them his protection, but, as a rule, they have received only intolerance in that country. Down even to the time of the deposition of Pius IX from the temporal power, it has been the barbarous custom, on the last Saturday before the Carnival, to compel the Jews to proceed “en masse” to the capitol, and ask permission of the pontiff to reside in the sacred city another year. At the foot of the hill the petition was refused them, but, after much entreaty, they were granted the favor when they had reached the summit, and, as their residence, the Ghetto was assigned them.

Their circumstances were most favorable among the Franks. Charlemagne is said to have had implicit confidence not only in the ability, but also in the integrity of the Jewish merchants in his realm, and he even sent the Jew  Isaac as his ambassador to the court of Haroun Alraschid. To Isaac's faithfulness and ability may perhaps be attributed the great privileges which the Jews enjoyed under Louis le Debonnaire, who is said to have made them “all-powerful.” But if these two Christian rulers were noble and generous towards the Jews, the clergy of their day by no means shared the same feeling towards the despised race. Many a bishop of the Church of Rome, and many a member of the lower orders, were heard before the throne and before the people complaining of the kind treatment which the Jews received. One prelate hesitated not to condemn the Jews because the “country people looked upon them as the only people of God!” Hence we cannot wonder that after the decease of these two noble monarchs, when the weaker Carlovingians began to rule, and the Church to advance with imperious strides, a melancholy change ensued-kings, bishops, feudal barons, and even the municipalities, all joined in a carnival of persecution, and the history of the Jews became nothing else than a successive series of massacre. (See below, 5; Brit. and For. Rev. 1842, p. 459 sq.)

In England the Jews made their first appearance during the period of the Saxons. They are mentioned in the ecclesiastical constitutions of Egbert, archbishop of York, A.D. 740; they are also named in a charter to the monks of Croyland, A.D. 833. They enjoyed many privileges under William the Conqueror and his son, William Rufus, who favored them in many ways. The lands of the vacant bishoprics were farmed out to them, which proves that the Jews must have been agriculturists at this time: while in the schools they held many honorable positions. Thus, at Oxford, even at this time a great seat of learning, they possessed themselves three halls — Lombard Hall, Moses Hall, and Jacob Hall, to which Christians as well as Jews went for instruction in the Hebrew tongue. They enjoyed these and other privileges until the period of the Crusades suddenly changed everybody against them. (See below.)

In Germany their position was perhaps more servile than in any other European country. They were regarded as the sovereign's property (kammerknechte, chamber servants), and were bought and sold. They had come to that country as early as the days of Constantine, but they did not become a numerous class until the days of the Crusaders, and we therefore postpone further treatment to the next section.

In Spain their circumstances at first were most fortunate. Especially during the whole brilliant period of Moorish rule in the Peninsula they shared the  same favorable condition as in all other countries to which the Moslem arms had extended; “they enjoyed, indeed, what must have seemed to them, in comparison with their ordinary lot, a sort of Elysian life. They were almost on terms of equality with their Mohammedan masters, rivaled them in civilization and letters, and probably surpassed them in wealth. The Spanish Jews were consequently of a much higher type than their brethren in other parts of Europe. They were not reduced to the one degrading occupation of usury, though they followed that too; on the contrary, they were husbandmen, landed proprietors, physicians, financial administrators, etc.; they enjoyed special privileges, and had courts of justice for themselves. Nor was this state of things confined to those portions of Spain under the sovereignty of the Moors; the Christian monarchs of the north and middle gradually came to appreciate the value of their services, and we find them for a time protected and encouraged by the rulers of Aragon and Castile. But the extravagance and consequent poverty of the nobles, as well as the increasing power of the priesthood, ultimately brought about a disastrous change. The estates of the nobles, and, it is also believed, those attached to the cathedrals and churches, were in many cases mortgaged to the Jews; hence it was not difficult for ‘conscience' to get up a persecution, when goaded to its ‘duty' by the pressure of want and shame. Gradually the Jews were deprived of the privilege of living where they pleased; their rights were diminished, and their taxes augmented” (Chambers). More in the next paragraph.

5. In tracing the history of the Jewish people in the Middle Ages, the Crusades form a distinct epoch amid these centuries of darkness and turmoil. If the Jew had hitherto suffered at the hand of the Christian, and had been gradually reduced in social privilege, he was now grossly abused in the name of the religion of him who taught, “Love thy neighbor as thyself.” Undertaken to bring about a union of the Christians of the world that ideal of a Christian commonwealth which forms the center of the polemical and religious life of the Middle Ages — the crusading movement was inaugurated by a wholesale massacre and persecution first of the Jew, and afterwards of the Mussulman. The latter, perhaps, had given just provocation by his endeavors to supplant the Cross by the Crescent, but what had the inoffensive and non-proselytizing Jew done to deserve such acts of violence and rapine? Shut out from all opportunities for the development of their better qualities, the Jews were gradually reduced to a decline both in character and condition. From a learned, influential, and  powerful class of the community, we find them, after the inauguration of the Crusades, sinking into miserable outcasts; the common prey of clergy, and nobles, and burghers, and existing in a state worse than slavery itself.

The Christians deprived the Jews even of the right of holding real estate, and confined them to the narrower channels of traffic. “Their ambition being thus fixed upon one subject, they soon mastered all the degrading arts of accumulating gain; and prohibited from investing their gains in the purchase of land, they found a more profitable employment of it in lending it at usurious interest to the thoughtless and extravagant. The effect of this was inevitable. At a time when commercial pursuits were held in contempt, the assistance of the Jews became indispensable to the nobles, whose hatred rose in proportion to their obligations; and, where there was the power, the temptation to cancel the debt by violence became irresistible.” A raid against the Jews was a favorite pastime of a bankrupt noble, and we need not wonder that the Jew had recourse to the only revenge that was left him to atone for this gross injustice — the exaction of a more exorbitant gain when the opportunity was afforded him.

Thus, in England, at the enthronement of Richard I (1189), the Crusaders, on their departure for the Holy Land, hesitated not to inaugurate their warfare by a pillage of the Jews. In the desperate defense which the latter waged against the knights of England in the castle at York, finding resistance useless, 500 of them, having first destroyed everything of value that belonged to them, murdered their wives and children, and then deprived themselves of life, rather than fall a prey to Christian warriors. (See Hume, History of England.) A like treatment the Jews received under the two following monarchs; their lives and wealth were protected only for a consideration. With the tyrannical treatment they received at the hand of king John (q.v.) every reader of history is familiar. Under Henry III they were treated still worse, if possible. The reign of Edward I (1272-1307) finally brought suddenly to a terminus the miserable condition of this people by a wholesale expulsion from the kingdom (A.D. 1290), after a vain attempt on the part of the priesthood to convert them to Christianity, preceded, of course, by a wholesale confiscation of their property. These exiles amounted to about 16,000. They emigrated mostly to Germany and France. In the former country the same sort of treatment befell them. In the Empire they had to pay all manner of iniquitous taxes — body tax, capitation tax, trade taxes, coronation taxes, and to present a multitude of gifts, to mollify the avarice or supply the necessities of emperor, princes, and barons. It did not suffice, however, to save them from the loss of their property.

The  populace and the lower clergy also must be satisfied; they, too, had passions to gratify. A wholesale slaughter of the “enemies of Christianity” was inaugurated. Treves, Metz, Cologne, Mentz, Worms, Spires, Strasburg, and other cities, were deluged with the blood of the “unbelievers.” The word Hep (said to be the initials of Hierosolyma est perdita, Jerusalem is taken) throughout all the cities of the empire became the signal for massacre, and if an insensate monk sounded it along the streets, it threw the rabble into paroxysms of murderous rage. The choice of death or conversion was given to the Jews, but few were found willing to purchase their life by that form of perjury. Rather than subject their offspring to conversion and such Christian training, fathers presented their breast to the sword after putting their children to death,. and wives and virgins sought refuge from the brutality of the soldiers by throwing themselves into the river with stones fastened to their bodies. (Comp. Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire [Harpers' edit.], 5, 554.) Not less than 17,000 were supposed to have perished in the German empire during these persecutions; yet those who survived clung to the land that had given them birth, and suffered from pillage and maltreatment until they were expelled by force — from Vienna (A.D. 1196), Mecklenburg (1225), Breslau (1226), Brandenburg (1243), Frankfort (1241), Munich (1285), Nurenburg (1390), Prague (1391), and Ratisbon (1476). The “Black Death,” in particular, occasioned a great and widespread persecution (1348-1350). They were murdered and burned by thousands, and many even sought death amidst the conflagrations of their synagogues. From Switzerland to Silesia the land was drenched with innocent blood, and even the interference of the emperor and the pope long proved insufficient to put an end to the atrocities that were perpetrated. When the race had almost disappeared from Germany, feelings of humanity as well as the interests of his kingdom caused Charles IV to concede them some privileges; and in the Golden Bull (1356) the future condition of the Jews was so clearly pointed out, that it prevented, in a great measure, further bloodshed, though it still continued to leave them subject to oppression and injustice. Their residence was forbidden in some places, and in many cities to which they had access they were confined to certain quarters or streets, known as ghettos or Jews' streets (Judenstrasse).

No better, nay worse, if possible, was their condition in France from the 11th to the 16th centuries. All manner of wild stories were circulated against them: it was said that they were wont to steal the host, and to  contemptuously stick it through and through; to inveigle Christian children into their houses and murder them; to poison wells, etc. They were also hated here as elsewhere on plea of excessive usury. Occasionally their debtors, high and low, hesitated not to have recourse to what they called Christian religion as a very easy means of getting rid of their obligations. Thus Philippe Augustus (1179-1223), under whose rule the Jews seem to have held mortgages of enormous value on the estates of Church and state dignitaries, simply confiscated the debts due to them, forced them to surrender the pledges in their possession, seized their goods, and finally even banished them from France; but the decree appears to have taken effect chiefly in the north; yet in less than twenty years the same proud but wasteful monarch was glad to let them come back and take up their abode in Paris. Louis IX (1226-1270), who was a very pious prince, among other religious acts, cancelled a third of the claims which the Jews had against his subjects, “for the benefit of his soul.” An edict was also issued for the seizure and destruction of their sacred books, and we are told that at Paris twenty-four carts filled with copies of the Talmud, etc., were consigned to the flames. SEE TALMUD.

The Jews were also forbidden to hold social intercourse with their Christian neighbors, and the murderer of a Jew, if he were a Christian, went unpunished. Need we wonder, then, that when, in the following century, a religious epidemic, known as the Rising of the Shepherds, seized the common people in Languedoc and the central regions of France (A.D. 1321), they indulged in horrible massacres of the detested race; so horrible, indeed, that in one place, Verdun, on the Garonne, the Jews, in the madness of their agony, threw down their children to the Christian mob from the tower in which they were gathered, hoping, but in vain, to appease the daemoniacal fury of their assailants. “One shudders to read of what followed; in whole provinces every Jew was burned. At Chinon a deep ditch was dug, an enormous pile raised, and 160 of both sexes burned together! Yet Christianity never produced more resolute martyrs; as they sprang into the place of torment; they sang hymns as though they were going to a wedding;” and, though “savage and horrible as such self-devotion is, it is impossible not to admire the strength of heart which it discovers; and, without inspiration, one might foretell that, so long as a solitary heart of this description was left to beat, it would treasure its national distinction as its sole remaining pride.” At last, in 1594, they were indefinitely banished from France, and the sentence rigidly executed (see Schmidt, Gesch. Frankreichs, 1, 504 sq.).  Such is the frightful picture of horrors and gloom which the Jews of Germany, France, England, and Italy offer in their medieval history. “Circumscribed in their rights by decrees and laws of the ecclesiastical as well as civil power, excluded from all honorable occupations, driven from place to place, from province to province, compelled to subsist almost exclusively by mercantile occupations and usury, overtaxed and degraded in the cities, kept in narrow quarters, and marked in their dress with signs of contempt, plundered by lawless barons and penniless princes, an easy prey to all parties during the civil feuds, again and again robbed of their pecuniary claims, owned and sold as serfs (chamber servants) by the emperors, butchered by mobs and revolted peasants, chased by the monks, and finally burned in thousands by the Crusaders, who also burned their brethren at Jerusalem in their synagogues, or tormented by ridicule, abusive sermons, monstrous accusations and trials, threats and experiments of conversion.”

In Spain and Portugal, indeed, the days of prosperity to the Jews lingered longest. As we have already noticed, they enjoyed in these countries, while they remained under Moorish rule, almost equality with the Moslems. As in France under the Carlovingians, so in Spain under Saracen rule, their literature betokens an uncommon progress in civilization — a progress which left far in the distance another nations, even those who professed to unfurl the banner of the Cross. But this was especially true of the Spanish Jews. Acquainted with the Arabic, they could easily dive into the treasures of that language; and the facility with which the Jews mastered all languages made them ready interpreters between Mussulman and Christian. It was through their original thinkers, such as Avicebron (Ibn-Gebirol, q.v.) and Moses Maimonides (q.v.), that the West became leavened with Greek and Oriental thought (Lewes, Philos. 2, 63), and the same persecuted and despised race must be regarded. as the chief instruments whereby the Arabian philosophy was made effective on European culture. “Dans le monde Musulman comme dans le monde chretien,” said the late professor Munk, of Paris (Melanges, p. 335), “les Juifs exclus de la vie publique, voues a la haine et au mepris par la religion dominante, toujours en presence des dangers dont les menacait le fanatisme de la foule, ne trouvaient la tranquillite et le bonheur que dans un isolement complet. Ignores de la societe les savants Juifs vouaient aux sciences un culte desinteresse.” But all their ability, learning, and wealth did not long ward off the unrestrained religious hatred of the common people, who felt no  need of culture, and enjoyed no opportunities to borrow money from them. The world, which before seemed to have made a kind of tacit agreement to allow them time to regain wealth that might be plundered, and blood that might be poured out like water, now seemed to have entered into a conspiracy as extensive to drain the treasures and the life of this devoted race. Kingdom after kingdom, and people after people, followed the dreadful example, and strove to peal the knell of the descendants of Israel; till at length, what we blush to call Christianity, with the Inquisition in its train cleared the fair and smiling provinces of Spain of this industrious part of its population, and brought a self-inflicted curse of barrenness upon the benighted land (Milman, Hist. of Jews, 3; comp. Prescott, Ferd. and Isabella, pt. 1, ch. 7; Jost, Gesch. d. Israeliten, 6, 75, 110, 184, 216, 290; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 221).

The condition of the Jews in Spain continued to be favorable from near the close of the 11th century (to which time we traced them in the preceding section) until the middle of the 14th century, when the star of their fortune may be said to have culminated. It is true, the Mohammedan power was now on the wane, but then the Christian rulers felt not vet sufficiently well established in the peninsula to take severe measures against the Jews (Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 189 sq., 224). A capitation tax was paid by the numerous synagogues, and presents were made to the infante, the nobility, or the Church; but in every other respect the Jews lived like a separate nation, framing and executing their own civil and criminal jurisdiction. It is true they had not here a Reshgelutha as their authority, but a substitute was afforded them in the ‘“rabbino mayor,” the Jewish magistrate, who “exercised his right in the king's name, and sealed his decrees, which the king alone could annul, with the royal arms. He made journeys through the country to take cognizance of all Jewish affairs, and inquire into the disposal of the revenues of the different synagogues. He had under him a ‘vice-rabbino mayor,' a chancellor, a secretary, and several other officers. Two different orders of rabbins, or judges, acted under him in the towns and districts-of the kingdom.” The first important danger that threatened them was in 1218 when a multitude of foreign knights and soldiers gathered together at Toledo preparatory to a crusade against the Moors. The campaign was to be opened, as had been done in Germany, by a general massacre of the Jews; but, by the intervention of Alphonso IX, surnamed the Good, the attempt was in a great measure defeated, and the Jews continued to prosper, after a similar attempt made by the Cortes of  Madrid had failed, until the middle of the 14th century. By this time the general hatred against the Jews had spread alarmingly in all countries of Europe, as we have already had occasion to see, in consequence of the terror which the black death caused throughout that portion of the globe. They were now also in Spain confined to particular quarters of cities in which they resided, and attempts were made for their conversion.

In 1250 an institution had even been erected for the express purpose of training men to carry on successfully controversies with the Jews, and, if possible, to bring about their conversion. But very different. results followed the bloody persecutions. which were actually and successfully inaugurated against them at Seville in 1391, 1392. These were the outbursts of priestly and popular violence, and had no sooner commenced in that city than Cordova, Toledo, Valencia, Catalonia, and the island of Majorca followed in its train; immense numbers were murdered, and wholesale theft was perpetrated by the religious rabble. Escape was possible only through flight to other countries, or by accepting baptism at the point of the sword, and the number of such enforced converts to Christianity is reckoned at no less than 200,000. If the persecutions in Germany, England, France, and elsewhere had severely tried the Jewish race, these persecutions in Spain completely extinguished all hope of further joy, for they hit, so to speak, the very core of the Jewish heart, and form a sad turning point in the history of the Jews, and the 15th of March, 1391, forms a memorable day not only for the Jew, not only for the Spaniard, but for all the world; it was the seed from which germinated that monster called the Inquisition — (Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 8, 61 sq.). Daily now the condition of this people, even in the Spanish peninsula, grew worse and worse, until it fairly beggars description. A.D. 1412-1414 they had to endure another bloody persecution throughout the peninsula, and by the middle of the 15th century Ewe read of nothing but persecution, violent conversion, massacre, and the tortures of the Inquisition. “Thousands were burned alive. ‘In one year 280 were burned in Seville alone.' Sometimes the popes, and even the nobles, shuddered at the fiendish zeal of the inquisitors, and tried to mitigate it, but in vain. At length the hour of final horror came. In A.D. 1492, Ferdinand and Isabella issued an edict for the expulsion, within four months, of all who refused to become Christians, with the strict inhibition to take neither gold nor silver out of the country.

The Jews offered an enormous sum for its revocation, and for a moment the sovereigns hesitated; but Torquemada, the Dominican inquisitor-general, dared to compare his royal master and mistress to Judas; they shrank from the awful  accusation; and the ruin of the most industrious, the most thriving, the most peaceable, and the most learned of their subjects — and consequently of Spain herself — became irremediable.” ( SEE INQUISITION in this volume, p. 601 sq.) This is perhaps the grandest and most melancholy hour in their modern history. It is considered by themselves as great a calamity as the destruction of Jerusalem. 300,000 (some even give the numbers at 650,000 or 800,000) resolved to abandon the country, which a residence of seven centuries had made almost a second Judaea to them. The incidents that marked their departure are heart rending. Almost every land was shut against them. Some, however, ventured into France, others into Italy, Turkey, and Morocco, in the last of which countries they suffered the most frightful privations. Of the 80,000 who obtained an entrance into Portugal on payment of eight gold pennies a head, but only for eight months, to enable :the .to obtain means of departure to other countries, many lingered after the expiration of the appointed time, and the poorer were sold as slaves. In A.D. 1495, king Emanuel commanded them to quit his territories, but at the same time issued a secret order that all Jewish children under 14 years of age should be torn from their mothers, retained in Portugal, and brought up as Christians. Agony drove the Jewish mothers into madness, they destroyed their children with their own lands, and threw them into wells and rivers, to prevent them from falling into the hands of their persecutors. Neither were the miseries of those who embraced Christianity, but who, for the most part, secretly adhered to their old faith (Onssie, Anussin — “ yielding to violence, forced ones”) less dreadful. It was not until the 17th century that persecution ceased. Autos-da-fe of suspected converts happened as late as A.D. 1655 (Chambers, s.v.). SEE MARRANOS.

6. The discovery of America, the restoration of letters occasioned by the invention of the art of printing, and the reformation in the Christian Church opened in a certain sense a somewhat more beneficial era to the Jews. It is true, they reaped the benefits of this transformation less than any other portion of European society; “still, the progress of civilization was silently preparing the way for greater justice being done to this people; and their conduct, in circumstances where they were allowed scope for the development of their better qualities, tended greatly to the removal of the prejudices that existed against them.” They found a friend in Reuchlin (q.v.), who made strenuous exertions in behalf of the preservation of Jewish literature. Luther, in the earlier part of his public career, is supposed  to have favored the conversion of the Jews by violent means (questioned by some; comp. Grätz, Geschichte des Jueden, 9, 220 sq.; 333 sq.; Etheridge, p. 440 sq.; Jost, Gesch. des Juedenthuss u. s. Sekten, 3, 217); and it is a fact that all through Germany where the Protestant element, if any where, was strong in those days, their lot actually became harder than it had ever been before. See below. On the other hand, we find a Roman pontiff (Sixtus V, 1585-90) animated by a far more wise and kindly spirit towards them than any Protestant prince of his time. In 1588 he abolished all the persecuting statutes of his predecessors, allowed them to settle and trade in every city of his dominions, to enjoy the free exercise of their religion, and, in respect to the administration of justice and taxation, placed them one a footing with the rest of his subjects. Of course, all this was done for a consideration. The Jews had money, and it he made them furnish freely, but then they enjoyed at least certain, advantages by virtue of their possessions.

Strange indeed must it appear to the student of history that one of the first countries in modern days that rose above the barbarism of the Middle Ages, and granted the Jews the most liberal concessions, was a part of the possessions of their most inveterate enemy, Philip II of Spain, and that one of the principal causes contributing to this change was the very instrument selected by the hatred of the Dominicans — the bloody Inquisition. It was the active, energetic, intelligent Hollander, readily appreciating the business qualifications of his Jewish brother, that permitted him to settle by his side as early as 1603. It is true, the Jew did not enjoy even in Holland the rights of citizenship until, after nearly two hundred years of trial (1796), he had been found the equal of his Christian neighbor whenever he was permitted to exchange the garb of a slave for that of a master. It was Holland that afforded to the hunted victims of a cruel and refined fanaticism a resting place on which they could encamp, and finally enjoy even equality with the natives of the soil.

Many of the Portuguese Jews (so the Jews of the Spanish peninsula are termed) left their mother country, and in this new republic vied with its citizens in the highest qualities of commercial greatness. Soon came the Jews of Poland and Germany also to enjoy the special privileges which the Dutch stood ready to administer to them. Denmark and Hamburg partook of the liberal spirit, and there also the Jews were heartily welcomed. In England, also, they soon after (1655), by the success of the Independents, gained anew a foothold. It is true, they did not really obtain public permission to settle again in the island until the reign of  Charles II (1660-85), but Cromwell, it is generally believed, favored their admission to the country, and no doubt permitted it quietly in a great many instances. The right to possess land, however, they did not acquire until 1723. and the right of citizenship was not conferred on them until 1753. Into France, also, they were, in the middle of the 16th century, admitted again, though, of course, at first the places which opened their gates to them were few indeed. Most of those who came thither were relics of that mighty host of exiles which had left Spain and Portugal after the establishment of the Inquisition (see above).

They went in considerable numbers to the provinces Avignon, Lorraine, and Alsace, and of the cities among the first to bid them enter were Bayonne and Bordeaux. The outbreak of the French Revolution, towards the close of the 18th century, finally caused here, as elsewhere, a decided change in their favor (of which more below). In Germany, as we have already said, their worth failed to be recognized. They were maltreated even under the great and otherwise. liberal monarch, Frederick II; and, as Prussia (Brandenburg) was even then in the vanguard of German affairs, the intolerant treatment which they here received was aped in the other and less important realms of the empire. They were driven out of Bavaria in 1553, out of Brandenburg in 1573, and similar treatment befell them elsewhere. They also excited numerous popular tumults (as late even as 1730 in Hamburg, of whose liberal treatment of the Jews we spoke above in connection with the Low Countries), and, in fact, during the whole of the 17th and nearly the whole of the 18th century, the hardships inflicted on them by the German governments became positively more and more grievous. Russia also failed to treat with the least consideration the Jewish people. Admitted into the realm by Peter the Great (1689-1725), they were expelled from the empire, 35,000 strong, in 1743 by the empress Elizabeth.

They were, however, readmitted by the empress Catharine II. The only other two countries which truly afforded the Jews protection were Turkey and Poland. The Mohammedans, as we have already had opportunity to observe, have, ever since the decease of the founder of their religion, been considerate in their dealings with their Jewish subjects. In Turkey, the Jews were at this period held in higher estimation than the conquered Greeks; the latter were termed teshir (slaves), but the Jews monsaphir (visitors). They were permitted to reestablish schools, rebuild synagogues, and to settle in all the commercial towns of the Levant. In Poland, where they are to this day more numerously represented than in any other European country, they met a most favorable reception as early as the 14th century by king Casimir the  Great, whose friendship for the Jews is attributed to the love he bore a Jewish mistress of his. For many years the whole trade of the country was in their hands. During the 17th and the greater part of the 18th century, however, they were much persecuted, and sank into a state of great ignorance and even poverty. The French Revolution — which, in spite of the severity and barbarism of Russian intolerance, affected more or less the Polish people — also greatly benefited the Jews of Poland. See below.

7. The Modern Period. — The appearance of Moses Mendelssohn (q.v.), the Jewish philosopher, on the stage of European history greatly improved the status of the Jews not only in Germany, but all over Europe, and we might say the world. Various other causes, among which, especially, the American and French revolutions, and the great European war of 1812-15, also contributed to this change. Efforts to ameliorate the condition of the Jews, indeed, began to be manifested even before these important events. In Italy, as early as 1740, Charles of Naples and Sicily gave to the Jews the right to resettle in his kingdom, with the privileges of unrestricted commerce. In England we notice as early as 1753 a Jews' Naturalization Bill pass the houses of Parliament, and in Austria the emperor Francis published his celebrated toleration edict, which gave the Jews a comfortable standing in his dominions, in 1782. With this last date virtually opens the new era.

The low ebb to which Rabbinism had sunk about the middle of the 18th century made a Jewish Reformation not only possible, but necessary. In the preceding centuries, before and even after the Christian Reformation, again and again false Messiahs had come forward, and sought to impose themselves upon the unfortunate leaders as embassadors from on high to ameliorate their condition, and to fulfill the law and the prophets. SEE SABBATHAI ZEWI; SEE CHASIDIM; SEE JACOB FRANK.

The people, in their forlorn condition, had gravitated with their teachers, and had fallen deep in the slough of ignorance and superstition. No man was better qualified to raise them up from this low estate, and transform the Jewish race into a higher state, than the “third Moses,” who — born in Germany (in 1729), an ardent disciple of the great Moses of the 12th century, SEE MAIMONIDES, the associate of the master minds of Germany of the last half of the 18th century, and the bosom friend of Lessing — eminently possessed every quality necessary to constitute a leader and a guide; and it is to Moses Mendelssohn that preeminently belong the honor and glory of having transformed the Jewish race all over the world to a position of  equality with their fellow beings of the Christian faith, not only mentally and morally, but politically also. It is true the change was slowly wrought, and there is even yet much to be accomplished. Still, in Germany, there is hardly an avenue of temporal pursuit in which the Jew is not found occupying the first positions. In the rostrum of the best German universities he is largely represented; on the bench, however great the obstacles that might seem to bar him from promotion, he has secured the most honorable distinctions. As physicians, the Jews are among the elite of the profession; and so in all the other vocations of life they have proved that they are worthy of the trust reposed in them.

The country in Europe, however, in which the Jew holds the highest social position is France. There Napoleon, in 1806, conferred upon them many privileges, and they have since entered the highest offices in the government, in the army, and navy. At present they enjoy like privileges in England also. The progress in removing “Jewish disabilities” was rather slow, but it was finally effected m 1860, when the Jew was admitted to Parliament. In Holland and Belgium all restrictions were swept away by the revolution of 1830. In Russia, which contains about two thirds of the Jewish population of Europe, their condition has been very variable since the opening of the present century. In 1805 and 1809 the emperor Alexander issued decrees granting them liberty of trade and commerce, but the barbarous Nicholas deprived them of all these, and treated them quite inhumanly, especially in Poland, where they were known to be in sympathy with the Revolutionists. Since the accession of Alexander II their condition has been improving, and there is reason to hope for still further amelioration of their circumstances. In Italy they were subject, more or less, to intolerance and oppression until the dethronement of the papal power. Since the establishment of a united kingdom they enjoy there the same high privileges as in France. In Spain, too, the establishment of a republican government, so lately remodeled into a monarchy, brought “glad tidings” to the Jews.

They had suffered under the yoke of Romanism the general fate of the heretic; the downfall of the Bourbon dynasty, and the establishment of a popular government, at once secured for all religious toleration, and it has since been ascertained that Spain contains many adherents to the Jewish faith among the attendants of the Romish service. In Denmark they were granted equality with other natives in 1814. In Norway they were excluded until 1860, and in Sweden their freedom is as yet limited. In Austria, as in other countries where Roman Catholicism has so long swayed the sceptre with mediaeval barbarity, the political changes of late years have placed the Jew on an  equality with his Christian neighbor, and not a few of the higher positions of the state are filled by Jews. Our notice of their condition in other countries (aside from the United States of America, for which see notice below) must be necessarily brief on account of our limited space. In Turkey, in spite of the exaction of pashas, the insolence of janizaries, and the miseries of war, they are quite numerous and thriving. In Palestine, where they are rapidly increasing, they are very poor, and depend mainly on their European brethren for assistance. SEE JERUSALEM.

In Arabia their number is small, and they enjoy much independence. In Persia they are quite numerous, but their condition is rather pitiable. They exist also in Afghanistan, a country whose importance will now be more realized since the occupation of Turkistan (June, 1871) by Russia leaves Afghanistan the only independent country separating the Russian empire from the wealth of India. The Jews here thrive as traffickers between Cabul and China. Jews are likewise found in India and Cochin China, where they are both agriculturists and artisans; as a flourishing colony in Surinam; in Bokhara, where they possess equal rights with the other inhabitants, and are skilled in the manufacture of silks and metals; in Tartary and China, where, however, their number is believed not to be adequately known. In Africa, also, they exist in large numbers; especially numerous are they all along the North African coast, where, indeed, they have had communities for perhaps more than a thousand years, which were largely reinforced in consequence of the great Spanish persecutions. They are numerous in Fez and Morocco, are found in small numbers in Egypt and Nubia, more numerous in Abyssinia, and it is ascertained that they have even made their way into the heart of Africa; they exist in Sudan, and are also found further south. America, too, has invited their spirit of enterprise. In the United States, as in Great Britain, they enjoy absolute liberty. (See, for further particulars of the history of the Jews in our country, the article SEE JUDAISM.) They have been in Brazil since 1625, and in Cayenne since 1639, and are also settled in some parts of the West Indies.

The entire number of Jews in the world is reckoned variously at between 31 and 15 millions. Chambers, taking the former estimate, distributes them as follows: about 1,700,000 to Russian, Austrian, and Prussian Poland, about 600,000 to Germany, about 240,000 to Hungary and Transylvania, about 200,000 to Galicia, about 300,000 to Turkey, about 47,000 to Italy, about 30,000 to Great Britain; Asia, about 138,000; Africa, about 504,000; and America, about 30,000. We are inclined to estimate the number of  Jews to be no less than six millions, and of these give to Europe about 4,000,000, and to the United States of America about 500,000. The estimate of Chambers for the United States might be more accurately adopted as the census of the city of New York only. The Handbuch der Vergleichenden Statistik by G. von Kolb (Leipzig, 1868) gives the following as the number of Jews in the countries named:

Germany ........... 478,500  Denmark. .......... 4,200

Austria ............1,124,000 Sweden ............ 1000

Great Britain ....... 40,000 Greece.... 500

France .......…..... 80,000  European Turkey .. 70,000

European Russia...2,277,000 Asiatic Turkey and

Italy .... ........…... 2,200 Syria............ 52,000

Portugal.........……3,000     Morocco and

North Switzerland ...4,2001  Africa............ 610,000

Belgium........…. 1,500      Eastern Asia....... 500,800

Netherlands ....... 64,000   America ............. 400,000

Luxembourg........ 1,500

See Jost, Geschichte d. Israeliten (since the time of the Maccabees) (Berlin, 1820-29, 9 vols. 8vo), his Neuere Gesch. (Berl. 1846-7, 3 vols. 8vo), and also his Gesch. d. Judenthums u. s. Sekten (Leipzig, 1857-9, 3 vols. 8vo); Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden (vol. 3-11; vols. 1 and 2, treating of the. earliest period of Jewish history, have not yet made their appearance); Milman, History of the Jews (London and N. York, new edit., revised and augmented, 1869-70, 3 vols. sm. 8vo); Geiger, Judenthum 2. s. Gesch. (Lpz. 1864-5, 2 vols. 8vo); Dessauer, Gesch. d. Israeliten (Leipzig, 1845); Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles (Lond. 1850, 12mo); Kaiserling, Gesch. der Juden in Portugal (Lpz. 1859, 8vo) ; Morgoliouth, History of Jews in Great Britain (Lond. 1851, 3 vols. 8vo); Capefigue, Hist. philos. des Juifs (Par. 1838); Depping, Les Juifs dans le' moyenage (Paris, 1834); Etheridge, Introd. to Heb. Literature, (Lond. 1856, 12mo) ; Haller, Des Juifs en France (Paris, 1845); Bedanide, Les Juifs en France, en Italie et en Espagne (Paris, 1859); Smucker, Hist. of Modern Jews (N.Y. 1860); Beer, Gesch. Lehren u. meinung. der Juden (Lpz. 1825, 8vo); Jenks (William), History of the Jew (Bost. 1847, 12mo); Mills, British Jews, their Religious Ceremonies (Lond. 1862); Ockley, History of the present Jews (translated from the Italian of Jeh. Arj. da Modena, Lond. 1650); Schirnding, Die Juden in Oesterreich, Preussen und Sachsen (Lpz. 1842); Toway, Anglia Judaica (Oxf. 1738); Benjamin, Eight Years in Asia and  Africa (Hanover, 1859); Finn, Sephardim, or History of the Jews in Spain and Portugal (London, 1841, 8vo; reviewed in Brit. and For. Rev. 1842, p. 459 sq.); Brit. and For. Rev. 1837, p. 402 sq.; Lond. Quarterly Review, 38:114 sq.; Christian Examiner, 1848, p. 48 sq.;. 1830, p. 290 sq.; North Am. Rev. 1831, p. 234 sq. The work of Basuage (Hist. de la Religion des Juifs depuis Jesus-Christ jusqu'a present (Haag, 1716, 15 vols. 8vo) was compiled from second hand sources, and so teems with errors and unjust statements towards Jews that we can hardly advise its perusal to any who seek accuracy and erudition. For the religious views, etc., of the Jews, SEE JUDAISM. (J.H.W.)

## Jew, The Wandering[[@Headword:Jew, The Wandering]]

             While the tradition obtained in the Christian Church that the “disciple whom Jesus loved” should not die (Joh 21:23), we find as a counterpart the tradition of an enemy of the Redeemer, whom remorse condemned to ceaseless wanderings until the second coming of the Lord. This tradition of the Wandering Jew has; like other traditions, undergone various changes. The first Christian writer by whom we find it mentioned is the Benedictine chronicler Matthenus Parisius († 1259). According to the account he gives in his Historia Major — an account which he professes to have received from an Armenian bishop, to whom the Wandering Jew had himself told it — his history was as follows: His name was Cartaphilues, and he was door keeper of the palace, in the employ of Pilate. When the Jews dragged Jesus out of the palace, after his sentence had been pronounced, the door keeper struck him, saying mockingly, “Go on. Jesus, go faster; why dost thou linger?” Jesus turned around sternly, and said, “I am going, but thou shalt remain waiting until I return.” The door keeper was then about thirty years old; but since, whenever he reaches his hundredth year, a sudden faintness overcomes him, and when he awakes from his swoon he finds himself returned to the age he was at the time the Lord pronounced his punishment. Cartaphilus was baptized with Ananias under the name of Joseph, which caused him afterwards to be confounded with Joseph of Arimathea. As a Christian, he led a life of strict penitence, in the hope of obtaining forgiveness. The scene of action of this Wandering Jew is in the East — namely, Armenia.

The tradition of the West is somewhat different. Here we find him first mentioned in the 16th century, under the name of Ahasuerus, and he is said to have appeared in 1547 in Hamburg, then in Dantzig and in \*other cities  of Germany, and in other countries also. Dr. Paulus, of Eizen, bishop of Schleswig — the storm goes — heard him relate his history as follows: Ahasuerus was a shoemaker in Jerusalem during the life of Jesus, and one of the loudest in crying “Crucify him.” When Jesus was led to the place of execution, he passed before the shoemaker's house. Tired with the weight of the cross, the Savior leaned against the porch for rest; but the shoemaker, who stood at his door with a child in his arms, bade him harshly move on (according to some he even struck him), when Christ, turning round and looking severely at him, said, “I shall stay and rest, but thou shalt move on until the last day.”

Towards the end of the 17th century and the beginning of the 18th, the tradition of the Wandering Jew, in England, changed to the original Eastern account. A stranger made his appearance claiming to be an officer of the upper council of Jerusalem, and that he had done what was generally attributed to Cartaphilus — namely, had struck Jesus as the latter left Pilate's palace, and said to him, “Go, move on; why dost thou yet linger here?” The English universities sent their ablest professors to question him. He proved himself able to answer them all; he related a great deal concerning the apostles, as also about Mohammed, Tamerlane, Soliman, etc., all of whom he professed to have known personally; he knew all the dates of the events connected with the Crusades, etc. Some considered him an impostor or a visionary, while others believed him.

Whether the allegory of Ahasuerus, or this ever restless being, is to be understood as a type of the anti-Christian spirit of skepticism, or whether, in a more concrete sense, it is meant to typify the ever-wandering, homeless, yet still unchanged Jewish people, is a question for critics to decide. We will only add that this fanciful tradition has become the theme for a great number of works of imagination. It has been worked up into songs, as by Schubert, Schlegel, etc.; into epics, as by Julius Mosen, Nich. Lenaw, etc.: into dramas, as by Klingemann. French writers also have used it; Edgar Quincet and Beranger have composed songs on the Wandering Jew. But the most remarkable production to which this legend has given rise is Eugene Sue's novel, The Wanderings Jew (Le Juif errant, Paris, 1844). See Dr. J. G. Th. Grasse, Sage v. ewigen Juden, historisch entwickelt (Dresden u. Leipz. 1844. 8vo); Herzog, Real-Encylopadie, 7, 131 sq. (J.N.P.)

## Jewel[[@Headword:Jewel]]

             is the representative in the A.V. of the following terms in the original: נֶזֶם (ne'zem,, a ring), a nose-ring (Pro 11:22; Isa 3:21; Eze 16:12; everywhere else rendered “earring,” Gen 24:22; Gen 24:30; Gen 24:47; see Jerome on Ezekiel ad loc.; Hartmann's Hebraerin, 2, 166; 3, 205), or an earring (Gen 35:4; Exo 32:2-3); elsewhere without specifying the part of the person on which it was worn (Jdg 8:24-26; Exo 35:32; Job 42, 51; Pro 25:12; Hos 2:15). חֲלַי(chali', so called as being polished), a necklace or trinket (Son 7:1; “ornament,” Pro 25:12), and חֶלְיָה(chelyah', fern. of precedo), a necklace or female ornament (Hos 2:13). כְּלַי(keli', an implement or vessel of any kind), an article of silver ware or other precious material (Gen 1:24-31; Exo 3:22; Exo 11:2; Exo 12:35; Num 26:50-51; 1Sa 6:8; 1Sa 6:15; Job 28:17; Pro 20:15), or ally elegant trappings or piece of finery in dress (Isa 61:10; Eze 16:7; Eze 16:39; Eze 23:16), elsewhere rendered “vessel,” etc. , סַגֻלָּה(segullah', property), wealth or treasure (Mal 3:17; elsewhere usually “peculiar treasure,” Exo 19:5; Psa 135:4, etc.). SEE DRESS; SEE PRECIOUS STONE; etc.

## Jewell, John[[@Headword:Jewell, John]]

             a learned English writer and bishop, one of the fathers of the English Protestant Church, was born May 24, 1522, at Bitden, in the county of Devon, and educated at Oxford, where he took the degree of bachelor of arts in 1541, became a noted tutor, and was soon after chosen lecturer on rhetoric in his college. He had early imbibed the principles of the Reformation, and inculcated them upon his pupils, though it had to be done privately till the accession of king Edward the Sixth, which took place in 1546, when he made a public declaration of his faith, and entered into a close friendship with Peter Martyr, who was visiting Oxford about this time. On the accession of queen Mary in 1553, he was one of the first to feel the rage of the storm then raised against the Reformation; he was obliged to flee, and, after encountering many difficulties, joined the English exiles at Frankfort, in the second year of queen Mary's reign, and here made a public recantation of his forced subscription to the popish doctrines.

He then went to Strasburg, and afterwards to Zurich, where he resided with Peter Martyr. He returned to England in 1559, after the death  of queen Mary, and in the following year was consecrated bishop of Salisbury. He now preached and wrote anew in favor of the Reformation, and sought in every way to extinguish any attachment still remaining for the Roman Catholics. It was at this time, after more than twenty years spent in researches, that he published his famous Apologia pro Ecclesia Anglicana (translated into six different languages, and into English by lady Bacon [wife of the councilor], under the title, An Apology or Answer in defence of the Church of England, 1562, 4to). But his watchful and laborious manner of life impaired his health, and brought him quickly to the grave. He died at Monkton Farley Sept. 22, 1571. “He was a prelate of great learning, piety, and moderation; irreproachable in his private life.; extremely generous and charitable to the poor, to whom, it is said, his doors always stood open. He was of a pleasant and affable temper, modest, meek, and temperate, and a great master of his passions.

His memory was naturally strong and retentive, but he is said to have greatly improved it by art, insomuch that marvelous things are related of it by his biographers.” The writings of bishop Jewell, which are chiefly controversial, are greatly valued even in our day, and are freely used in two departments of Church controversy — on the question between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, and on the question respecting the devotional sentiments of the English Protestant fathers. Besides his Apology, he wrote, in reply to Thomas Harding (q.v.), A Defence of the Apology (1565 and 1567, folio), the reading of which was obligatory in all parishes until the time of Charles I: — A View of a seditious Bull sent into England by Pope Pius V in 1569: — A Treatise on the Holy Scriptures (Lond. 1582, 8vo): — An Exposition of the two Epistles to the Thessalonians: — A Treatise on the Sacraments (Lond. 1583, 8vo); besides several sermons and controversial treatises. His works were collected and published in one folio volume (Lon. 1609, 1611, 1631, 1711; recent editions, Camb. 1845-50, 4 vols. sm. fol.; Oxf. 1847, 1848, 8 vols. 8vo). See Fuller, Church Hist.; Burnet, Hist. of Reformation; L. Humfrey, Life of John Jewell (1573); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gem. 26, 710; Allibone, Dict. of Auth. 1, 967; Wood, Athenoe Oxon. vol. 1 (see Index); Chas. Webb le Bas, Life of Bishop Jewell (1835); Middleton, Reformers, 3, 352 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Jewess[[@Headword:Jewess]]

             (Ι᾿ουδαία), a woman of Hebrew birth, without distinction of tribe (Act 16:1; Act 24:24). It is applied in the former passage to Eunice, the mother of Timothy, who was unquestionably of Hebrew origin (comp. 2Ti 3:15), and in the latter to Drusilla, the wife of Felix and daughter of Herod Agrippa I. — Smith. SEE JEW.

## Jewett, William[[@Headword:Jewett, William]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Sharon, Conn., in the year 1789. At the age of seventeen he was converted, commenced preaching the year following, and traveled a circuit by direction of a presiding elder. In 1808 he joined the New York Annual Conference. His ministerial labors were uninterrupted from 1807 to 1851, a period of forty-four years, during nineteen of which he held the office of presiding elder. His appointments were Middletown, Conn.; Poughkeepsie, New York City, and from 1832 on the Hudson River, White Plains, Newburgh, Poughkeepsie, and Rhinebeck districts. The last six years of his life he sustained to the Conference a superannuated relation. As a man, Mr. Jewett possessed many estimable traits of character. As a Christian, he was distinguished for a marked decision and firmness of character. As a preacher, he was plain, simple, and eminently practical. As a pastor, he was wise, diligent, faithful, and unusually successful, leaving behind him, wherever he went, a holy influence. As a presiding elder, he commanded the confidence and respect of his brethren. He died at Poughkeepsie, N.Y., June 27, 1857. (G.L.T.)

## Jewett, William D[[@Headword:Jewett, William D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Ballston, N.Y., about 1788; was converted in 1811; was licensed to preach in 1821, and preached much, and was ordained deacon previous to entering the Genesee Conference in 1830; was superannuated in 1845, and died at Huron, N.Y., Nov. 10, 1855. Mr. Jewett was a man of unobtrusive piety, and a pattern of ministerial fidelity.” He labored with all faithfulness and love until his strength failed him. At death he left his property, about $3000, to the Bible and Missionary societies, and the superannuated brethren of his own Conference. — Minutes of Conf. 6, 102. (G.L.T.)

## Jewish[[@Headword:Jewish]]

             (Ι᾿ουδαϊκός), of or belonging to Jews: an epithet applied to the Rabbinical legends against which the apostle Paul warns his younger brother (Tit 1:14). SEE JEW.

## Jewish Christians[[@Headword:Jewish Christians]]

             SEE JUDAIZERS.

## Jewry[[@Headword:Jewry]]

             (יְהוּד, Yehud', Chald., Dan 5:13, last clause; “Judaea” in Ezr 5:8; elsewhere “Judah;” Ι᾿ουδαῖα, Luk 23:5; Joh 7:1; elsewhere “Judah”), the nation of the Jews, i.e. the kingdom of JUDAH, later JUDAEA. “Jewry” also occurs frequently in the A.V. of the Apocrypha (1Es 1:32; 1Es 2:4; 1Es 4:49; 1Es 5:7-8; 1Es 5:57; 1Es 6:1; 1Es 8:81; 1Es 9:3; Bel 33; 2Ma 10:24).

Jews.

SEE JEW.

## Jezaniah[[@Headword:Jezaniah]]

             (Jer 40:8; Jer 42:1). SEE JAAZANIAH, 4.

## Jezebel[[@Headword:Jezebel]]

             (Hebrew lze'bel, אַזֶבֶל, not-cohabited, q.d. ἄλοχος, compare Plato, p. 249; Lat. Agnes, i.e. intacta chaste; an appropriate female name, remarks Gesenius, and not to be estimated from the character of Ahab's queen; comp. Isabella; Sept.Ι᾿εζάβελ; N.T.Ι᾿εζαβήλ, Rev 2:20; Joseph.Ι᾿αζεβέλις, 9: Ant. 9, 6, 4; Vul. Jezabel), the consort of Ahab, king of Israel (1Ki 16:31), was the daughter of Ethbaal (q.v.), king of Tyre and Sidon, and originally a priest of Astarte (Josephus, Apion, 1, 18). This unsuitable alliance proved most disastrous to the kingdom of Israel; for Jezebel induced her weak husband not only to connive at her introducing the worship of her native idols, but eventually to become himself a worshipper of them, and to use all the means in his power to establish them in the room of the God of Israel. The worship of the golden calves, which previously existed, was, however mistakenly intended in honor of Jehovah; but this was an open alienation from him, and a turning aside to foreign and strange gods, which, indeed, were no gods (but see Vatke, Bibl. Theol. 1, 406). Most of the particulars of this bad but apparently highly-gifted woman's conduct have been related in the notices of AHAB and ELIJAH. From the course of her proceedings, it would appear that she grew to hate the Jewish system of law and religion on account of what must have seemed to her its intolerance and its anti-social  tendencies. She hence sought to put it down by all the means she could command; and the imbecility of her husband seems to have made all the powers of the state subservient to her designs.

The manner in which she acquired and used her power over Ahab is strikingly shown in the matter of Naboth which, perhaps, more than all the other affairs in which she was engaged, brings out her true character, and displays the nature of her influence. B.C. cir. 897. When she found him puling, like a spoiled child, on account of the refusal of Naboth to gratify him by selling him his patrimonial vineyard for a “garden of herbs,” she taught him to look to her, to rely upon her for the accomplishment of his wishes; and for the sake of this impression, more perhaps than from savageness of temper, she scrupled not at murder under the abused forms of law and religion (1Ki 21:1-29). She had the reward of her unscrupulous decisiveness of character in the triumph of her policy in Israel, where, at last, there were but 7000 people who had not bowed the knee to Baal, nor kissed their hand to his image. Nor was her success confined to Israel; for through Athaliah — a daughter after her own heart — who was married to the son and successor of Jehoshaphat, the same policy prevailed for a time in Judah, after Jezebel herself had perished and the house of Ahab had met its doom. It seems that after the death of her husband, Jezebel maintained considerable ascendency over her son Jehoram; and her measures and misconduct formed the principal charge which Jehu cast in the teeth of that unhappy monarch before he sent forth the arrow that slew him. The last effort of Jezebel was to intimidate Jehu as he passed the palace by warning him of the eventual rewards of even successful treason. It is eminently characteristic of the woman that, even in this terrible moment, when she knew that her son was slain, and must have felt that her power had departed, she displayed herself, not with rent veil and disheveled hair, “but tired her head and painted her eyes” before she looked out at the window. The eunuchs, at a word from Jehu, having cast her down, she met her death beneath the wall, SEE JEHU; and when afterwards the new monarch bethought him that, as “a king's daughter,” her corpse should not be treated with disrespect, nothing was found of her but the palms of her hands and the soles of her feet: the dogs had eaten all the rest (1Ki 16:31; 1Ki 18:4; 1Ki 18:13; 1Ki 18:19; 1Ki 21:5-25; 2Ki 9:7; 2Ki 9:22; 2Ki 9:30-37). B.C. 883.

The name of Jezebel appears anciently (as in modern times) to have become proverbial for a wicked termagant (comp. 2Ki 9:22), and in this sense it is probably used in Rev 2:20, where, instead of “that  woman Jezebel” (τὴν γυναίκα Ι᾿εζαβήλ), many editors prefer the reading “thy wife Jezebel” (τὴν γυναῖκὰ σου Ι᾿εζάβελ), i.e. of the bishop of the Church at Thyatira, who seems to have assumed the office of a public teacher, although herself as corrupt in doctrine as in practice. In this address to the representative of the Church she is called his wife, i.e. one for whose character and conduct, as being a member of the congregation over which he had charge, he was responsible, and whom he should have taken care that the Church had, long since repudiated. Her proper name is probably withheld through motives of delicacy. We need not suppose that she was literally guilty of licentiousness, but only that she disseminated and acted upon such corrupt religious principles as made her resemble the idolatrous wife of Ahab in her public influence. (See Jablonski, Diss. de Jezabele Thyatirenor, pseudo-prophet essa, Frankf. 1739; Stuart's Comment. ad loc.) Others, however, maintain a more literal interpretation of the passage (see Clarke and Alford, ad loc.). SEE NICOLAITAN.

## Jezelus[[@Headword:Jezelus]]

             (Ι᾿έζηλος), the Graecized form (in the Apocrypha) of the name of two Jews whose sons are said to have returned from Babylon with Ezra; but a comparison with the Hebrew text seems to indicate an identity or else confusion.

1. (Vulgate Zecheleus.) The father of Sechenias, of “the sons of Zathoe” (1Es 8:32); evidently the JAHAZIEL of Ezr 8:5.

2. (Vulg. Jehelus.) The father of Abadias, of “the sons of Joab” (1Es 8:35); evidently the JEHIEL of Ezr 8:9.

## Jezer[[@Headword:Jezer]]

             (Heb. Ye'tser, יֵצֶרformation; Sept. Ι᾿σσάαρ, Ι᾿έσερ, but in Chronicles Σααρ v.r. Α᾿σήρ), the third named of the four sons of Naphtali (Gen 46:24; Num 26:49; 1Ch 7:13), and progenitor of the family of JEZERITES (Heb. Yitsri', יַצְרַיSeptuag. Ι᾿εσερί, Num 26:49; SEE IZRI ). B.C. 1856.

## Jezerel, Blood Of[[@Headword:Jezerel, Blood Of]]

             (דָּמַים, i.e. bloodshed), put for the murders perpetrated by Ahab and Jehu at this place (Hos 1:4). See below.

## Jezerite[[@Headword:Jezerite]]

             (Num 26:49). SEE JEZER.

## Jeziah[[@Headword:Jeziah]]

             (Heb. Yizziyah', יַזַּיָּה, for יַזַּיאּיָהּ, sprinkled by Jehovah; or perhaps to be written יַזְיָה, Yizyah', for יְזַיאּיָהּ, assembled by Jehovah, SEE JEZIEL; Sept. Α᾿ζία,Vulgate Jezia), an Israelite, one of the “sons” of Parosh, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:25). B.C. 459.

## Jeziel[[@Headword:Jeziel]]

             [some Jezi'ël] (Heb. Yeziul', יְזַיַאֵל, as in the margin, assembled by God; Sept. Α᾿ζιήλ v.r. Ι᾿ωήλ, etc.; Vulg. Jaziel), a. “son” of Azmaveth, who, with his brother, was one of the Benjamite archers that reinforced David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:3). B.C. 1055.

## Jezirah[[@Headword:Jezirah]]

             (סֵפֶר יְצַירָה, Sepher Yetsirah), or the Book of Creation, is the name of one of the cabalistic books which, next to the ZOHAR, forms the principal source whence we derive our knowledge of Jewish mysticism. The age of the book it has thus far been impossible exactly to determine. Jewish tradition claims it to be of divine origin. It was intrusted by the Lord to Abraham, and he handed it down to Akiba (q.v.). Modern scholars have come to the conclusion that the Jezirah is the product of the Jewish schools in Egypt at the time of Philo Judaeus. Dr. Zunz, however, assigns it to the Geonastic period, the 8th or 9th century. For the latter assertion there seems to us to be no good reason, and we are inclined to believe it was composed during the period of the first Mishnaists, i.e. between a century before and about eighty years after the birth of Christ (comp. Etheridge, Introd. to Heb. Lit. p. 300 sq.; Enfield, Hist. Philos. p.405). SEE CABALA, vol. 2. p. 1. We do this after having determined that the Hebrew of this work is of that dialectic kind used by the learned Jews at the time of the opening of the Christian era. Indeed, it is barely possible that the work itself was a collection of fragments of various earlier times; a kind of résumé of what had hitherto been determined on the occult subject of which it treats. The Jezirah treats of the Creation of the World, and “is, in fact, an ancient effort of the human mind to discover the plan of the universe at large, and the law or band which unites its various parts into one harmonious whole. It opens its instructions with something of the tone and manner of the Bible, and announces that the universe bears upon itself the imprint of the name of God; so that, by means of the great panorama of  the world, the mind may acquire a conception of the Deity, and from the unity which reigns in the creation, it may learn the oneness of the Creator.” So far, so good.. But now, instead of tracing in the universe the laws which govern it, so as to ascertain from those laws the thoughts of the lawgiver, “it is sought rather to arrive at the same end by finding some tangible analogy between the things which exist and the signs of thought, or the means by which thought and knowledge are principally communicated and interpreted among men; and recourse is had for this purpose to the twenty- two letters of the Hebrew alphabet, and to the first ten of the numbers” (compare Etheridge, p. 304 sq.).

“The book of Jezirah begins by an enumeration of the thirty-two ways of wisdom (נְתַיבוֹת חָכְמָה), or, in plainer terms, of the thirty-two attributes of the divine mind (שֵׂכֶל), as they are demonstrated in the founding of the universe. The book shows why there are just thirty-two of these; by an analysis of this number it seeks to exhibit, in a peculiar method of theosophical arithmetic, so to speak (on the assumption that figures are the signs of existence and thought), the doctrine that God is the author of all things, the universe being a development of original entity, and existence being but thought become concrete; in short, that, instead of the heathenish or popular Jewish conception of the world as outward or coexistent with Deity, it is coequal in birth, having been brought out of nothing by God, thus establishing a pantheistic system of emanation, of which, principally because it is not anywhere designated by this name, one would think the writer was not himself quite conscious. The following sketch will illustrate the curious process of this argumentation. The number 32 is the sum of 10 (the number of digits) and 22 (the number of the letters of the Heb. alphabet), this latter being afterwards further resolved into 3 + 7 +12. The first chapter treats of the former of these, or the decade, and its elements, which are designated as figures (סְפַירוֹת, Sephiroth), in contradistinction from the 22 letters. This decade is the sign manual of the universe. In the details of this hypothesis, the existence of divinity in the abstract is really ignored, though not formally denied; thus the number 1 is its spirit as an active principle, in which all worlds and beings are yet enclosed; 2 is the spirit from this spirit, i.e. the active principle in so far as it has beforehand decided on creating; 3 is water; 4 fire, these two being the ideal foundations of the material and spiritual worlds respectively; while the six remaining figures, 5 to 10, are regarded severally as the signs manual of  height, depth, east, west, north, and south, forming the six sides of the cube, and representing the idea of form in its geometrical perfection.

“We see, however, that this alone establishes nothing real, but merely expounds the idea of possibility or actuality, at the same time establishing the virtualiter as existing in God, the foundation of all things. The actual entities are therefore introduced in the subsequent chapters under the 22 letters. The connection between the two series is evidently the Word, which in the first Sephirah (number) is yet identical in voice and action with the spirit; but afterwards these elements, separating as creator and substance, together produce the world, the materials of which are represented by the letters, since these, by their manifold combinations, name and describe all that exists. Next, three letters are abstracted from the 22 as the three mothers (composing the mnemotechnic word אמש), i.e. the universal relations of principle, contrary principle, and balance, or in nature — fire, water, and air; in the world — the heavens, the earth, the air; in the seasons — heat, cold, mild temperature; in humanity — the spirit, the body, the soul; in the body — the head, the feet, the trunk; in the moral organization — guilt, innocence, law, etc. These are followed by seven doubles (consisting of בגדכפר8ת), i.e. the relations of things which are subject to change (opposition without balance), e.g. life and death, happiness and misery, wisdom and insanity, riches and poverty, beauty and ugliness, mastery and servitude. But these seven also designate the material world, namely, the six ends (sides) of the cube, and the palace of holiness in the middle (the immanent deity) which supports it; also the seven planets, the seven heavenly spheres, the seven days of the week, the seven weeks (from Passover to Pentecost), the seven portals of the soul (i.e. the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, etc.). This theory further has express reference to the fact that from the combination of the letters results, with mathematical certainty and in a geometrical ratio, a quantity of words so great that the mind cannot enumerate them; thus, from two letters, two words; from three, six; from four, twenty-four, etc.; or, in other words, that the letters, whether spoken as results of breath, or written as elements of words, are the ideal foundation of all things. Finally, the twelve single letters (constituting the remainder of the alphabet) show the relations of things so far as they can be apprehended in a universal category. Their geometrical representative is the regular twelve-sided polygon, such as that of which the horizon consists; their representation in the world gives the twelve signs of the zodiac and the twelve months of the lunar year; in human beings, the twelve parts of  the body and twelve faculties of the mind (these being very arbitrarily determined). They are so organized by God as to form at once a province and yet be ready for battle, i.e. they are as well fitted for harmonious as for contentious action”

The text of the Jezirah is divided into six chapters, which are subdivided into sections. Its style is purely dogmatic, having the air and character of aphorisms, or theorems laid down with an absolute authority. The abstract character is, however, relieved by a haggadistic addition which relates the conversion of Abram from Chaldaean idolatry to pure theism, so treated as to render the work a kind of monologue of that patriarch on the natural world, as a monument or manifestation of the glory of the one only God. The book of Jezirah has been published with five commentaries (Mantua, 1562); with a Latin translation and notes by Rittangelius (Amst. 1642), and with a German translation and notes by Meyer (Lpzg. 1830); with ten commentaries (Warsaw, 1884, 4to). See Grätz, in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 8, 67 sq., 103 sq., 140 sq.; Steinschneider, Catalog. Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodl. col. 335 sq., 552,639 sq.; Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. 1, 27 sq.; 2, 258 sq. SEE PANTHEISM.

## Jezliah[[@Headword:Jezliah]]

             (Heb. Yizliah', יַזְלַיאָה, perh. drawn out, i.e. preserved; Sept. Ι᾿εζλία v.r. Ι᾿εζλίας, Vulg. Jezlia), one of the “sons” of Elpaal, and apparently a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:18). B.C. prob. cir. 588.

## Jezoar[[@Headword:Jezoar]]

             [some Jez'oär] (1Ch 4:7). SEE ZOAR.

## Jezrahiah[[@Headword:Jezrahiah]]

             (Neh 12:42). SEE IZRAHIAH, 2.

## Jezreel[[@Headword:Jezreel]]

             (Heb. Yizreel, יְזְרְעֶאל, once יַזְרְעֵאל, 2Ki 9:10; sown by God; Sept. Ι᾿εζραήλ, but sometimes Ι᾿εζρεήλ, Ι᾿εζριήλ, Ι᾿εζράελ, or Ι᾿εζραέλ; Josephus Ι᾿εσράηλα, Ant. 8, 13, 6; Ι᾿εσράελα, Ant. 9, 6, 4), the name of two places and of several men.  1. A town in the tribe of Issachar (Jos 19:18), where the kings of Israel had a palace (2Sa 2:8 sq.), and where the court often resided (1Ki 18:45; 1Ki 21:1; 2Ki 9:30), although Samaria was the metropolis of that kingdom. It is most frequently mentioned in the history of the house of Ahab. “In the neighborhood, or within the town probably, was a temple and grove of Astarte, with an establishment of 400 priests supported by Jezebel (1Ki 16:33; 2Ki 10:11). The palace of Ahab (1Ki 21:1; 1Ki 18:46), probably containing his ‘ivory house' (1Ki 22:39), was on the eastern side of the city, forming part of the city wall (comp. 1Ki 21:1; 2Ki 9:25; 2Ki 9:30; 2Ki 9:33). The seraglio, in which Jezebel lived, was on the city wall, and had a high window facing eastward (2Ki 9:30). Close by, if not forming part of this seraglio (as Josephus supposes, Ant. 9, 6, 4), was a watchtower, on which a sentinel stood, to give notice of arrivals from the disturbed district beyond the Jordan (2Ki 9:17). This watchtower, well known as ‘the tower in Jezreel,' may possibly have been the tower or migdal near which the Egyptian army was encamped in the battle between Necho and Josiah (Herod. 2, 159). An ancient square tower which stands amongst the hovels of the modern village may be its representative. The gateway of the city on the east was also the gateway of the palace (2Ki 9:34). Immediately in front of the gateway, and under the city wall, was an open space, such as existed before the neighboring city of Bethshan (2Sa 21:12), and is usually found by the walls of Eastern cities, under the name of ‘the mounds' (see Arabian Nights, passim), whence the dogs, the scavengers of the East, prowled in search of offal (2Ki 9:25). SEE JEZEBEL.

A little further east, but adjacent to the royal domain (1Ki 21:1), was a smooth tract of land cleared out of the uneven valley (2Ki 9:25), which belonged to Naboth, a citizen of Jezreel (2Ki 9:25), by a hereditary right (1Ki 21:3); but the royal grounds were so near that it would have easily been turned into a garden of herbs for the royal use (1Ki 21:2). Here Elijah met Ahab (1Ki 21:17)” (Smith). Here was the vineyard of Naboth, which Ahab coveted to enlarge the palace grounds (1Ki 18:45-46; 1 Kings 21), and here Jehu executed his dreadful commission against the house of Ahab, when Jezebel, Jehoram, and all who were connected with that wretched dynasty perished (2Ki 9:14-37; 2Ki 10:1-11). These horrid scenes appear to have given the kings of Israel a distaste for this residence, as it is not again mentioned in their history. It is, however, named by Hosea (Hos 1:4; compare 1:11; 2:22); and in Judith (1:8; 4:3; 7:3) it occurs under the name of  Esdraelon (Εσδρηλών), near Dothaim. In the days of Eusebius and Jerome it was still a large village, 12 R. miles from Scythopolis and 10 from Legio, called Esdraela (Εσδράηλα, Onomast. s.v. Ιεζραιέλ, Jezrael); and in the same age it again occurs as Stradela (Itin. Hieros. p. 586). Nothing more is heard of it till the time of the Crusades, when it was called by the Franks Parvum Gerinum, and by the Arabs Zerin (an evident corruption of the old name); and it is described as commanding a wide prospect on the east to the mountains of Gilead, and on the west to Mount Carmel (Will. Tyr. 22, 26). But this line of identification seems to have been afterwards lost sight of, and Jezreel came to be identified with Jenin. Indeed, the village of Zerin ceased to be mentioned by travelers till Turner, Buckingham, and others after them again brought it into notice; and it is still more lately that the identification of Zerin and Jezreel has been restored (Raumer, Palästina, p. 155; Schubert, 3, 164; Elliot, 2, 379; Robinson, 3, 164).

Zerin is seated on the brow of a rocky and very steep descent into the great and fertile valley of Jezreel, which runs down between the mountains of Gilboa and Hermon. Lying comparatively high, it commands a wide and noble view, extending down the broad valley on the east as far as the Jordan (2Ki 9:17) to Beisan (Bethshean), and on the west quite across the great plain to the mountains of Carmel (1Ki 18:46). It is described by Dr. Robinson (Researches, 3, 163) as a most magnificent site for a city, which, being itself a conspicuous object in every part, would naturally give its name to the whole region. In the valley directly under Zerin is a considerable fountain, and another still larger somewhat further to the east, under the northern side of Gilboa, called Ain Jalud. There can, therefore, be little question that as in Zerin we have Jezreel, so in the valley and the fountain we have the “valley of Jezreel” and the “fountain of Jezreel” of Scripture. Zerin has at present little more than twenty humble dwellings, mostly in ruins, and with few inhabitants. (See De Saulcy, 1, 79; 2, 306 sq.; Schwarz, p. 164; Thomson, 2, 180.)

The inhabitants of this city were called JEZREELITES (Heb. Yezreëli',

יַזְרְעֵאלַי, 1Ki 21:1; 1Ki 21:4; 1Ki 21:6-7; 1Ki 21:15-16; 2Ki 9:21; 2Ki 9:25).

## Jezreel (2)[[@Headword:Jezreel (2)]]

             Zerin, the modern representative of this noted place, is briefly described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (2:88), but more graphically by Conder (Tent Work, 1:124):

"Crossing the valley, we see before us the site of Jezreel, on a knoll five hundred feet high. The position is very peculiar, four while on the north and north-east the slopes are steep and rugged, on the south the ascent is very gradual, and the traveller coming northwards is astonished to look down suddenly on the valley, with its two springs, one ('Ain Jalud) welling out from a conglomerate cliff, and forming a pool about one hundred yards long, with muddy borders: the other ('Ain Tub'aun), the Crusaders' Fountain of Tubania, where the Christian armies were fed 'miraculously' for three days on the fish which still swarm in most of the great springs near.

"The main road ascends from near these springs and passes by the 'Dead Spring,' which was reopened by the governor of Jenin, and now forms a shallow pool between rocks of black basalt, covered with red and orange-colored lichen; and also full of little fish; thence it passes on the east side beneath the knoll of Zerin (Jezreel) to the plain on the south. Climbing up to the village, we are again struck by the absence of any traces of antiquity: the buildings, including the central tower, are all modern, and only the great mound beneath, and perhaps some of the innumerable cisterns, seem ancient; yet the site is undoubted, and has never been really lost. Here, from a tower, perhaps standing where the modern one is erected, tusa watchman could see down the broad valley of Jezree  as far as Bethshau, and watch the dust and the gleam of the armor advancing. The course of the two horseman and of Jehu's chariot was distinctly seen beneath the hill, and the distances are sufficiently extensive to give time for the succession of events.

“On the east and south-east there are rock-cut winepresses on the rugged hills, where no doubt the 'portion of the field of Naboth' and his vineyard are to be placed a good instance of the decay of vine cultivation in Palestine."

## Jezreel, Day Of[[@Headword:Jezreel, Day Of]]

             (יוֹם, i.e. period), put for the predicted time of the execution of vengeance for the atrocities there committed (Hos 1:5). See 3, below.

## Jezreel, Ditch Of[[@Headword:Jezreel, Ditch Of]]

             (חֵל, Septuag. πρλτείχισμα), was simply the fortification or entrenchments surrounding the city, outside of which Naboth was executed (1Ki 21:23; comp. 1Ki 21:13). SEE TRENCH.

## Jezreel, Fountain Of[[@Headword:Jezreel, Fountain Of]]

             (עִיַן, always a perennial natural spring), a place where Saul encamped before the fatal battle of Gilboa (1Sa 29:1). Still in the same eastern direction from Zerin are two springs, one 12 minutes from the town, the other 20 minutes (Robinson, Bib. Res. 3, 167). This latter spring “flows from under a sort of cavern in the wall of conglomerate rock, which here forms the base of Gilboa. The water is excellent; and issuing from crevices in the rocks, it spreads out at once into a fine limpid pool 40 or 50 feet in diameter, full of fish” (Robinson, 3, 168). This probably, both from its size and situation, is the one above referred to. It is also probably the same as the spring (A.V. “well”) of “Harod,” where Gideon encamped before his night attack on the Midianites (Jdg 7:1). (Possibly the nearer spring may distinctively have been called that of Jezreel, and the farther one that of Harod.) The name of Harod, “trembling,” probably was taken from the “trembling” of Gideon's army (Jdg 7:3). It was the scene of successive encampments of the Crusaders and Saracens, and was called by the Christians Tubania, and by the Arabs Ain Jalud. “the spring of Goliath” (Robinson, Bib. Res. 3, 69). This last name, which it still bears, is derived from a tradition mentioned by the Bordeaux Pilgrim, that here David killed Goliath. The tradition may be a confused reminiscence of many battles fought in its neighborhood (Ritter, Jordan, p. 416); or the word may be a corruption of “Gilead,” supposing that to be the ancient name of Gilboa, and thus explaining Judges 7, 3, “depart from Mount Gilead” (Schwarz, p. 334). SEE GILEAD.

According to Josephus (Ant, 8, 15, 4, 6), this spring, and the pool attached to it, was the spot where Naboth and his sons were executed, where the dogs and swine licked up their blood and that of Ahab, and where the harlots bathed in the blood- stained water (Sept.). But the natural inference from the present text of  1Ki 22:38 makes the scene of these events to be the pool of Samaria. SEE NABOTH.

## Jezreel, Portion Of[[@Headword:Jezreel, Portion Of]]

             (חֵלֶק), merely signifies the field or country adjoining the city, where the crime of Ahab had been perpetrated, and where its retribution was to be exacted (2Ki 9:10; 2Ki 9:21; 2Ki 9:36-37; comp. 2Ki 9:25-26). Naboth was stoned to death outside the city of Jezreel (1Ki 21:13), and the dogs licked up Ahab's blood that was clotted in the bottom of his chariot, before it was washed, near the pool of Samaria (1Ki 22:35; 1Ki 22:38); hence Schwarz (Palest. p. 165, note) proposes to render the expression אֲשֶׁר בַּמְקוֹם“in the place where” (occurring in the sentence of retaliation, 1Ki 21:19), as signifying “in punishment for that;” but this construction is not in accordance with the Heb. idiom (see Gesenius' Lex. s.v. מָקוֹם), and the other incidents furnish a sufficiently exact fulfilment of the prediction (see Clarke's Comment. ad loc.).

## Jezreel, Tower Of[[@Headword:Jezreel, Tower Of]]

             (מַגְדָּל, Sept. πύργος), was one of the turrets or bastions guarding the entrance to the city, and sentinelled as usual by a watchman (2Ki 9:17). See above.

## Jezreel, Valley Of[[@Headword:Jezreel, Valley Of]]

             (עֵמֶק, Jos 17:16; Judges 6, 33; Hos 1:5). On the northern side of the city, between the parallel ridges of Gilboa and Moreh (now called Jebel ed-Duhy; SEE MOREH ), lies a rich valley (hence its name, God's seeding-place), an offshoot of Esdraelon, running down eastward to the Jordan. This was called the “Valley of Jezreel;” and Bethshean with the other towns in and around the valley, was originally inhabited by a fierce and warlike race who had “chariots of iron” (Jos 17:16). The region fell chiefly to the lot of Issachar, but neither this tribe nor its more powerful neighbor Ephraim was able to drive out the ancient people (Jos 19:18). The “valley of Jezreel” became the scene of one of the most signal victories ever achieved by the Israelites, and of one of the most melancholy defeats they ever sustained. In the time of the Judges, the Midianites, Amalekites, and “children of the East” crossed the Jordan, and “pitched in the valley of Jezreel,” almost covering its green pastures with their tents,  flocks, and herds (Jdg 6:33 sq.). Gideon hastily summoned the warriors of Israel round his standard, and took up a position on the lower slopes of Gilboa, close to the “well of Harod” (7, 1; also called “the fountain of Jezreel”), about a mile east of the city. (See above.) SEE GIDEON.

Two centuries later the Philistines took up the identical position formerly occupied by the Midianites, and the Israelites under Saul pitched on Gideon's old camping ground by the “fountain of Jezreel” (1Sa 29:1-11). The Israelites were defeated, and Saul and Jonathan, with the flower of their troops, fell on the heights of Gilboa (1Sa 31:1-6). SEE SAUL.

In later ages the valley of Jezreel seems to have extended its name to the whole of the wider plain of Esdraelon, which continued to be the scene of the greatest military evolutions of Palestine. This latter is, indeed, the most extensive level in the Holy Land (τὸ πεδίον μέγα simply, 1Ma 12:49; Josephus, Ant. 15, 1, 22; 8, 2, 3; 12, 8, 5; 15, 8, 5; War, 3, 3, 1; Life, 41; fully τὸ μέγα πεὸίον Ε᾿σδρηλώμ, Jdt 1:8). It is the modern Merj Ibn- 'Amir, by which the whole of the plain is known to the Arabs. It is also known in Scripture as the plain of Megiddo (2Ch 35:22; Zec 12:11), and the Armageddon of the Apocalypse (Rev 16:16). It extends about thirty miles in length from east to west, and eighteen in breadth from north to south. It is bounded on the north by the mountains of Galilee, and on the south by those of Samaria; on the eastern part by Mount Tabor, the Little Hermon, and Gilboa; and on the west by Carmel, between which range and the mountains of Galilee is an outlet, whereby the river Kishon winds its way to the bay of Acre (see Robinson's Researches, 3, 160-162, 181, 227). Here, in the most fertile part of the land of Canaan (see Hasselquist, Trav. p. 176; Troilo, p. 545; Maundrell, p. 76; Schubert, 3, 163, 166), the tribe of Issachar rejoiced in their tents (Deu 33:18). In the first ages of Jewish history, as well as during the Roman empire and the Crusades, and even in later times, this plain has been the scene of many a memorable contest (see Robinson, Researches, 2, 233). The same plain was the scene of the conflict of the Israelites and the Syrians (1Ki 20:26-30). Here also Josiah, king of Judah, fought in disguise against Necho, king of Egypt, and fell by the arrows of his antagonist (2Ki 23:29). Josephus often mentions this remarkable part of the Holy Land, and always (as above) under the appellation of the Great Plain; under the same name it is also spoken of by  Eusebius and Jerome, (in the Onomast.). “It has been a chosen place for encampment,” says Dr. E. Clarke, “in every contest from the days of Nabuchadonosor, king of the Assyrians, in the history of whose war with Arphaxad (Jdt 1:8) it is mentioned as the great plain of Esdraelon, until the disastrous march of the late Napoleon Bonaparte from Egypt into Syria. Jews, Gentiles, Saracens, Christian crusaders, Egyptians, Persians, Druses, Turks, Arabs, and French, warriors out of every nation which is under heaven, have pitched their tents in the plain of Esdraelon, and have beheld the various banners of their nation wet with the dews of Tabor and of Hermon.” (For other notices of this place, see De Saulcy's Narrative, 2, 306-311.) This noble plain, like the greater portion of all the rich plains of Palestine and Syria, is in the hands of the government, and is only partially cultivated; the soil is deep, of a dark red color, inclined to be clayey, and cannot be surpassed in natural fertility (see Reland, Paloest. p. 366 sq.; Hamesveld, 1, 418 sq.). SEE ESDRAELON.

2. A town in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Juttah and Jokdeam (Jos 15:56), situated (according to the associated names) in the district southeast of Hebron, on the edge of the desert of Judah. It is possibly identical with the modern ruined site Zurtut, which lies in a fertile region (Robinson, Researches, 2, 201), as the name Jezreel implies. See No. 3. It was probably this place (1Sa 25:43) from which came Ahinoam, one of David's wives (comp. the neighboring Carmel, where Abigail, his other wife, taken about the same time, resided), the JEZREELITESS (יַזְרְעֵאלַית, 1Sa 27:3; 1Sa 30:5; 2Sa 2:2; 2Sa 3:2; 1Ch 3:1). SEE ABEZ.

3. A descendant of Judah (1Ch 4:3, where two brothers and a sister are also mentioned), apparently of the same family with Penuel and Ezer, “sons” of Hur, the grandson of Hezron (1Ch 4:4). From the frequent association of names of places in the vicinity of Bethlehem in the same connection, it is probable that this Jezreel was the founder of the town in the tribe of Judah (No. 2, above) which bore his name. In the text it is stated of him and his relatives, “these are the father of Etam” (יְאֵלֶּה אֲבַי עֵיטָם, Sept. καὶ ουτοι ὑιοὶ Αἰτάμ, Vulg. ista qeuoque stirps. Etam, Auth. Vers. “and these are of the fathers of Etam”), meaning apparently that they founded or resided in the place by that name; and, as several other towns in the same general neighborhood are expressly assigned to separate individuals in the enumeration, this must be ascribed  specially to Ishma and Idbash, who, with their sister, are the only two not thus particularly identified with any other locality. B.C. cir. 1612.

4. A symbolical name given by the prophet Hosea to his oldest son (Hos 1:4), then just born (B.C. cir. 782), in token of a great slaughter predicted by him, like that which had before so often drenched the soil of the plain of Esdraelon with blood (Hos 2:2). He is afterwards made, together with his brother Lo-ammi and his sister Lo-ruhama (Hos 1:6; Hos 1:9), emblems of the Jewish people to be restored after punishment and dispersion in the approaching exile, and to be augmented by-new favors (2:24, 25). In this way is to be understood the vexed passage of the same prophet (Hos 2:22), “And the earth shall hear [rather, answer, and yield] the corn, and the wine, and the oil [due from the soil]; ands they [i.e. these gifts of the earth] shall hear [answer] Jezreel,” i.e. the earth, rendered fertile from heaven (see Hos 2:21), shall yield anew her produce to (the tillers of) Jezreel. The prophet then (Hos 2:23) carries out the reference to his son, with evident allusion to the signification of the name Jezreel, which implies the productiveness of that plain, “And I will sow her [i.e. him and it, Jezreel being construed as a fem., like other collectives, e.g. Ephraim in Isa 17:10-11, etc.] unto me in the earth; and I will have mercy upon her that had not obtained mercy [i.e. again cherish Lo-ruhama], and I will say to them which were not my people [i.e. to Lo-ammi], Thou art my people, and they shall say. Thou art my God;” i.e. the whole people of Israel, whom the prophet thus emblematically represents by his three children, will again be planted, cherished, and claimed by Jehovah as his own. — Gesenius. SEE HOSEA. “From this time the image seems to have been continued as a prophetical expression for the sowing the people of Israel, as it were broadcast; as if the whole of Palestine and the world were to become, in a spiritual sense, one rich plain of Jezreel. ‘I will sow them among the people, and they shall remember me in far countries' (Zec 10:9). ‘Ye shall be tilled and sown, and I will multiply men upon you' (Eze 36:9-10). ‘I will sow the house of Israel and the house of Judah with the seed of men and with the seed of beast' (Jer 31:27). Hence the consecration of the image of ‘sowing,' as it appears in the N.T. (Mat 12:2)”

## Jezreelite[[@Headword:Jezreelite]]

             (1Ki 21:1; 1Ki 21:4; 1Ki 21:6-7; 1Ki 21:15-16; 2Ki 9:21; 2Ki 9:25), an inhabitant of JEZREEL SEE JEZREEL (q.v.), in Issachar.

## Jezreelitess[[@Headword:Jezreelitess]]

             (1Sa 27:3; 1Sa 30:5; 2Sa 2:2; 1Ch 3:1), a woman of JEZREEL SEE JEZREEL (q.v.), in Judah.

## Jibsam[[@Headword:Jibsam]]

             (Hebrew Yibsamn', יַבְשָׂם, pleasant; Sept. Ι᾿εβασάμ v.r. Ι᾿εμασάν), one of the “sons” of Tola, the son of Issachar, a valiant chief, apparently of the time of David (1Ch 7:2). B.C. cir. 1017.

## Jidlaph[[@Headword:Jidlaph]]

             (Hebrew Yidlaph', יַדְלָŠ, tearful; Sept. Ι᾿ελδάφ), the seventh named of the eight sons of Nahor (Abraham's brother) by Micah (Gen 22:22). B.C. cir. 2040.

## Jidsin-Jombaja[[@Headword:Jidsin-Jombaja]]

             in Lamaism, was a young, beautiful god, a Burchan, assistant or friend of Jakshiamuni, when the latter founded his religion. He usually is placed beside the statue of the supreme god in the Lama temple, and is represented as a very soft, feminine personage, with four arms, the body light-yellow color, the dress blue. Jidsin-Jombaja was instructor of astrological and other secret sciences, and taught the wise men in these branches.

## Jijelia (or Jiemona)[[@Headword:Jijelia (or Jiemona)]]

             in Slavonic mythology, was a youthful goddess of hunting, comparable in many things to Diana of the Romans, but wanting the hostile attributes of the latter. She was regarded as a friendly companion, and as giving success in hunting. She subdues the wild animals, drives the reindeer within range of the hunter, and favors the most courageous and most worthy; hence many young people, whose family relations were not positively known, were called her sons and daughters, in case they were beautiful and daring. She is also said to have been the goddess of love, at least, she was implored by the Slavs for children, unless she is mistaken for the similarly named Jijindla, who was worshipped as the goddess of marriage.

## Jilsbog[[@Headword:Jilsbog]]

             was a Wendian and Slavic deity, representing the moon, with a half-moon on the breast, and the arms raised in the form of a half-moon. He was also a god of time (his name is from Jas, "time"), because the Wends measured their time according to the moons.

## Jimna[[@Headword:Jimna]]

             (Num 26:44),

## Jimnah[[@Headword:Jimnah]]

             (Gen 46:17),

## Jimnite[[@Headword:Jimnite]]

             (Num 16:44). SEE IMNA.

## Jinas[[@Headword:Jinas]]

             saints among the Jainas (q.v.) in India. A saint is called a Jina, as being the victor over all human passions and propensities. He is supposed to possess thirty-six superhuman attributes, four of which regard his person; eleven refer to his supernatural powers; while the remaining nineteen are of celestial origin, as the raining of flowers and perfumes, the sound of heavenly drums, and the menial offices rendered by Indra and the gods. The Jinas are twenty-four in number, and although similar in their general character and attributes, are distinguished from each other in color, stature, and longevity. Two of them are red, two white, two blue, two black, the rest are of a golden hue, or a yellowish brown. In regard to stature and length of life, they undergo a gradual decrease from Rishabha, the first Jina, who was five hundred poles in stature, and lived 8,400,000 great years, to Mahavira, the twenty-fourth Jina, who had degenerated to the size of a man, and was not more than forty years on the earth.

## Jins[[@Headword:Jins]]

             (i.e., enii), according to the Mohammedams, an intermediate race between angels and men. They are said to be made of fire, but with grosser bodies than the angels, to propagate their species, and, though longlived, not to be immortal; also to have inhabited the earth previous to Adam, under a succession of sovereigns. Mohammed professed to be sent as a preacher to them as well as to men. In the Koran there is a chapter bearing their name, in which they are introduced as saying: "There are some among us who are upright, and there are some among us who are otherwise; we are of different ways, and we verily thought that we could by no means frustrate God in the earth, neither could we escape him by flight; therefore, when we heard the direction, we believed therein. There are Moslems among us, and others who swerve from righteousness."

## Jiphtah[[@Headword:Jiphtah]]

             (Heb. Yiphtach', יַפְתָּח, the same name as Jephthah; Sept. Ι᾿εφδά), a town in the “lowland” district of Judah, mentioned between Ashan and Ashmah (Jos 15:43), and lying in the southern medial group west of Hebron and east of Eleutheropolis. SEE JUDAH. Some (e.g. Keil, ad loc.) have located it in the mountain district, contrary to the text; but, although the import of the name implies a “defile” adjoining, and the associated names are indicative of naturally strong positions, yet the “plain” or Shephelah (q.v.) here actually comes quite far in this direction to the proper “hill country” (Robinson, Researches, 3, 13). We may therefore presume a location for Jiphtah at the ruined village Jimrin, where a smaller valley runs up south from wady el-Melek (Robinson, 2, 342, note; Van de Velde's Map, ed. 1864).

## Jiphthah-el[[@Headword:Jiphthah-el]]

             (Heb. Yiphtach'-el, יַפְתִּחאּאֵל, opening of God; Sept. [Γαϊv] Ι᾿εφθαήλ), a valley at the intersection of the line between Asher and Naphtali with the northern boundary of Zebulon (Jos 19:14; Jos 19:27). Dr. Robinson, with great probability, suggests (new ed. of Researches, 3, 106, 107) that the name is represented by that of Jotapata (Ι᾿ωτάπατα), the renowned fortress of Galilee mentioned by Josephus as having been fortified by himself ( War, 2, 20, 6; Life, 37). and then as having held out, under his own command, against the continued assaults of Vespasian, and where he was at last taken prisoner after the downfall of the place (War, 3, 7, 3-36). He describes it as surrounded by a precipice, except on the north, where the city extended out upon the sloping extremity of the opposite mountain; the deep valleys on the other sides were overlooked by surrounding mountains. It contained no fountains, but only cisterns, with caverns and subterranean recesses. Reland had already remarked (Paloest. p. 816, 867) that the Gopatata (גופתתא) of the Talmudic writings, three miles from Sepphoris, was probably identical with this place. It is doubtless the modern Jefat, which lies four or five English miles from Sefurieh.

It was first visited and identified by Schultz (Ritter, Erdk. 16, 763 sq.). The valley in question would thus answer to the great wady Abilin, which runs southwesterly from Jefat, the boundary between Asher and Zebulon following the line of hills between Sukhnin and Kefr Menda, in which this wady has its head (Robinson, ut sup.), rather than to the deeper wady Jiddin, considerably south of this, and running in the same direction, on the southern side of which stands the village of Arukah, therefore not altogether answering to Beth-Emek (as thought by Dr. Smith, Bibliotheca Sacra, 1853, p. 121), which was thus situated on the valley Jiphthah-el (Jos 19:27). Dr. Thomson, while justly objecting to the letter valley, as being too far north (Land and Book, 1, 472), proposes as the site of Jiphthah the ruined site Jiftah, “situated on the edge of the long valley [rather plain] of Turan,” which he would identify with the “valley of Jiphthah-el” (ib. 2, 122); but this, on the other hand, lies even south of Rumaneh (Rimmon), which undoubtedly lay within Zebulon (1Ch 6:77). The title (גִּיְא, ravine, and not נִחִל, wady, i.e. “valley watered by a brook;” see Gesenius, Lexic. s.v.) properly designates this fine pass (hence the superlative name, God's Defile), which connects the rich plain el-Buttauf on the east with the yet more fertile plain of Acre on the west, and is described by the Scottish deputation as “enclosed with  steep wooded hills; sometimes it narrows almost to the straitness of a defile... The valley is long, and declines very gently towards the west; the hills on either side are often finely wooded, sometimes rocky and picturesque. The road is one of the best in Palestine, and was no doubt much frequented in ancient days” (Report, p. 309, 310). There seems also to be an allusion to the etymological force of the name (q.d. the opening out of a gorge into a plain) in the statement (Jos 19:14), “And the outgoings thereof are in the valley of Jiphthah-el” (comp. Deu 33:18, “And of Zebulon he said, Rejoice, Zebulon, in thy goings out”).

## Jireh[[@Headword:Jireh]]

             SEE JEHOVAH-JIREH.

## Jirsik, Johann Valentin[[@Headword:Jirsik, Johann Valentin]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate of Bohemia, was born June 19, 1798. In 1881 he was made bishop of Budweis, in Bohemia, and died February 23, 1883. He is the author of Populare Dogmatik oder Glaubenslehre der katholischen Kirche. edited by B. Schon (4th ed. Vienna, 1865): — in the Bohemian language Jirsik published Twenty Friendly Letters Addressed to the Protestants in Bohemia (1842). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:679 sq. (B.P.)

## Jisu[[@Headword:Jisu]]

             a god among the Japanese, whose office it is to convey souls to the infernal regions.

## Jizchaki[[@Headword:Jizchaki]]

             SEE RASHI; SEE SAKTAR.

## Joachim I And II[[@Headword:Joachim I And II]]

             SEE REFORMATION (GERMAN).

## Joachim Of Korsun[[@Headword:Joachim Of Korsun]]

             the first bishop of Novgorod. He was commissioned, in 992, by the metropolitan of Kiew, Leonce, with evangelizing the northern part of Russia, and has the honor of having planted Christianity there, and having founded the Church of St. Sophia, at Novgorod, where he died in 1030, after a useful episcopate. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Joachim, Abbot Of Floris[[@Headword:Joachim, Abbot Of Floris]]

             was born at Celico, in the diocese of Cosenza, about 1130. After a short residence at the court of Roger of Sicily, he journeyed to Jerusalem, and on his return joined the Cistercians, and became abbot of Corace (Curatium), in Calabria. This office he resigned, however, some time after, and founded himself a monastery at Floris, near Cosenza. Joachim died between 1201 and 1202. He enjoyed great reputation during his life: he was reverenced by many as a prophet, and stood in high consideration with popes and princes, but since his day he has been very variously judged. Praised as a prophet by J.G. Syllanaeus, and defended by the Jesuit Papebroch, he was accused of heresy by Bonaventura, and called a pseudo-prophet by Baronius. His partisans claimed that he worked miracles, but it appears better proved that he wrote prophecies, and denounced in the strongest terms the growing corruption of the Romish hierarchy. He endeavored to bring about a reformation. His character has perhaps been best delineated by Neander (Ch. Hist. 4, 220), who says of him: “Grief over the corruption of the Church, longing desire for better times, profound Christian feeling, a meditative mind, and a glowing imagination, such are the peculiar characteristics of his spirit and his writings.” He complained of the deification of the Roman Church, opposed the issue of indulgences, condemned the Crusades as antagonistic to the express purpose of Christ, who had himself predicted only the destruction of Jerusalem, decried the simonious habits of the clergy, and even argued against the bestowal of temporal power on the pope, fearing that the contentions in his day for temporal power might ultimately result, as they eventually did, in the assumption of “spiritual things which do not belong to him.” Joachim's  doctrines, however, are somewhat peculiar. His fundamental argument is that the Christian era closes with the year 1260, when a new era would commence under another dispensation.

Thus the three persons of the Godhead divided the government of ages among them: the reign of the Father embraced the period from the creation of the world to the coming of Christ; that of the Son, the twelve centuries and a half ending in 1260, and then would commence the reign of the Holy Spirit. This change would be marked by a progress similar to that which followed the substitution of the new for the old dispensation. Thus man, after having been carnal under the Father, half carnal and half spiritual under the Son, would, under the Holy Ghost, become exclusively spiritual. So there have been three stages of development in society, in which the supremacy belonged successively to warriors, the secular clergy, and monks (comp. Neander, Church History, 4, 229 sq.). As Joachim found many adherents, the third Lateran Council, at the request of Alexander III, condemned Joachim's “mystical extravagances ;” Alexander IV was still more severe in opposition to Joachim; and in 1260 the Council at Arles finally pronounced all followers of Joachim heretics. Joachim's ideas were chiefly presented in the form of meditations on the N.T. He strongly opposed the scholastic theology, which aimed at establishing the principles of faith dialectically, and also the manner in which Peter Lombard explained the doctrine of the Trinity. Towards the middle of the 13th century these views had gained a large number of adherents. Among the many works attributed to Joachim some are undoubtedly spurious, while others have probably been subjected to additions, etc., in consequence of his popularity (compare Neander, 4, 221, note). The Expositio super Apocalypsim (Venice, 1517, 4to, often reprinted), Concordioe Veteris ac Novi Testamenti libri v (Venice, 1519, 8vo), and the Psalterium decem Chordarum appear to be genuine. Among the others bearing his name are commentaries on Jeremiah, the Psalms, Isaiah, parts of Nahum, Habakkuk, Zechariah, and Malachi; also a number of prophecies concerning the popes, and predicting the downfall of the papacy. All these were published at Venice (1519-1524) and Cologne (1577). His Life was written by Gregory di Lauro (Naples, 1660, 4to). Among the MS. works attributed to him, Prophetioe et Expositiones Sibyllarum; Excerptiones e libris Joachimi de Mundi fine, de Terroribus et AErumnis, seu de pseudo-Christis; Prophetioe de Oneribus Provinciarum; Epistoloe Joachimni de suis Prophetiis; and Revelationes, are to be found in the public libraries of Paris. See Hist. Litter. de la France, vol. 20; Dom Gervaise, Histoire de l'abbe Joachim; Tiraboschi,  Storia della letter. Ital. vol. 5, 2d ed. Gregoire Laude, Vie de l'abbe Joachim; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 26, 718; Neander, Ch. History, 4, 215 sq. Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 713 sq.; Engelhardt, Joachim, etc., in Kirchengesch. Abhandlungen (Erl. 1832).

## Joachimites[[@Headword:Joachimites]]

             SEE JOACHIM OF FLORIS.

Joäcim (Ι᾿ωακίμ), another Graecized form of the Heb. name JOACHIM, applied in the Apocrypha to

1. The son of Josiah, king of Judah (1 Esdr. 1:37, 38, 59).

2. By corruption for JEHOIACHIN, the next king of Judah (1Es 1:43).

3. A son of Zerubbabel, who returned to Jerusalem after the exile (1Es 5:5), apparently a mistake for Zerubbabel himself.

4. “The high priest which was in Jerusalem” (Jdt 4:6; Jdt 4:14) in the time of Judith, and who welcomed the heroine after the death of Holofernes, in company with “the ancients of the children of Israel” (ἡ γερουσία τῶν μὶῶν Ι᾿σραήλ, 15:8 sq.). The name occurs with the various reading Eliakim, but it is impossible to identify him with any historical character. No such name occurs in the lists of high priests in 1 Chronicles 6 (compare Josephus, Ant. 10, 8, 6); and it is a mere arbitrary conjecture to suppose that Eliakim, mentioned in 2Ki 18:18, was afterwards raised to that dignity. Still less can be said for the identification of Joacim with Hilkiah (2Ki 22:4; Josephus Ε᾿λιακίας, Ant. 10, 4, 2; Sept. Χελκίας). The name itself is appropriate to the position which the high priest occupies in the story of Judith (“The Lord hath set up”), and the person must be regarded as a necessary part of the fiction. SEE JUDITH.

5. The husband of Susanna (Sus. 1 sq). The name seems to have been chosen, as in the former case, with a reference to its meaning; and it was probably for the same reason that the husband of Anna, the mother of the Virgin, is called Joacim in early legends (Protev. Jac. 1, etc.). SEE SUSANNA.

## Joah[[@Headword:Joah]]

             (Heb. Yoäch', יוֹאָח, Jehovah is his brother, i.e. helper), the name of four men.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿ωαά v.r. ῾Ιωάθ,Vulg. Joaha.) The third son of Obed-edom (q.v.), appointed with his brethren to take charge of the sacred furniture (1Ch 26:4). B.C. 1014.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿ωάχ v.r. Ι᾿ωάβ, Ι᾿ωάς, Ι᾿ωαά; but in 2 Chronicles first occurrence Ι᾿ωά v.r. Ι᾿ωδαάδ, second Ι᾿ωαχά; Vulg. Joah.) A Levite of the family of Gershom, the son of Zimmah and father of Iddo (1Ch 6:21); apparently the same elsewhere called ETHAN, and father of Adaiah (1Ch 6:42). He is probably the same as the person who, with his son Eden, aided Hezekiah in his efforts at a religious reformation (2Ch 29:12). B.C. 726.

3. (Sept. Ι᾿ωάς, in Isaiah Ι᾿ωάχ, Vulg. Joahe.) Son of Asaph and historiographer of king Hezekiah, who was one of the messengers that received the insulting message of Rabshakeh (2Ki 18:18; 2Ki 18:26; 2Ki 18:37; Isa 36:3; Isa 36:11; Isa 36:22). B.C. 712.

4. (Sept. Ι᾿ουάχ v.r. Ι᾿ωάς, Vulg. Joha; Josephus Ι᾿ωατής, Ant. 10, 4, 1.) Son of Joahaz and historiographer of king Josiah; he was one of the officers that superintended the repairs of the Temple (2Ch 34:8). B.C. 623.

## Joahaz[[@Headword:Joahaz]]

             (Heb. Yodaichaz', יוֹאָחָז, a contracted form of the name JEHOAHAZ, for which it occurs in speaking of others of the same name; Sept. Ι᾿ωάχαζ,Vulg. Joachaz), the father of Joah, which latter was historiographer in the reign of Josiah (2Ch 34:8). B.C. ante 623.

## Joainan[[@Headword:Joainan]]

             (Ι᾿ωανάν v.r. Ι᾿ωνάν), a Graecized form (1Es 9:1) of the name of JOHANAN SEE JOHANAN (q.v.), the son of Eliashib (Ezr 10:6).

## Joan[[@Headword:Joan]]

             pope(ss), is the name of a fictitious female who was supposed to have occupied the chair of St. Peter, as John VIII, between the popes Leo IV and Benedict III, about 853-855. This personage is first said to have been spoken of as a Roman pontiff by Marianus Scotus, a monk of the abbey of Fulda, who died at Mentz in 1086, and who says in his chronicle (which many authorities declare to be spurious), under the year 853, the thirteenth year of the reign of the emperor Lotharius, that Leo IV died on the 1st of August, and that to him succeeded Joan, a woman, whose pontificate lasted two years, five months, and four days, after which Benedict III was made pope. But Anastasius, who lived at the time of the supposed pope Joan, and who wrote the lives of the popes down to Nicholas I, who succeeded Benedict III, says that fifteen days after Leo IV's death Benedict III succeeded him. Further, Hincmar of Rheims, a contemporary, in his twenty-sixth letter to Nicholas I, states that Benedict III succeeded Leo IV immediately. It is proved, moreover, by the unquestionable evidence of a diploma still preserved, and of a contemporary coin which Garampi has published, that Benedict III was actually reigning before the death of the emperor Lothaire, which occurred towards the close of 855. It is true that some MS. copies of Anastasius, among others, one in the king's library at Paris, contain the story of Joan; but this has been ascertained to be an interpolation of later copyists, who have inserted the tale in the very words of Martinus Polonus, a Cistercian monk and confessor to Gregory X (latter part of the 12th century), who wrote the Lives of the Popes, in which, after Leo IV, he places “John, an Englishman,” and then adds, “Hic, ut asseritur, foemina fuit.” Other authorities for this story are Sigbert of Gemblours († 1113) and Stephen de Bourbon, who wrote about 1225.

According to these accounts, she was the daughter of an English missionary, was born at Mayence or Ingelheim, and was a woman of very loose morals. She is said to have removed to Fulda, and having there established an improper intimacy with a monk of the convent, assumed male attire, entered the convent, and afterwards eloped with her paramour, who was a very learned man, to Athens, where she applied herself to the study of Greek and the sciences under her lover's able directions. After the death of her companion she went to Rome, where she became equally proficient in sacred learning, for which her reputation became so great, under the assumed name of Johannes Anglicanus, that she easily obtained holy orders, and with such ability and adroitness clad the deception that at  the death of Leo she was unanimously elected as his successor, under the general belief of her male sex. Continuing to indulge in sexual intercourse, the fraud was finally discovered, to the infinite mortification of the Roman Church, by her sudden delivery of an infant in the public streets, near the Colosseum, while heading a religious procession to the Lateran Basilica. The mother and child died soon after, and were buried in 856. This event is said to have caused the adoption of the Sella stercoraria, which was in use from the middle of the 11th century to the time of Leo X, for the purpose of proving the sex of the popes elect.

The story was generally credited from the latter part of the 11th until the opening of the 16th century. All Church historians after Martinus generally copied it from him, and presented it as an authentic narrative. The first to doubt the accuracy of the story was Platina (1421-1481), who, although repeating it in his Lives of the Popes, concludes with these words: “The things I have above stated are current in vulgar reports, but are taken from uncertain and obscure authorities, and I have inserted them briefly and simply not to be taxed with obstinacy.” Panvinius, Platina's continuator, seems to have been more critical: he subjoins a very elaborate note, in which he shows the absurdity of the tale, and proves it to have been an invention. Later Roman Catholic writers, seeing the arguments which their opponents in doctrine obtained from this story against papal succession, took great pains to impeach its accuracy; but it is truly curious that the best dissertation on the subject is that of David Blondel, a Protestant, who completely refutes the story in his Familier Eclaircissement de la question si une Femine a ete assise au Siege Papal entre Leon IV et Benoit III (Amsterdam, 1649). He was followed on the same side by Leibnitz (Flores sparsi in tumulum Papissoe, in [Chr. L. Scheidt] Biblioth. Hist. [Götting. 1758], 1, 297 sq.), and, although attempts have been made from time to time by a few writers to maintain the tale (among which one of the most noted was a work published in 1785 by Humphrey Shuttleworth, entitled A Present for a Papist, or the History of the Life of Pope Joan, proving that a Woman called Joan really was Pope of Rome), it has been all but universally discarded, its latest patron being professor Kist, of Leyden, who but a few years since devoted an elaborate essay (Verhandeling over de Pausin Joanna) to the subject. Nearly all ecclesiastical writers of our day seem to be agreed that no feminine character ever filled the papal chair, but there is certainly a variety of opinions as to the causes which provoked the story. Some attribute it to a misconception of the object of the Sella  stercoraria; the canons excluded eunuchs from the papal throne, and the sella stercoraria was contrived to prove that the person elected fulfilled the requirements of the canons. Others consider it as a symbolical satire. Still others look upon it as a lampoon on the incontinence of the pope, John VIII; or, and perhaps more correctly, as a satire on the female regiment (under Marozia) during the popedom of John X-XII. See, for further details, Gieseler's Kirchengeschichte, vol. 2, pt. 1 (4th ed.), 29 sq.; also Wensing, Over de Pausin Joanna — in reply to Kist — (S'Gravenhage, 1845); Bianchi Giovini's Esame Critico degli atti relativi alla Papessa Giovanna (Milan, 1845) ; Bower, Hist. Popes, 4, 246 sq.; Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. der Kirchengesch. 2, 469 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 721; Christ. Examiner, 75, 197; Western Rev. April, 1864, p. 279. (J.H.W.)

## Joan Dalbret[[@Headword:Joan Dalbret]]

             SEE HUGUENOTS; FRANCE.

## Joan Of Arc[[@Headword:Joan Of Arc]]

             (French Jeanne d'Arc), or “the Maid of Orleans,” is the name of a character whose history concerns not only the secular historian; it deserves the careful consideration also of the ecclesiastical student. The remarkable fate of this heroine is truly a phenomenon in religious philosophy. We have room here, however, only for a short biographical sketch of the heroine, and refer the student to Böttiger, Weltgesch. in Biographien, 4, 474; Michelet, Hist. de France, 7, 44; Görres, Jungfrau v. Orleans (Regensb. 1834); Hase, Neue Propheten (Lpz. 1851); Strass, Jean d'Arc (1862); Eysell, Joh. d'Arc (1864); Locher, Schlaf u. Träume (Zurich, 1853); and especially (mainly on her visions, etc.) the celebrated German theologian of Bonn University, Dr. J. P. Lange, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 7, 165 sq.

Joan was the daughter of respectable peasants, and was born in 1412, in the village of Domremy, in the department of Vosges, France. She was taught, like other young women of her station in that age, to sew and to spin, but not to read and write. She was distinguished from other girls by her greater simplicity, modesty, industry, and piety. When about thirteen years of age she believed that she saw a flash of light, and heard an unearthly voice, which enjoined her to be modest, and to be diligent in her religious duties. The impression made upon her excitable mind by the national distresses of the time soon gave a new character to the revelations  which she supposed herself to receive, and when fifteen years old she imagined that unearthly voices called her to go and fight for the Dauphin. Her story was at first rejected as that of an insane person; but she not only succeeded in making her way to the Dauphin, but in persuading him of her heavenly mission. She assumed male attire and warlike equipments, and, with a sword and a white banner, she put herself at the head of the French troops, whom her example and the notion of her heavenly mission inspired with new enthusiasm. April 29, 1429, she threw herself, with supplies of provisions, into Orleans, then closely besieged by the English, and from the 4th to the 8th of May made successful sallies upon the English, and finally compelled them to raise the siege. After this important victory the national ardor of the French was rekindled to the utmost, and Joan became the dread of the previously triumphant enemy. She conducted the Dauphin to Rheims, where he was crowned, July 17, 1429, and Joan, with many tears, saluted him as king. She now wished to return home, deeming her mission accomplished; but Charles importuned her to remain with his army, to which she consented.

Now, however, because she no longer heard any unearthly voice, she began to have fearful forebodings. She continued to accompany the French army, and was present in many conflicts. May 24, 1430, while heading a sally from Compiegne, which the Burgundian forces were besieging, she was taken prisoner and sold by a Burgundian officer to the English for the sum of 16,000 francs. Being conveyed to Rouen, the headquarters of the English, she was brought before the spiritual tribunal of the bishop of Beauvais as a sorceress and heretic; and after a long trial, accompanied with many shameful circumstances, of which perhaps the most astounding is the fact that her own countrymen, and the most learned of these, representing the University of Paris, pronounced her under the influence of witchcraft. By their advice, she was condemned to be burned to death. Recanting her alleged errors, her punishment was commuted into perpetual imprisonment. But the English feared her, and determined at all hazards to sacrifice her life, and they finally succeeded in renewing the trial; words which fell from her when subjected to great indignities, and her resumption of male attire when all articles of female dress were carefully removed from her, were made grounds of concluding that she had relapsed, and she was brought to the stake May 30, 1431, and burned, and her ashes cast into the Seine. Her family, who had been ennobled on her account, obtained in 1440 a revisal of her trial, and in 1456 she was formally pronounced by the highest ecclesiastical authorities to have been innocent. The doubts respecting the fate of Joan d'Arc raised by M. Delapierre in his  Doute historique (1855), who is inclined to think that she never suffered martyrdom, and that another person was executed in her stead, seem to have no good ground;

## Joan Of Kent (Joan Bocher)[[@Headword:Joan Of Kent (Joan Bocher)]]

             a female character who flourished in the first half of the 16th century, and who was condemned to death as a heretic, April 25, 1552, for holding the doctrine that “Christ was not truly incarnate of the Virgin, whose flesh, being sinful, he could not partake of; but the Word, by the consent of the inward man in the Virgin, took flesh of her.” This scholastic nicety appalled all the grandees of the English Church, including even Cranmer, who, finding the king slow to approve the condemnation of Joan of Kent, presented to the sovereign the practice of the Jewish Church in stoning blasphemers as a counterpart of the duty of the head of the English Church, and secured the king's approval for the execution of the poor woman, who “could not reconcile the spotless purity of Christ's human nature with his receiving flesh from a sinful creature.” See Neal, Puritans, 1, 49; Strype, Memorials of the Reformation, 2, 214.

## Joan Of Valois, Saint and queen[[@Headword:Joan Of Valois, Saint and queen]]

             was the daughter of Louis XI of France and Charlotte of Savoy, and was born in 1456. She was plain in face and somewhat deformed, and her father, who wished a son, treated her with contempt. This dislike increased, until on one occasion the king rushed into the room to kill her, and her life was only saved by the countess of Linieres. In her twelfth year Joan was married against her will to duke Louis of Orleans, who also treated her with coldness and contempt. Louis XI died in August 1483, and his son succeeded him as Charles VIII, under the regency of his elder sister Anne. The husband of Joan, thinking the regency ought to have been intrusted to him, endeavored to stir up an insurrection, was unsuccessful, and fled to Francis II of Brittany the bitter foe of France. War broke out, and Joan stood as an angel of peace and reconciliation between the contending parties. Twice she obtained pardon for her captured husband, and he as often returned to his perfidy. After the death of Charles VIII, April 7, 1498, the duke of Orleans ascended the throne a Louis XII. He at once obtained a divorce from pope Alexander VI, by taking an oath that his marriage with Joan was not complete. He gave her the duchy of Berry and Pontoise. She resided at Bourges, where she spent time and revenues in the exercise of charity. In 1500 she founded the order of the Annunciation for women. Joan took the habit herself in 1504, but died February 4, 1505, and was buried at Bourges. Her body was torn from its resting-place in 1562, and burned by Calvinists. She is commemorated in the French martyrology on February 4. Her canonization began under Clement XII, and was completed by Pius VI, in 1775, but she was venerated at Bourges from the time of her death. See Baring-Gould, Lives of the Saints, 2:109.

## Joanes (Or Juanes),Vicente[[@Headword:Joanes (Or Juanes),Vicente]]

             a celebrated Spanish painter whose subjects are exclusively religious, was born at Fuente la Higuera, in Valencia, in 1523. He studied in Italy, and, as we may infer from his style, chiefly the works of the Roman school, and died Dec. 21, 1579, while engaged in finishing the altar piece of the church of Bocairente. His body was removed to Valencia, and deposited in the church of Santa Cruz in 1581. Joanes was one of the best of the Spanish painters: he is acknowledged as the head of the school of Valencia, and is sometimes termed the Spanish Raffaelle. His drawing is correct, and displays many successful examples of foreshortening; his draperies are well cast, his coloring is sombre (he was particularly fond of mulberry color), and his expression is mostly in perfect accordance with his subject, which is generally devotion or impassioned resignation, as in the “Baptism of Christ” in the cathedral of Valencia. Like his countrymen Vargas and D'Amato of Naples, he is said to have always taken the sacrament before  he commenced an altar piece. His best works are in the cathedral of Valencia, and there are several good specimens in the Prado at Madrid.

## Joanna[[@Headword:Joanna]]

             the name of a man (prop. Joannas) and also of a woman in the New Testament.

1. (Ι᾿ωαννᾶς, probably. i.q. Ι᾿ωάννης, JOHN.) The (great) grandson of Zerubbabel, in the lineage of Christ (Luk 3:27); probably the same called ARNAN in the Old Testament (1Ch 3:21. See Strong's Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 16, 17). B.C. considerably post 536. SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

2. (Ι᾿ωάννα, prob. femin. of Ιωάννης, John.) The wife of Chuza, the steward of Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee (Luk 8:3). She was one of those women who followed Christ, and ministered to the wants of him and his disciples out of their abundance. They had all been cured of grievous diseases by the Savior, or had received material benefits from him; and the customs of the country allowed them to testify in this way their gratitude and devotedness without reproach. It is usually supposed that Joanna was at this time a widow. She was one of the females to whom Christ appeared after his resurrection (Luk 24:10). A.D. 27-29.

## Joannan[[@Headword:Joannan]]

             (Ι᾿ωαννάν v.r. Ι᾿ωάννης),

the eldest brother of Judas Maccabaeus (1Ma 2:2); elsewhere called JOHN SEE JOHN (q.v.).

## Joannes[[@Headword:Joannes]]

             SEE JOHN.

## Joarib[[@Headword:Joarib]]

             (Ι᾿ωαρίβ v.r. Ι᾿ωαρείμ), a Graecized form (1Ma 2:1) of the name of the priest JEHOIARIB (1Ch 24:7).

## Joasaf I[[@Headword:Joasaf I]]

             the fourth Russian patriarch, was elected February 6, 1634, and died November 28, 1642. He left a ritual, containing the synodal statutes of his predecessor Philaret. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Joasaf II[[@Headword:Joasaf II]]

             the sixth patriarch of Russia, was raised to that dignity December 29, 1667. He assembled, in the first year of his patriarchate, a council to anathematize the sectaries; at this council were present Paisi, the patriarch of Alexandria and Macarius of Antioch; its principal motions are inscribed in the Slorngebuik, or missal of 1668. There are extant of his works, a pastoral letter (1668): — another directed to the sectaries, entitled Gezl Pravlenia (reprinted in 1753): — an Instruction on the Manner of Painting the Images (1668): — and another on The Manner of Behaving One's Self at the Church (reprinted at Moscow in 1786). He died February 17, 1672. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Joash[[@Headword:Joash]]

             (Heb. Yoäsh', the name of several persons, written in two forms in the original.  1. (יוֹאָשׁ, a contracted form of JEHOASH; Septuag. Ι᾿ωάς) The father of Gideon, buried in Ophrah where he had lived (Jdg 6:11; Jdg 6:29; Jdg 7:14; Jdg 8:13; Jdg 8:29; Jdg 8:32). Although himself probably an idolater, he ingeniously screened his son from the popular indignation in overthrowing the altar of Baal (Jdg 6:30-31). B.C. 1362. SEE GIDEON.

2. (Same form as preceding; Sept. Ι᾿ωράς v.r. Ι᾿ωάς) A son of Shemaah or Hasmaah the Gibeathite, and second only to his brother Ahiezer among the brave Benjamite archers that joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:3). B.C. 1055.

3. (Same form as preceding; Sept. Ι᾿ωάς) One of the descendants of Shelah, son of Judah, mentioned among those who were in some way distinguished among the Moabites in early times (1Ch 4:22). B.C. perh. cir. 995. SEE JASHUBI-LEHEM. “The Hebrew tradition, quoted by Jerome (Quoest. Hebr. in Paral.) and Jarchi (Comm. ad loc.), applies it to Mahlon, the son of Elimelech, who married a Moabitess. The expression rendered in the A.V., ‘who had the dominion (בָּעֲלוּ) in Moab,' would, according to this interpretation, signify ‘who married in Moab.' The same explanation is given in the Targum of R. Joseph.”

4. (Same form as preceding; Sept. Ι᾿ωάς) An eminent officer of king Ahab, to whose close custody the prophet Micaiah was remanded for denouncing the allied expedition against Ramoth-Gilead (1Ki 22:26; 2Ch 18:25). B.C. 896. He is styled “the king's son,” which is usually taken literally, Thenius (Comment. ad loc., in Kings) suggesting that he may have been placed with the governor of the city for military education. Geiger conjectures that Maaseiah, “the king's son,” in 2Ch 28:7, was a prince of the Moloch worship, and that Joash was a priest of the same. (Urschrift, p. 307). The title, however, may merely indicate a youth of princely stock.

5. (Same form as preceding: Sept. Ι᾿ωάς) King of Judah (2Ki 11:2; 2Ki 12:19-20; 2Ki 13:1; 2Ki 13:10; 2Ki 14:1; 2Ki 14:3; 2Ki 14:17; 2Ki 14:23; 1Ch 3:11; 2Ch 22:11; 2Ch 24:1 [יאֹשׁ], 2, 4, 22, 24; 25:23, 25). SEE JEHOASH, 1.

6. (Same form as preceding; Sept. Ι᾿ωάς) King of Israel (2Ki 13:9; 2Ki 13:12-14; 2Ki 13:25; 2Ki 14:1; 2Ki 14:23; 2Ki 14:27; 2Ch 25:17-18; 2Ch 25:21; 2Ch 25:23; Hos 1:1; Amo 1:1). SEE JEHOASH, 2.

7. (יוֹעָשׁ, to whom Jehovah hastens, i.e. for aid; Sept. Ι᾿ωάς.) One of the “sons” of Becher, son of Benjamin, a chieftain of his family (1Ch 7:8). B.C. prob. cir. 1017.

8. (Same form as last; Septuag. Ι᾿ωάς.) The person having charge of the royal stores of oil under David and Solomon (1Ch 27:28). B.C. 1014.

## Joatham[[@Headword:Joatham]]

             (Mat 1:19). SEE JOTHAM.

## Job[[@Headword:Job]]

             the name of two persons, of different form in the original.

1. (אַיּוֹב, Iyob', persecuted; Sept. and N.T. 1ώβ.) An Arabian patriarch and hero of the book that bears his name; mentioned elsewhere only in Eze 14:14; Eze 14:20; James 5, 11. The various theological, moral, and philosophical questions connected with his history are involved in the discussion of the poem itself, and we therefore treat them in considerable detail in that connection, aside from their critical bearings.

I. Analysis of Contents. —

1. The Introduction (Job 1:1-2; Job 1:10) supplies all the facts on which the argument is based. Job, a chieftain in the land of Uz (apparently a district of Northern Arabia — see Uz), of immense wealth and high rank, is represented to us as a man of perfect integrity, and blameless in all the relations of life. The highest goodness and the most perfect temporal happiness are combined in his person; under the protection of God, surrounded by a numerous family, he enjoys in advanced life (from Job 42:16 it has been inferred that he was about seventy years old at this time), an almost paradisiacal state, exemplifying the normal results of human obedience to the will of a righteous God.

One question, however, could be raised by envy: May not the goodness which secures such direct and tangible rewards be a refined form of selfishness? In the world of spirits, where all the mysteries of existence are brought to light, Satan, the accusing angel, suggests this doubt, and boldly asserts that if those external blessings were withdrawn Job would cast off his allegiance. The question thus distinctly propounded is obviously of infinite importance, and could only be answered by inflicting upon a man, in whom, while prosperous, malice itself could detect no evil, the calamities which are the due, and were then believed to be invariably the results, even in this life, of wickedness. The accuser receives permission to make the trial. He destroys Job's property, then his children; and afterwards, to leave no possible opening for a cavil, is allowed to inflict upon him the most terrible disease known in the East. SEE JOBS DISEASE.

Each of these calamities assumes a form which produces an impression that it must be a visitation from God, precisely such as was to be expected, supposing that the patriarch had been a successful hypocrite, reserved for the day of wrath. Job's wife breaks down entirely under the trial — in the very words which Satan had anticipated that the patriarch himself would at last utter in his despair, she counsels him “to curse God and die.” (The Sept. has a remarkable addition to her speech at Job 2:9, severely reproaching him as the cause of her bereavements.) Job remains steadfast. The destruction of his property draws not from him a word of complaint; the death of his children elicits the sublimest words of resignation which ever fell from the lips of a mourner — the disease which made him an object of loathing to man, and seemed to designate him as a visible example of divine wrath, is borne without a murmur; he repels his wife's suggestion with the simple words, “What! shall we receive good at the hand of the Lord, and shall we not receive evil?” “In all this Job did not sin with his lips.”

2. The Controversy (Job 2:11-13). — Still it is clear that, had the poem ended here, many points of deep interest would have been left in obscurity. Entire as was the submission of Job, he must have been inwardly perplexed by events to which he had no clue, which were quite unaccountable on any hypothesis hitherto entertained, and seemed repugnant to the ideas of justice engraven on man's heart. It was also most desirable that the impressions made upon the generality of men by sudden and unaccountable calamities should be thoroughly discussed, and that a broader and firmer basis than heretofore should be found for speculations concerning the providential government of the world. An opportunity for such discussion is afforded in the most natural manner by the introduction of three men representing the wisdom and experience of the age, who came to condole with Job on hearing of his misfortunes. Some time appears to have elapsed in the interim, during which the disease had made formidable progress, and Job had thoroughly realized the extent of his misery. The meeting is described with singular beauty. At a distance they greet him with the wild demonstrations of sympathizing grief usual in the East; coming near, they are overpowered by the sight of his wretchedness, and sit seven days and seven nights without uttering a word (Job 2:11-13). This awful silence, whether Job felt it as a proof of real sympathy, or as an indication of inward suspicion on their part, drew out all his anguish. In an agony of desperation he curses the day of his birth, and sees and hopes for no end of his misery but death (ch. 3).

This causes a discussion between him and his friends (ch. 4-31), which is divided into three main parts, each with subdivisions, embracing alternately the speeches of the three friends of Job and his answers: the last part, however, consists of only two subdivisions, the third friend, Zophar, having nothing to rejoin; a silence by which the author of the book generally designates the defeat of Job's friends, who are defending a common cause. (It has, however, been argued with much force by Wemyss, that some derangement has occurred in the order of the composition; for Job 27:13-23, appears to contain Zophar's third address to Job, while ch. 28 seems to be the conclusion of the whole book, containing the moral, added perhaps by some later hand.) But see below, § 5.

(a.) The results of the first discussion (chap. Job 3-14) may be thus summed up. We have on the part of Job's friends a theory of the divine government resting upon an exact and uniform correlation between sin and punishment (Job 4:6; Job 4:11, and throughout). Afflictions are always penal, issuing in  the destruction of those who are radically opposed to God, or who do not submit to his chastisements. They lead, of course, to correction and amendment of life when the sufferer repents, confesses his sins, puts them away, and turns to God. In that case restoration to peace, and even increased prosperity, may be expected (Job 5:17-27). Still the fact of the suffering always proves the commission of some special sin, while the demeanor of the sufferer indicates the true internal relation between him and God.

These principles are applied by them to the case of Job. They are, in the first place, scandalized by the vehemence of his complaints, and when they find that he maintains his freedom from willful or conscious sin, they are driven to the conclusion that his faith is radically unsound; his protestations appear to them almost blasphemous; they become convinced that he has been secretly guilty of some unpardonable sin, and their tone, at first courteous, though warning (compare ch. Job 4 with ch. Job 15), becomes stern, and even harsh and menacing. It is clear that, unless they are driven from their partial and exclusive theory, they must be led on to an unqualified condemnation of Job.

In this part of the dialogue the character of the three friends is clearly developed. Eliphaz represents the true patriarchal chieftain, grave and dignified, and erring only from an exclusive adherence to tenets hitherto unquestioned, and influenced in the first place by genuine regard for Job and sympathy with his affliction. Bildad, without much originality or independence of character, reposes partly on the wise saws of antiquity, partly on the authority of his older friend. Zophar differs from both: he seems to be a young man; his language is violent, and at times even coarse and offensive (see, especially, his second speech, ch. Job 20). He represents the prejudiced and narrow-minded bigots of his age.

In order to do justice to the position and arguments of Job, it must be borne in mind that the direct object of the trial was to ascertain whether he would deny or forsake God, and that his real integrity is asserted by God himself. His answers throughout correspond with these data. He knows with a sure inward conviction that he is not an offender in the sense of his opponents: he is therefore confident that, whatever may be the object of the afflictions for which he cannot account, God knows that he is innocent. This consciousness, which from the nature of things cannot be tested by others, enables him to examine fearlessly their position. He denies the  assertion that punishment follows surely on guilt, or proves its commission. Appealing boldly to experience, he declares that, in point of fact, prosperity and misfortune are not always or generally commensurate; both are often irrespective of man's deserts; “the tabernacles of robbers prosper, and they that provoke God are secure” (Job 12:6). In the government of Providence he can see but one point clearly, viz. that all events and results are absolutely in God's hand (Job 12:9-25), but as for the principles which underlie those events he knows nothing. In fact, he is sure that his friends are equally uninformed, and are sophists defending their position, out of mere prejudice, by arguments and statements false in themselves and doubly offensive to God, being hypocritically advanced in his defense (Job 13:1-13). Still he doubts not that God is just, and although he cannot see how or when that justice can be manifested, he feels confident that his innocence must be recognized. “Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him; he also will be my salvation” (Job 13:14; Job 13:16). There remains, then, but one course open to him, and that he takes. He turns to supplication, implores God to give him a fair and open trial (Job 13:18-28). Admitting his liability to such sins as are common to man, being unclean by birth (Job 13:26; Job 14:4), he yet protests his substantial innocence, and in the bitter struggle with his misery he first meets the thought which is afterwards developed with remarkable distinctness. Believing that with death all hope connected with this world ceases, he prays that he may be hidden in the grave (Job 14:13), and there reserved for the day when God will try his cause and manifest himself in love (Job 14:15). This prayer represents but a dim, yet a profound and true presentiment, drawn forth, then evidently for the first time, as the possible solution of the dark problem. As for a renewal of life here, he dreams not of it (Job 14:14), nor will he allow that the possible restoration or prosperity of his descendants at all meets the exigencies of his case (Job 14:21-22).

(b.) In the second discussion (ch. 15-21) there is a more resolute, elaborate attempt on the part of Job's friends to vindicate their theory of retributive justice. This requires an entire overthrow of the position taken by Job. They cannot admit his innocence. The fact that his calamities are unparalleled proves to them that there must be something quite unique in his guilt. Eliphaz (ch. 15), who, as usual, lays down the basis of the argument, does not now hesitate to impute to Job the worst crimes of which man could be guilty. His defense is blasphemous, and proves that he is quite godless; that he disregards the wisdom of age and experience,  denies the fundamental truths of religion (Job 15:3-16), and by his rebellious struggles (Job 15:25-27) against God deserves every calamity which can befall him (Job 15:28-30). Bildad (ch. 18) takes up this suggestion of ungodliness, and, after enlarging upon the inevitable results of all iniquity, concludes that the special evils which had come upon Job, such as agony of heart, ruin of home, destruction of family, are peculiarly the penalties due to one who is without God. Zophar (ch. 20) draws the further inference that a sinner's sufferings must needs be proportioned to his former enjoyments (Job 20:5-14), and his losses to his former gains (Job 20:15-19), and thus not only accounts for Job's present calamities, but menaces him with still greater evils (Job 20:20-22).

In answer, Job recognizes the hand of God in his afflictions (Job 16:7-16, and Job 19:6-20), but rejects the charge of ungodliness; he has never forsaken his Maker, and never ceased to pray. This, being a matter of inward consciousness, cannot of course be proved. He appeals therefore directly to earth and heaven: “My witness is in heaven, and my record is on high” (Job 16:19). The train of thought thus suggested carries him much further in the way towards the great truth — that since in this life the righteous certainly are not saved from evil, it follows that their ways are watched and their sufferings recorded, with a view to a future and perfect manifestation of the divine justice. This view becomes gradually brighter and more definite as the controversy proceeds (Job 16:18-19; Job 17:8-9, and perhaps 13-16), and at last finds expression in a strong and clear declaration of his conviction that at the latter day (evidently that day which Job had expressed a longing to see, Job 14:12-14) God will personally manifest himself as his nearest kinsman or avenger SEE GOEL, and that he, Job, although in a disembodied state (מַבְּשָׂרַי, without my flesh). should survive in spirit to witness this posthumous vindication, a pledge of which had already often been given him (עֵינִי רָאוּ) — he, notwithstanding the destruction of his skin, i.e. the outward man, retaining or recovering his personal identity (Job 19:25-27). There can be no doubt that Job here virtually anticipates the final answer to all difficulties supplied by the Christian revelation.

On the other hand, stung by the harsh and narrow minded bigotry of his opponents, Job draws out (chap. 21) with terrible force the undeniable fact that, from the beginning to the end of their lives, ungodly men, avowed atheists (Job 19:14-15), persons, in fact, guilty of the very crimes imputed,  out of mere conjecture, to himself, frequently enjoy great and unbroken prosperity. From this he draws the inference, which he states in a very unguarded manner, and in a tone calculated to give just offense, that an impenetrable veil hangs over the temporal dispensations of God.

(c.) In the third dialogue (chap. 22-31) no real progress is made by Job's opponents. They will not give up and cannot defend their position. Eliphaz (ch. 22) makes a last effort, and raises one new point which he states with some ingenuity. The station in which Job was formerly placed presented temptations to certain crimes; the punishments which he undergoes are precisely such as might be expected had those crimes been committed; hence he infers they actually were committed. The tone of this discourse thoroughly harmonizes with the character of Eliphaz. He could scarcely come to a different conclusion without surrendering his fundamental principles; and he urges with much dignity and impressiveness the exhortations and warnings which in his opinion were needed. Bildad has nothing to add but a few solemn words on the incomprehensible majesty of God and the nothingness of man. Zophar, the most violent and least rational of the three, is put to silence, and retires from the contest (unless we adopt the above suggestion of a transposition of the text).

In his last two discourses Job does not alter his position, nor, properly speaking, adduce any new argument, but he states with incomparable force and eloquence the chief points which he regards as established (ch. 26). All creation is confounded by the majesty and might of God; man catches but a faint echo of God's word, and is baffled in the attempt to comprehend his ways. He then (ch. 27) describes even more completely than his opponents had done the destruction which, as a rule, ultimately falls upon the hypocrite, and which he certainly would deserve if he were hypocritically to disguise the truth concerning himself, and deny his own integrity. He thus recognizes what was true in his opponents' arguments, and corrects his own hasty and unguarded statements. Then follows (chap. 28) the grand description of Wisdom, and the declaration that human wisdom does not consist in exploring the hidden and inscrutable ways of God, but in the fear of the Lord, and in turning away from evil. The remainder of this discourse (ch. 29-31) contains a singularly beautiful description of his former life, contrasted with his actual misery, together with a full vindication of his character from all the charges made or insinuated by his opponents.  Taking a general view of the argument thus far, Job's three friends may be considered as asserting the following positions:

(1.) No man being free from sin, we need not wonder that we are liable to calamities, for which we must account by a reference, not to God, but to ourselves. From the misery of the distressed, others are enabled to infer their guilt; and they must take this view in order to vindicate divine justice,

(2.) The distress of a man proves not only that he has sinned, but shows also the degree and measure of his sin; and thus, from the extent of calamity sustained, may be inferred the extent of sins committed, and from this the measure of impending misfortune.

(3.) A distressed man may recover his former happiness, and even attain to greater fortune than he ever enjoyed before, if he takes a warning from his afflictions, repents of his sins, reforms his life, and raises himself to a higher degree of moral rectitude. Impatience and irreverent expostulation with God serve but to prolong and increase punishment; for, by accusing God of injustice, a fresh sin is added to former transgressions.

(4.) Though the wicked man is capable of prosperity, still it is never lasting. The most awful retribution soon overtakes him; and his transient felicity must itself be considered as punishment, since it renders him heedless, and makes him feel misfortune more keenly.

In opposition to them, Job maintains:

(1.) The most upright man may be highly unfortunate — more so than the inevitable faults and shortcomings of human nature would seem to imply. There is a savage cruelty, deserving the severities of the divine resentment, in inferring the guilt of a man from his distresses. In distributing good and evil, God regards neither merit nor guilt, but acts according to his sovereign pleasure. His omnipotence is apparent in every part of the creation, but his justice cannot be seen in the government of the world; the afflictions of the righteous, as well as the prosperity of the wicked, are evidence against it. There are innumerable cases, and Job considers his own to be one of them, in which a sufferer has a right to justify himself before God, and to appeal to some other explanation of his decrees. Of this right Job freely avails himself, and maintains it against his friends.

(2.) In a state of composure and calmer reflection, Job qualifies, chiefly in his concluding speech, some of his former rather extravagant assertions,  and says that, although God generally afflicts the wicked, and blesses the righteous, still there are exceptions to this rule, single cases in which the pious undergo severe trials; the inference, therefore, of a man's guilt from his misfortunes is by no means warranted. For the exceptions established by experience prove that God does not always distribute prosperity and adversity after this rule, but that he sometimes acts on a different principle, or as an absolute lord, according to his mere will and pleasure.

(3.) Humbly to adore God is our duty, even when we are subject to calamities not at all deserved; but we should abstain from harshly judging of those who, when distressed, seem to send forth complaints against God.

3. Thus ends the discussion, in which it is evident both parties had partially failed. Job has been betrayed into very hazardous statements, while his friends had been on the one hand disingenuous, on the other bigoted, harsh, and pitiless. The points which had been omitted, or imperfectly developed, are now taken up by a new interlocutor (ch. 32-37), who argues the justice of the divine administration both from the nature of the dispensations allotted to man, and from the essential character of God himself. Elihu, a young man, descended from a collateral branch of the family of Abraham, has listened in indignant silence to the arguments of his elders (Job 32:7), and, impelled by an inward inspiration, he now addresses himself to both parties in the discussion, and specially to Job. He shows, first, that they had accused Job upon false or insufficient grounds, and failed to convict him, or to vindicate God's justice. Job, again, had assumed his entire innocence, and had arraigned that justice (Job 33:9-11). These errors he traces to their both overlooking one main object of all suffering. God speaks to man by chastisement (Job 33:14; Job 33:19-22) — warns him, teaches him self-knowledge and humility (Job 33:16-17) — and prepares him (Job 33:23) by the mediation of a spiritual interpreter (the angel Jehovah of Genesis) to implore and to obtain pardon (Job 33:24), renewal of life (Job 33:25), perfect access and restoration (Job 33:26). This statement does not involve any charge of special guilt, such as the friends had alleged and Job had repudiated. Since the warning and suffering are preventive as well as remedial, the visitation anticipates the commission of sin; it saves man from pride, and other temptations of wealth and power, and it effects the real object of all divine interpositions, the entire submission to God's will. Again, Elihu argues (Job 34:10-17) that any charge of injustice, direct or implicit, against God involves a contradiction in terms. God is the only source of justice; the very idea of justice is derived from his governance of  the universe, the principle of which is love. In his absolute knowledge God sees all secrets, and by his absolute power he controls all events, and that for the one end of bringing righteousness to light (Job 34:21-30). Man has, of course, no claim upon God; what he receives is purely a matter of grace (Job 35:6-9). The occasional appearance of unanswered prayer (Job 35:9), when evil seems to get the upper hand, is owing merely to the fact that man prays in a proud and insolent spirit (Job 35:12-13). Job may look to his heart, and he will see if that is true of himself.

Job is silent, and Elihu proceeds (ch. 36) to show that the almightiness of God is not, as Job seems to assert, associated with any contempt or neglect of his creatures. Job, by ignoring this truth, has been led into grave error, and terrible danger (Job 35:12; comp. 18), but God is still drawing him, and if he yields and follows he will yet be delivered. The rest of the discourse brings out forcibly the lessons taught by the manifestations of goodness as well as greatness in creation. Indeed, the great object of all natural phenomena is to teach men—”Who teacheth like him?” This part differs from Job's magnificent description of the mystery and majesty of God's works, inasmuch as it indicates a clearer recognition of a loving purpose — and from the address of the Lord which follows, by its discursive and argumentative tone. The last words are evidently spoken while a violent storm is coming on, in which Elihu views the signs of a Theophany, such as cannot fail to produce an intense realization of the nothingness of man before God.

4. The Almighty's Response. — From the preceding analysis it is obvious that many weighty truths have been developed in the course of the discussion — nearly every theory of the objects and uses of suffering has been reviewed — while a great advance has been made towards the apprehension of doctrines hereafter to be revealed, such as were known only to God. But the mystery is not as yet really cleared up. The position of the three original opponents is shown to be untenable — the views of Job himself to be but imperfect — while even Elihu gives not the least intimation that he recognizes one special object of calamity. In the case of Job, as we are expressly told, that object was to try his sincerity, and to demonstrate that goodness, integrity in all relations, and devout faith in God can exist independent of external circumstances. This object never occurs to the mind of any one of the interlocutors, nor could it be proved without a revelation. On the other hand, the exact amount of censure due to Job for the excesses into which he had been betrayed, and to his three  opponents for their harshness and want of candor, could only be awarded by an omniscient Judge.

Accordingly, from the midst of the storm, Jehovah, whom Job had several times vehemently challenged by appeal to decide the contest, now speaks. In language of incomparable grandeur he reproves and silences the murmurs of Job. God does not condescend, strictly speaking, to argue with his creatures. The speculative questions discussed in the colloquy are unnoticed, but the declaration of God's absolute power is illustrated by a marvelously beautiful and comprehensive survey of the glory of creation, and his all-embracing providence by reference to the phenomena of the animal kingdom. He who would argue with the Lord must understand at least the objects for which instincts so strange and manifold are given to the beings far below man in gifts and powers. This declaration suffices to bring Job to a right mind: he confesses his inability to comprehend; and therefore to answer his Maker (Job 40:3-4). A second address completes the work. It proves that a charge of injustice against God involves the consequence that the accuser is more competent than he to rule the universe. He should then be able to control, to punish, to reduce all creatures to order — but he cannot even subdue the monsters of the irrational creation. Baffled by leviathan and behemoth, how can he hold the reins of government, how contend with him who made and rules them all?

5. Job's unreserved submission terminates the trial (ch. 38-12. There is probably another transposition at Job 40:1-14, which belongs after Job 42:1-6). He expresses deep contrition, not, of course, for sins falsely imputed to him, but for the bitterness and arrogance which had characterized some portion of his complaints. In the rebuke then addressed to Job's opponents the integrity of his character is distinctly recognized, while they are condemned for untruth, which, inasmuch as it was not willful, but proceeded from a real but narrow minded conviction of the divine justice, is pardoned on the intercession of Job. The restoration of his external prosperity, which is an inevitable result of God's personal manifestation, symbolizes the ultimate compensation of the righteous for all sufferings undergone upon earth.

II. Design of the Book. —

1. From this analysis it may seem clear that certain views concerning the general object of the book are partial or erroneous.

a. It cannot be the object of the writer to prove that there is no connection between guilt and sorrow, or that the old orthodox doctrine of retribution was radically unsound. Job himself recognizes the general truth of the doctrine, which is, in fact, confirmed by his ultimate restoration to happiness.

b. Nor is the development of the great doctrine of a future state the primary object. It would not, in that case, have been passed over in Job's last discourse, in the speech of Elihu, or in the address of the Lord God. In fact; critics who hold that view admit that the doctrine is rather suggested than developed, and amounts to scarcely more than a hope, a presentiment, at the most a subjective conviction of a truth first fully revealed by him “who brought life and immortality to light.” (See Pareau, De Immortalitatis notis in libro Jobi, Devent. 1807.) The cardinal truth of the immortality of the soul is, indeed, clearly implied throughout Job's reasoning, as it is elsewhere assumed in the O.T. (comp. Mat 22:32); and this thought, in fact, constitutes the afflicted patriarch's ground of consolation and trust, especially in that sublime passage (Mat 19:25-27) where he expresses his confidence in his posthumous vindication, which could be of no satisfaction unless his spirit should survive to witness it. Yet this belief is nowhere carried out at length, as would have been the case had this been the main theme of the epopee. Much less is the later doctrine of the resurrection of the body contained in the poem. SEE RESURRECTION.

c. On the doctrine of future retribution, see below. SEE FUTURE LIFE; SEE IMMORTALITY.

2. It may be granted that the primary design of the poem is that which is distinctly intimated in the introduction, and confirmed in the conclusion, namely, to show the effects of calamity in its worst and most awful form upon a truly religious spirit. Job is no Stoic, no Titan (Ewald, p. 26), struggling rebelliously against God; no Prometheus victim of a jealous and unrelenting Deity: he is a suffering man, acutely sensitive to all impressions inward and outward, grieved by the loss of wealth, position, domestic happiness, the respect of his countrymen, dependents, and followers, tortured by a loathsome, incurable, and all but unendurable disease, and stung to an agony of grief and passion by the insinuations of conscious guilt and hypocrisy. Under such provocation, being wholly without a clue to the cause of his misery, and hopeless of restoration to happiness on earth, he is shaken to the utmost, and driven almost to desperation. Still in  the center of his being he remains firm and unmoved — with an intense consciousness of his own integrity — without a doubt as to the power, wisdom, truth, or absolute justice of God, and therefore awaiting with longing expectation the final judgment which he is assured must come and bring him deliverance. The representation of such a character, involving the discomfiture of man's great enemy, and the development of the manifold problems which such a spectacle suggests to men of imperfect knowledge, but of thoughtful and inquiring mind, is the more direct object of the writer, who, like all great spirits of the ancient world, dealt less with abstract propositions than with the objective realities of existence. Such is the impression naturally made by the book, and which is recognized more distinctly in proportion as the reader grasps the tenor of the arguments, and realizes the characters and events.

3. Still, beyond and beneath this outward and occasional design there evidently lies a grander problem, which has exercised the reflection of all pious and considerate minds, and which we know was vividly pressed upon the contemplation even of the Oriental saint of early times (Psalms 37). Hence the nearly unanimous voice of critics and readers has decided that the ultimate object of the book is the consideration of the question how the afflictions of the righteous and the prosperity of the wicked can be consistent with God's justice. But it should be observed that the direct problem exclusively refers to the first point, the second being only incidentally discussed on occasion of the leading theme. If this is overlooked, the author would appear to have solved only one half of his problem: the case from which the whole discussion proceeds has reference merely to the leading problem.

There is another fundamental error which has led nearly all modern interpreters to a mistaken idea of the design of this book. They assume that the problem could be satisfactorily solved only when the doctrine of retribution in another life had been first established, which had not been done by the author of the book of Job: a perfect solution of the question was therefore not to be expected from him. Some assert that his solution is erroneous, since retribution, to be expected in a future world, is transferred by him to this life; others say that he cut the knot which he could not unloose, and has been satisfied to ask for implicit submission and devotedness, showing at the same time that every attempt at a solution must lead to dangerous positions: blind resignation, therefore, was the short meaning of the lengthened discussion. Upon the doctrine of  retribution after death our author does not enter; but that he knew it may be inferred from several passages with great probability; as, for instance, 14:14, “If a man die, shall he live again? All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come.” The if here shows that the writer had been before engaged in considering the subject of life after death; and when such is the case, a pious mind will necessarily indulge the hope, or will, at least, have an obscure presentiment of immortality. The truth also of God's undoubted grace, on which the doctrine of immortality is based, will be found clearly laid down in chap. 19. Still the author does not recur to this hope for the purpose of solving his problem; he did not intend in his discussion to exceed the limits of what God had clearly revealed, and this was in his time confined to the vague notion of life continued after death. but not connected with rewards and punishments. From these considerations it appears that those interpreters who, with Bernstein, De Wette, and Umbreit, assume that the book of Job was of a skeptical nature, and intended to dispute the doctrine of retribution as laid down in the other books of the Old Testament, have entirely misunderstood it.

On nearer examination, however, it appears that the doctrine of retribution after death is not of itself alone calculated to lead to a solution of the problem. The belief in a final judgment is firm and rational only when it rests in the belief in God's continued providential government of the world, and in his acting as sovereign Lord in all the events of human life. Temporary injustice is still injustice, and destroys the idea of a holy and just God. A God who has something to redress is no God at all. Even the ancient heathen perceived that future awards would not vindicate incongruities in divine providence here (see Barth, Notes to Claudian, 1078 sq.). God's just retribution in this world is extolled throughout the Old Testament. The New Testament holds out to the righteous promises of a future life, as well as of the present; and our Savior himself, in setting forth the rewards of those who, for his sake, forsook everything, begins with this life (Mat 19:29). A nearer examination of the benedictions contained in the Sermon on the Mount (Matthew 5) shows that none of them exclusively refer to future blessings; the judgment of the wicked is in his view proceeding without interruption, and therefore his examples of the distribution of divine justice in this world are mingled with those of requital in a future order of things. The Galilaeans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their own sacrifices (Luk 13:1), were in Christ's opinion not accidentally killed; and he threatens those who would not repent that they  should in like manner perish. That sickness is to be considered as a punishment for sin we are clearly taught (Joh 5:14; Luk 5:20; Luk 5:24): in the former passage it is threatened as a punishment for sins committed; in the latter it is healed in consequence of punishment remitted. The passage in Joh 9:2-3, which is often appealed to in proof that our Lord did not consider sickness as a punishment for, does not prove this, but only opposes the Jewish position—founded on the mistaken doctrine of retribution—that all severe sicknesses and infirmities were consequences of crimes. The solution of the problem regarding the sufferings of the righteous rests on two positions:

(1.) Their Necessity. — Even the comparatively righteous are not without sin, which can be eradicated only by afflictions, and he who patiently endures them will attain a clearer insight into the otherwise obscure ways of God. The trials of the pious issue at once from God's justice and love. To him who entertains a proper sense of the sinfulness of man, no calamity appears so great as not to be deserved as a punishment, or useful as a corrective.

(2.) The Compensations attending them. — Calamity, as the veiled grace of God, is with the pious never experienced alone, but manifest proofs of divine favor accompany or follow it. Though sunk in misery, they still are happier than the wicked, and when it has attained its object it is terminated by the Lord. The consolations offered in the Old Testament are, agreeably to the weaker judgment of its professors, derived chiefly from external circumstances, while in the New Testament they are mainly spiritual, the eye being, moreover, directed beyond the limits of this world.

It is this purely correct solution of the problem which occurs in the book of Job. It is not set forth, however, in any one set of speeches, but is rather to be gathered from the concurrent drift of the entire discussion. For,

[1.] The solution cannot be looked for in Job's speeches, for God proves himself gracious towards him only after he has been corrected and humbled himself. Although the author of the book does not say (Job 1:22; Job 2:10; comp. Job 42:7) that Job had charged God foolishly, and sinned with his lips, yet the sentiment calling for correction in his speeches is clearly pointed out to be that “he was righteous in his own eyes, and justified himself rather than God” (Job 32:1-2). The entire purity of his character did not prevent his falling into misconceptions and even contradictions on this important topic, which the discussion only tended the more to perplex. Job  continues to be embarrassed for the solution, and he is only certain of this, that the explanation of his friends cannot be satisfactory. Job erred chiefly in not acknowledging his need of chastisement; notwithstanding his integrity and sincere piety, this prevented him from apprehending the object of the calamity inflicted on him, led him to consider God's dispensations as arbitrary, and made him despair of the return of better days. The greatness of his sufferings was in some measure the cause of his misconception, by exciting his feelings, and preventing him from calmly considering his case. He was in the state of a man tempted, and deserving God's indulgence. He had received considerable provocation from his friends, and often endeavored to soften his harsh assertions, which, particularly in ch. 27 leads him into such contradictions as must have occurred in the life of the tempted; he is loud in acknowledging the wisdom of God (ch. 28), and raises himself at times to cheering hopes (comp. ch. 19). But this can only excuse, not justify him, and therefore it is in the highest degree honorable to him that he remains silent when, in Elihu's speeches, the correct solution of the question is suggested, and that he ultimately acknowledges his fundamental error of doing justice to himself only.

[2.] The solution of the question mooted cannot be contained in the speeches of Job's friends. Their demeanor is reproved by God, and represented as a real sin, so much so, indeed, that to obtain pardon for them Job was directed to offer a propitiatory sacrifice. Their error proceeded from a crude notion of sin in its external appearance; and, inferring its existence from calamity, they were thus led to condemn the afflicted Job as guilty of heinous crimes (ch. 32). The moral use of sufferings was unknown to them, which evidently proved that they themselves were not yet purged and cleared from guilt. If they had been sensible of the nature of man, if they had understood themselves, they would on seeing the misery of Job, have exclaimed, “God be merciful to us sinners!” There is, indeed, an important correct principle in their speeches, whose center it forms, so much so that they mostly err only in the application of the general truth. It consists in the perception of the invariable connection between sin and misery, which is indelibly engrafted on the heart of man, and to which many ancient authors allude. The problem of the book is then solved by properly uniting the correct positions of the speeches both of Job and his friends, by maintaining his innocence as to any moral obliquity (although cherishing a view which must have resulted in spiritual pride, had not the Lord thus mercifully exposed its  character before it ripened into guilt), and at the same time avoiding the idea that misfortune is necessarily a punitive infliction (being only a curse when it follows the violation of the physical laws of the Creator, and even then capable of being overruled for the welfare of his saints), thus tracing the errors of both parties to a common source, the want of a sound insight into the nature of sin. Job considers himself righteous, and not deserving of such inflictions, because he was not conscious of having committed any crime; and his friends fancy they must assume that he was highly criminal, in order to justify his misery.

[3.] The solution of the question at issue is not exclusively given in the addresses of God, which contain only the basis of the solution, not the solution itself. In setting forth his majesty, and in showing that imputing to him injustice is repugnant to a correct conception of his nature, these addresses establish that there must be a solution which does not impair divine justice. This is not, indeed, the solution itself, but everything is thus prepared for the solution. We apprehend that God must be just, but it remains further to be shown how he can be just, and still the righteous be miserable.

[4.] Nor yet can we justly regard the speech of Elihu as affording altogether a correct solution of this main question; for, as the preceding analysis has shown, it falls short of the purpose, and the text itself (Job 38:2) expressly states its bewilderment and incompetency. Nevertheless, the position of this in the poem, and the general agreement of its doctrines with the final result, indicate that it contains, in germ at least, the correct solution, as far as human sagacity can go. The leading principle in Elihu's statement is, that calamity in the shape of trial was inflicted even on the comparatively best men, but that God allowed a favorable turn to take place as soon as it had attained its object. Now this is the key to the events of Job's life. Though a pious and righteous man, he is tried by severe afflictions. He knows not for what purpose he is smitten, and his calamity continues; but when he learns it from the addresses of Elihu and God, and humbles himself, he is relieved from the burden which oppresses him, and ample prosperity atones for the afflictions he has sustained (the last vestige of injustice on the part of the Almighty in thus afflicting a good man at the instance of Satan, and for the sake of the example to future ages, disappearing with the consideration that the subject of it himself required the severe lesson for his own spiritual profit). Add to this that the remaining portion of Elihu's speeches, in which he points to God's infinite  majesty as including his justice, is continued in the addresses of God; that Elihu foretells God's appearance; that he is not punished by God as are the friends of Job; in fine, that Job, by his very silence, acknowledges the problem to have been solved by Elihu; and his silence is the more significant, because Elihu had urged him to defend himself (Job 33:32), and because Job had repeatedly declared he would “hold his peace” if it was shown to him wherein he had erred (Job 6:24-25; Job 19:4). This view of the book of Job has among modern authors been supported chiefly by Stäudlin (Beiträge zur Religions und Sittenlehre, 2, 133) and Stickel (Das Buch Hiob, Lpzg. 1842), though in both it is mixed up with much erroneous matter; and it is further confirmed by the whole Old Testament giving the same answer to the question mooted which the speeches of Elihu offer: in its concentrated form it is presented in Psalms 37, 44, 73.

At the same time, it must be conceded that the reprehension of Elihu's speech by Jehovah himself, as savoring of presumption, intimates, as the tenor of the whole succeeding portion of the poem also implies, that there are mysteries in divine providence, the full solution of which, in this life at least, God does not deign nor think best to make to his creatures who are the subjects of them. The inscrutability of God's ways by human judgment is a necessary inference from his infinity, and the character of this life as a probation requires the withholding of many of his plans in order to their proper disciplinary effects. Especially is the saint required to “wall by faith and not by sight,” and the growth and fullest exercise of this faith can only occur under such circumstances as those in which Job was placed. While it is preeminently the doctrine of both the Old and the New Testament that afflictions are the earthly lot of the righteous, it is equally a maxim under both dispensations that the most ennobling motive for their patient endurance is the simple fact that they are dispensed by our heavenly Father, who alone fully knows why they are best for us. Could the subject of them at the time perceive clearly their necessity and advantage, half their value would be destroyed; for an assurance of this he must trust the known kindness and wisdom of the Hand that smites him (Heb 12:1). It was this sublime position, finally attained by the tried patriarch (Job 23:10), which gilds his character with its most sacred hue. The above is substantially the view of the moral design of the book entertained by the latest expositors (e.g. Conant, Delitzsch, etc.), although they do not bring out these ethical considerations with sufficient distinctness.  It remains to consider the view taken by Ewald respecting the design of the book of Job. He justly rejects the common, superficial view of its design, which has recently been revived and defended by Hirzel (see his Commentar, Lpzg. 1839), and which represents the author as intending to show that man cannot apprehend the plans of God, and does best to submit in ignorance, without repining at afflictions. Nowhere in the whole book is simple resignation crudely enjoined, and nowhere does Job say that he submits to such an injunction. The prologue represents his sufferings as trials, and the epilogue declares that the end had proved this consequently the author was competent to give a theodicy with reference to the calamity of Job and if such is the case he cannot have intended simply to recommend resignation.

The Biblical writers, when engaged on this problem, know how to justify God with reference to the afflictions of the righteous, and have no intention of evading the difficulty when they recommend resignation (see the Psalms quoted above, and, in the New Testament, the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. 12). The view of the book of Job alluded to would isolate it, and take it out of its natural connection. Thus far, then, we agree with Ewald, but we cannot approve of his own view of the design of the book of Job. According to his system, “calamity is never a punishment for sins committed, but always a mere phantom, an imaginary show, above which we must raise ourselves by the consciousness of the eternal nature of the human mind, to which, by external prosperity, nothing can be added, and from which, by external misfortune, nothing can be taken away. It was (says Ewald) the merit of the book of Job to have prepared these sounder views of worldly evil and of the immortality of mind, transmitting them as fruitful buds to posterity.” But such a system as this must be abortive to console under any considerable affliction, and is equally opposed to the whole tenor of Scripture, which, while recognizing the reality and naturalness of sorrow, and even allowing its exhibition, yet knows how effectually to cure its wounds by the most substantial considerations. Nor is it in accordance with the book itself, which nowhere impugns or mitigates the extent of Job's calamities, but, from the high vantage ground of the prologue and epilogue, impresses us with a more solemn insight into their significance than even Job was enabled to take, and throughout the discussion (both on the part of the three friends — whose argument is based upon their tangibility as evidence of the divine displeasure, and especially in the key furnished by Elihu — which exalts them to the most interesting degree of importance in the moral discipline of the people of God), admits and therefore seeks to justify their pungency. Their design is  as far from stoicism as from insensibility. Viewed in the light of the foregoing purpose, this book becomes one of the most precious legacies to the Church to which tribulation in this world has been left as a heritage; and a sublime exposition of some of the most interesting problems of religious experience in its most highly developed phase.

III. Historical Character of the Work. — On this subject there are three opinions.

(1.) Some contend that the book contains an entirely true history.

(2.) Others assert that it contains a narrative entirely imaginary, and constructed by the author to teach a great moral truth.

(3.) The third opinion is that the book is founded on a true history, which has been recast, modified, and enlarged by the author.

1. The first view, taken by numerous ancient interpreters, is now abandoned by nearly all expositors. Until a comparatively late time, the general opinion was not only that the persons and events which it describes are real, but that the very words of the speakers were actually recorded. It was supposed either that Job himself employed the latter years of his life in writing it (A. Schultens), or that at a very early age some inspired Hebrew collected the facts and sayings, faithfully preserved by oral tradition, and presented them to his countrymen in their own tongue. Some such view seems to have been adopted by Josephus, for he places Job in the list of the historical books, and it was prevalent with all the fathers of the Church. In its support several reasons are adduced, of which only the first and second have any real force; and even these are outweighed by other considerations, which render it impossible to consider the book of Job as an entirely true history, but which may be used in defense of the third view alluded to. It is said.

(1.) That Job is (Eze 14:14-20) mentioned as a public character, together with Noah and Daniel, and represented as an example of piety.

(2.) In the Epistle of James (Jam 5:11), patience in sufferings is recommended by a reference to Job.

(3.) In the Greek translation of the Sept. a notice is appended to the book of Job, evidently referring to Gen 36:33, and stating that Job was the king Jobab of Edom. It is as follows: “And it is written that he will rise  again with those whom the Lord will raise up. This is translated out of a Syrian book. He dwelt indeed in the land of Ausitis, on the confines of Idumaea and Arabia. His first name was Jobab; and having married an Arabian woman, he had by her a son whose name was Ennon. He was himself a son of Zare, one of the sons of Esau, and his mother's name was Bosorra; so that he was the fifth in descent from Abraham. And these were the kings who reigned in Edort, over which country he also bore rule. The first was Balak, the son of Beor, and the name of his city was Dennaba. And after Balak, Jobab, who is called Job; and after him Asom, who was governor from the region of Thaimanitis; and after him Adad, son of Barad, who smote Madian in the plain of Moab; and the name of his city was Gethaim. And the friends who came to him were Eliphaz of the sons of Esau, the king of the Thaimanites; Baldad, the sovereign of the Sauchaeans; and Sophar, the king of the Minaians.” An account is given at the close of the Arabic version so similar that the one has every appearance of having been copied from the other, or of their having had a common origin. Aristaeus, Philo, and Polyhistor acknowledged the account to be true, as did the Greek and Latin fathers. It is not unlikely that the tradition is derived from the Jews. This statement is too late to be relied on, and originates in an etymological combination, SEE JOBAB; and that it must be erroneous is to a certain extent evident from the contents of the book, in which Job is not represented as a king.

(4.) In the East numerous traditions (see D'Herbelot, s.v. Ayoub) about the patriarch and his family show the deep impression made by his character and calamities: these traditions may possibly have been derived from the book itself, but it is at least equally probable that they had an independent origin. Indeed, Job's tomb continues to be shown to Oriental tourists. Now the factor a Job having lived somewhere would not of itself prove that the hero of our narrative was that person, and that this book contained a purely historical account. Moreover, his tomb is shown not in one place, but in six, and, along with it, the dunghill on which Job is reported to have sat! (See Carpzov, Introd. 2, 33; Jahn, Einleit. 1, 1, 761; Michaelis, Einleit. 1, 1; Bertholdt, 5, 2040).

(5.) Dr. Hales and others have even gone so far as to fix his exact year, by a calculation of the constellation alluded to in 9:9; 38:31; but the uncertainty of such a process is too evident to need consideration, as the very names of the planets alluded to are doubtful.  Against this view it must be remarked generally, that the whole work is arranged on a well-considered plan, proving the author's power of independent invention; that the speeches are, in their general structure and in their details, so elaborate that they could not have been brought out in the ordinary course of a conversation or disputation; that it would be unnatural to suppose Job in his distressed state to have delivered such speeches, finished with the utmost care; and that they exhibit uniformity in their design, fullness, propriety, and coloring, though the author, with considerable skill, represents each speaker whom he introduces arguing according to his character. Moreover, in the prologue and epilogue, as well as in the arrangement of the speeches, the figures 3 and 7 constantly occur, with the decimal number formed by their addition. The transactions between God and Satan in the prologue absolutely require that we should distinguish between the subject matter forming the foundation of the work and its enlargement, which can be only done when a poetical principle is acknowledged in its composition. God's speaking out of the clouds would. be a miracle, without an object corresponding to its magnitude, and having a merely personal reference, while all the other miracles of the Old Testament are in connection with the theocratical government, and occur in the midst and for the benefit of the people of God.

2. Impelled by the force of these arguments, many critics have adopted the opinion either that the whole work is a moral or religious apologue, or that, upon a substratum of a few rudimental facts preserved by tradition, the genius of an original thinker has raised this, the most remarkable monument of the Shemitic mind. The first indications of this opinion are found in the Talmud (Baba Bathra, 15:1). In a discussion upon the age of this book, while the Rabbins in general maintain its historical character, Samuel Bar- Nachman declares his conviction “Job did not exist, and was not a created man, but the work is a parable.” Hai Gaon (Ewald and Duke's Beiträge, 3, 165), A.D. 1000, who is followed by Jarchi, altered this passage to “Job existed, and was created to become a parable.” They had evidently no critical ground for the change, but bore witness to the prevalent tradition of the Hebrews. Maimonides (Moreh Nebochim, 3, 22), with his characteristic freedom of mind, considers it an open question of little or no moment to the real value of the inspired book. Ralbag, i.e. R. Levi Ben-Gershom, treats it as a philosophic work. A late Hebrew commentator, Simcha Arieh (Schlottmann, p. 4), denies the historical truth of the narrative on the ground that it is incredible that the patriarchs of the chosen race should be  surpassed in goodness by a child of Edom. This is worth noting in corroboration of the argument that such a fact was not likely to have been invented by an Israelite of any age.

In opposition to this view, the following arguments may be adduced:

(1.) It has always seemed to pious writers incompatible with any idea of inspiration to assume that a narrative, certainly not allegorical, should be a mere fiction, and irreverent to suppose that the Almighty would be introduced as a speaker in an imaginary colloquy.

(2.) We are led to the same conclusion by the soundest principles of criticism. Ewald says (Einl. p. 15) most truly, “The invention of a history without foundation in facts — the creation of a person, represented as having a real historical existence, out of the mere head of the poet — is a notion so entirely alien to the spirit of all antiquity, that it only began to develop itself gradually in the latest epoch of the literature of any ancient people, and in its complete form belongs only to the most modern times.” In the canonical books there is not a trace of any such invention. Of all people, the Hebrews were the least likely to mingle the mere creations of imagination with the sacred records reverenced as the peculiar glory of their race.

It is true that the arguments advanced by Ewald to show the historical character of the chief features of the book are not entirely conclusive, especially the literature of the name Job, which may have reference to the character he sustains in the narrative (from אָיִב, to hate, q.d. “the assailed,” i.e. tempted; see Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 81); still they must be allowed to have some weight, and, taken in connection with the general usage of Scripture in its poetical and rhetorical amplifications, and especially with the considerations presently to be adduced in relation to the author of this. book, justify the presumption of a historical foundation, not only for the facts and personages represented in the book, but also, to a certain extent, for the speeches.

(3.) To this it must be added that there is a singular air of reality in the whole narrative, such as must either proceed naturally from a faithful adherence to objective truth, or be the result of the most consummate art. The effect is produced partly by the thorough consistency of all the characters, especially that of Job, not merely as drawn in broad, strong outlines, but as developed under a variety of most trying circumstances;  partly also by the minute and accurate account of incidents which in a fiction would probably have been noted by an ancient, writer in a vague and general manner. Thus we remark the mode in which the supernatural trial is carried into execution by natural agencies — by Chaldean and Sabaean robbers — by whirlwinds common in and peculiar to the desert — by fire — and, lastly, by the elephantiasis (see Schlottmann, p. 15; Ewald, l. c.; and Hengstenberg), the most formidable disease known in the East. The disease was indeed one which the Indians and most Orientals then probably believed to be peculiarly indicative of divine wrath, and would therefore be naturally selected by the writer (see the analysis above). But the symptoms are described so faithfully as to leave no doubt that the writer must either have introduced them with a view to giving an air of truthfulness to his work, or have recorded what he himself witnessed or received from an exact tradition. The former supposition is confuted by the fact that the peculiar symptoms are not described in any one single passage so as to attract the reader's attention, but are made out by a critical and scientific examination of words occurring here and there at intervals in the complaints of the sufferer. The most refined art fails in producing such a result; it is rarely attempted in the most artificial ages, was never dreamed of by ancient writers, and must here be regarded as a strong instance of the undesigned coincidences which the soundest criticism regards as the best evidence of genuineness and authenticity in any work.

3. Luther first suggested the theory which, in some form or other, is most generally received. In his introduction to the first edition of his translation of the Bible he speaks of the author as having so treated the historical facts as to demonstrate the truth that God alone is righteous; and in the Tischreden (ed. Walch, 22, 2093) he says: “I look upon the book of Job as a true history, yet I do not believe that all took place just as it is written, but that an ingenious, pious, and learned man brought it into its present form.” This position was strongly attacked by Bellarmine and other Roman theologians, and was afterwards repudiated by most Lutherans. The fact that Spinoza, Clericus, Du Pin, and Father Simon held nearly the same opinion, the first denying, and the others notoriously holding low views of the inspiration of Scripture, had of course a tendency to bring it into disrepute. J.D. Michaelis first revived the old theory of Bar-Nachman, not upon critical, but dogmatic grounds. In a mere history the opinions or doctrines enounced by Job and his friends could have no dogmatic authority; whereas, if the whole book were a pure inspiration, the strongest  arguments could be deduced Room them on behalf of the great truths of the resurrection and a future judgment, which, though implied in ether early books, are nowhere so distinctly inculcated. The arbitrary character of such reasoning is obvious. At present no critic doubts that the narrative rests on facts, although the prevalent opinion among Continental scholars is certainly that in its form and general features, in its reasonings and representations of character, the book is a work of creative genius.

Taking this view, we must still abstain from undertaking to determine what the poet derived from tradition, and what he added himself, since we know not how far tradition had already embellished the original fact. Thus much only will it be safe to conclude: that the individual really existed, possibly in the region indicated; that he literally underwent a trial substantially like that represented, and that a discussion grew out of it, held, perhaps, between him and a party of his friends after its first severity was passed, covering the essential principles developed in the book, but briefly and simply expressed.

IV. Descent. Country, and Age of the Author. —

1. Opinions differed in ancient times as to the nation to which the author belonged, some considering him to have been an Arab, others an Israelite. Various indications favor the latter supposition:

(1st), We find in our book many ideas of genuine Israelitish growth: the creation of the world is described, in accordance with the prevailing notions of the Israelites, as the immediate effect of divine omnipotence; man is formed of clay; the spirit of man is God's breath; God employs the angels for the performance of his orders; Satan, the great enemy of the children of God, is his instrument for tempting them; men are weak and sinful; nobody is pure in the sight of God, moral corruption is propagated. There is promulgated to men the law of God, which they must not infringe, and the transgressions of which are visited on offenders with punishments. Moreover, the nether world, or Sheol, is depicted in hues entirely Hebrew. To these particulars might, without much trouble, be added many more, but the deep searching inquirer will particularly weigh,

(2dly), the fact that the book displays a strength and fervor of religious faith such as could only be expected within the domain of revelation. Monotheism, if the assertions of ancient Arabian authors may be trusted. prevailed, indeed, for a long period among the Arabs, and it held its ground  at least among a portion of the nation till the age of Mohammed, who obtained for it a complete triumph over polytheism, which was spreading from Syria. Still the god of the Arabs was, is those of the heathens generally were, a retired god, dwelling far apart, while the people of the Old Covenant enjoyed the privilege of a vital communion with God; and the warmth with which our author enters into this view incontrovertibly proves that he was an Israelite.

(3dly), As regards the language of our book, several ancient writers asserted that it was originally written in the Aramaean or Arabic tongue, and afterwards translated into Hebrew by Moses, David, Solomon, or some unknown writer. Of this opinion was the author of the Appendix in the Septuagint, and the compiler of the tract on Job added to the works of Origen and Jerome; in modern times it has been chiefly defended by Spanheim, in his Historia Jobi. But for a translation there is too much propriety and precision in the use of words and phrases; the sentences are too compact, and free from redundant expressions and members; and too much care is bestowed on their harmony and easy flow. The parallelism also is too accurate and perfect for a translation, and the whole breathes a freshness that could be expected from an original work only.

Sensible of the weight of this argument, others, as Eichhorn, took a medium course, and assumed that the author was a Hebrew, though he did not live among his countrymen, but in Arabia. “The earlier Hebrew history,” they say, “is unknown to the author, who is ignorant of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. In portraying nature, also he proves himself always familiar with Arabia, while he is silent respecting the characteristics of Palestine. With Egypt he must have been well acquainted, which can be accounted for better by supposing him to have lived in Arabia than in Palestine.” Hitzig and Hirzel accordingly, among the latest writers, hold that the writer was an Egyptian. Wetzstein and Delitzsch say that he was a native of the Hauran. The occasional use of the name Jehovah however, appears to imply a later date than the Exode, and the absence of allusion to the events of Jewish history, it has been thought, may be accounted for by the peculiar line of argument (from natural religion) pursued in the book, as in Ecclesiastes. It has further been suggested that the author, without directly mentioning the Pentateuch, frequently alludes to portions of it, as in Job 3:4, to Gen 1:3; in Job 4:19, and Job 33:6, to Moses' account of the creation of man in Job 5:14, to Deu 32:32; in Job 24:1, to Deu 25:4. Moreover, history says nothing of the Israelites  having permanently taken up their residence in the land of Arabia, so as to allow the supposition of the above origin of the book of Job by a Hebrew thus isolated from Palestine; nor will most of the arguments adduced to prove the acquaintance (and therefore neighborhood) of the author with Egypt bear a close examination. Thus it is a mistake to suppose that the description of the working of mines in ch. 28 must necessarily have reference to Egypt; Phoenicia, Arabia, and Edom afforded much better materials. That the author must have known the Egyptian mausolea rests on an erroneous interpretation of Job 3:14, which may also be said of the assertion that Job 29:18, refers to the Egyptian mythus of the phoenix. Casting aside these arbitrarily assumed Egyptian references, we have only the following: Our author knows the Egyptian vessels of bulrushes, Job 9:26; the Nile grass, Job 8:12, the Nile horse (Behemoth) and the crocodile (Leviathan), Job 11:15; Job 41:1. Now, as these things belong to the more prominent peculiarities of a neighboring country, they must .have been known to every educated Israelite: the vessels of bulrushes are mentioned also in Isa 18:2. Neither are we disposed to adopt the compromising view of Stickel, who assumes that the author wrote his book in the Israelitish territory indeed, but close to the frontier, in the far southeast of Palestine. That the author had there the materials for his descriptions, comparisons, and imagery set better before his eyes than anywhere else, is true, for there he had an opportunity of observing mines, caravans, drying up of brooks, etc. But this is not sufficient proof of the author having lived permanently in that remote part of Palestine, and of having there written his book: he was not a mere copyist of nature, but a poet of considerable eminence, endowed with the power of vividly representing things absent from him.

2. As to the age of the author of this book, we meet with three opinions:

(a.) That he lived before Moses. or was, at least. his contemporary.

(b.) That he lived in the time of Solomon, or in the centuries next following — the opinion of Hahn, Schlottmann (Berl. 1857). and Delitzsch.

(c.) That he lived shortly before, or during, or even after the Babylonian exile.  Against this last view (adopted by Le Clerc among earlier interpreters, and among modern expositors by Bernstein, Gesenius, Umbreit, and De Wette) it is conclusively objected,

(1.) That the book is referred to in the Old Testament itself (Eze 14:14-20) as well known before the Chaldaean exile. Others, with less plausibility, urge what they deem imitations of various sentiments and even passages of Job in the ante-exilian prophets, e.g. Jer 20:14, comp. with Job 3 (see Küper, Jeremias librorum sacrorum interpres atque vindex, p. 164 sq.); Lam 2:16, comp. Job 16:13; Lam 3:7; Lam 3:9, comp. Job 19:8; Isa 40:2, comp. Job 1 (and Job 10:17; Job 14:14); Isa 51:9, comp. Job 26:13. Isa 19:5, comp. Job 14:11; Psa 107:42, comp. Job 5:16.

(2.) The absence of those Chaldaisms in Job which occur in books written about the time of the captivity.

(3.) The poetical character of the book, which is wholly different from the declining style of the later period.

The most complete statement of the reasons in support of the opinion that the book of Job was written between the age of Moses and the Exile may be found in Richter's essay, De AEtate Jobi definienda, reprinted in Rosenmüller's edition of Lowth's Pralectiones de Poesi Sacra Hebroeorum, in which he maintains that it was written in the age of Solomon. Most of these reasons, indeed, are either not conclusive at all, or not quite cogent. Thus it is an arbitrary assumption, proved by modern researches to be erroneous, that the art of writing was unknown previous to the age of Moses. The assertion, too, that the marks of cultivation and refinement observable in our book belonged to a later age rests on no historical ground. Further, it cannot be said that for such an early time the language is too smooth and neat, since in no Shemitic dialect is it possible to trace a progressive improvement. The evident correspondence also between our book and the Proverbs and Psalms is not a point proving with resistless force that they were all written at the same time. Nor is it altogether of such a kind that the authors of the Proverbs and Psalms (comp. especially Psa 39:13, with Job 7:19; Job 14:6; Job 10:20-21; Job 7:8; Job 7:21, in the Hebrew Bible), can be exactly said to have copied our book; but it may be accounted for by their all belonging to the same class of writings, by the very great uniformity and accordance of religious conceptions and  sentiments expressed in the Old Testament, and by the stability of its religious character. The striking coincidence, in particular, observable between the eulogy of “wisdom” contained in Job 28 and the numerous similar didactic strains found in the writings of Solomon (comp. especially Pro 3:4), may be accounted for by the above supposition that this chapter was added by a later hand than the author of the rest of the book, or at least as a sequel to the traditional part of the poem.

The traditionary view of the authorship of the book of Job ascribes it to Moses; the arguments in favor of this view have been collected by Spanheim, and may be seen with replies in Wemyss (Life and Times of Job, p. 82 sq.). The following leading points are deserving of consideration:

(1.) There is in the book of Job no direct reference to the Mosaic legislation; and its descriptions and other statements are suited to the period of the patriarchs; as, for instance, the great authority held by old men, the high age of Job, and fathers offering sacrifices for their families — which leads to the supposition that when our book was written no sacerdotal order yet existed. Nor is this ignoring of all the most interesting objects and associations of Judaism fully explainable on the ground of the author's desire to base the question at issue wholly on religious consciousness and experience; for many of the incidents of Jewish and even patriarchal history were too apposite to his topic to be passed over (e.g. the overthrow of Pharaoh and the destruction of the cities of the plain), unless we suppose a degree of studied impersonation at variance with the naturalness and practical aims of Scripture.

(2.) The language of the book of Job seems strongly to support the opinion of its having been written as early as the time of Moses. It has often been said that no writing of the Old Testament may be more frequently illustrated from the Arabic than this book. Jerome observes (Proefat. in Dan.), “Jobum cum Arabica lingua plurimam habere societatem;” and Schultens proved this so incontrovertibly that Gesenius was rather too late in denying the fact (see his Geschichte der Hebräischen Sprache, p. 33). Now, from this character of its language we might be induced to infer that the work was written in the remotest times, when the separation of the dialects had only begun, but had not yet been completed. It is true that this peculiarity of idiom is not such as to be of itself conclusive as to the date; and it might even have been to some extent assumed in order to correspond with the foreign garb of the poem. It also contains some Aramaisms and  other signs of degeneracy, but these (unless attributable to copyists) may easily be accounted for by the supposition of a later editorship merely.

(3.) The Jewish tradition of the authorship of Moses (see Otho, Lex. Rabbin. p. 323; comp. Tobit 2, 12; Euseb. Proep. Ev. 9, 25), although not entirely uniform, seems to have been firmly established at an early period; and, lightly as it has been treated by some (see Dr. Davidson, in the new ed. of Home's Introd. 2, 727), still affords the only writer of sufficient note to whom the work has ever been definitely ascribed. The facilities enjoyed by Moses during his quiet sojourn in Midian were greater perhaps than those of any other Hebrew author for such a production; and the contemplations of his active and well stored mind may have furnished as ample a motive for the task as can be found at any other period, or in the case of any other writer to whom the book has been assigned, even if no special outward occasion can be shown to have led to the literary effort at that time. This date, moreover, is precisely such as to admit the incorporation of Jewish theology without its history, and affords a locality where all the elements of the poem were at hand.

(4.) The period in which Job himself lived is a distinct question from that of the age in which the book was written, it being only necessary (on the supposition of the reality of the narrative) to locate the author subsequently to the times of his hero, and under such circumstances as to suggest the topic. The ante-Mosaic date of Job's life is evident from his longevity (probably two centuries and a half, 43:16, 17 where the Sept. expressly gives his total age as 240 years, assigning, however, 170 of these as preceding his affliction), which seems to mark him as contemporary with Peleg, Reu, or Serug (B.C. 2414-2122), as well as from the primitive character of his social relations, which are similar to those of Abraham (B.C. 2163-1988). His country could not have been far from the Sinaitic peninsula. SEE UZ.

There is thus found to be a reasonable presumption in favor of the Mosaic authorship of this book, so far as time and place are concerned, while there is no internal evidence decidedly opposed to the tradition in its favor. Our conclusion, as being the most probable combination. of all the facts in the case, is that, as a recitative poem in a rudimentary form, it was originally framed, in Job's age (by that romance style of composition spontaneous with Orientals), and that, in its Arabic dress, it was gathered by Moses from the lips of the Midianitish bards during his residence among them; that it was first composed by him in the Hebrew language, but not reduced to its present complete form till  considerably later, perhaps by Solomon. This progressive kind of authorship is vindicated by the fact that other epics have come down to us through similar stages of heroic legend, oral preservation, collection, formal composition, and editorship, and is even illustrated in the origin of other less obscurely traceable books of the Bible. SEE GENESIS.

(5.) In defense of the theory that the book was written during the Assyrian invasion, B.C. cir. 700, see the introduction to Merx's Buch Job (Jena, 1870).

V. Integrity of the Book. — It is satisfactory to find that the arguments employed by those who impugn the authenticity of considerable portions of this book are, for the most part, mutually destructive, and that the most minute and searching investigations bring out the most convincing proofs of the unity of its composition, and the coherence of its constituent parts. One point of great importance is noted by the latest and one of the most ingenious writers (M.E. Rénan, Le Livre de Job, Par. 1859) on this subject. After some strong remarks upon the inequality of the style, and appearance of interpolation, M.E. Rénan observes (p. 44): “The Hebrews, and Orientals in general, differed widely from us in their views about composition. Their works never have that perfectly defined outline to which we are accustomed, and we should be careful not to assume interpolations or alterations (retouches) when we meet with defects of sequence which surprise us.” He then shows that in parts of the work, acknowledged by all critics to be by one hand, there are very strong instances of what Europeans might regard as repetition, or suspect of interpolation: thus Elihu recommences his argument four times; while discourses of Job, which have distinct portions, such as to modern critics might seem unconnected and even misplaced, are impressed with such a character of sublimity and force as to leave no doubt that they are the product of a single inspiration. To this just and true observation it must be added that the assumed want of coherence and of logical consistency is, for the most part, only apparent, and results from a radical difference in the mode of thinking and enunciating thought between the old Eastern and modern European.

1. Objections have been made to the introductory and concluding chapters

(1.) on account of the style. Of course there is an obvious and natural difference between the prose of the narrative and the highly poetical  language of the colloquy. Yet the best critics now acknowledge that the style of these portions is quite as antique in its simple and severe grandeur as that of the Pentateuch itself (to which it bears a striking resemblance: see above, and comp. Lee, Job, p. 49), or as any other part of the book, while it is as strikingly unlike the narrative style of all the later productions of the Hebrews. Ewald says with perfect truth, “These prosaic words harmonize thoroughly with the old poem in subject matter and thoughts, in coloring and in art; also in language, so far as prose can be like poetry.”

(2.) It is said, again, that the doctrinal views are not in harmony with those of Job. This is wholly unfounded. The fundamental principles of the patriarch, as developed in the most solemn of his discourses, are identical with those maintained throughout the book. The form of worship belongs essentially to the early patriarchal type; with little of ceremonial ritual, without a separate priesthood, thoroughly domestic in form and spirit. The representation of the angels, and their appellation, “sons of God,” peculiar to this book and to Genesis, accord entirely with the intimations in the earliest documents of the Shemitic race.

(3.) It is, moreover, alleged that there are discrepancies between the facts related in the introduction, and statements or allusions in the dialogue. But the apparent contradiction between 19:17 and the statement that all Job's children had perished rests upon a misinterpretation of the words בְּנֵי בַטְנַי, “children of my womb,” i.e. “of the womb that bare me” — “my brethren,” not “my children” (compare 3:10) indeed, the destruction of the patriarch's whole family is repeatedly assumed in the dialogue (e.g. 8:4; 29:5). Again, the omission of all reference to the defeat of Satan in the last chapter is quite in accordance with the grand simplicity of the poem (Schlottmann, p. 39, 40). It was too obvious a result to need special notice, and it had, in fact, been accomplished by the steadfast faith of the patriarch even before the discussions commenced. No allusion to the agency of that spirit was to be expected in the colloquy, since Job and his friends are represented as wholly ignorant of the transactions in heaven. At present, indeed, it is generally acknowledged that the entire work would be unintelligible without these portions.

(4.) The single objection (Rénan, p. 40) which presents any difficulty on the ground of anachronism is the mention of the Chaldeans in the introductory chapter. It is certain that they first appear in Hebrew history about the year B.C. 770. But the name of Chesed, the ancestor of the race, is found in the  genealogical table in Genesis (22:22), a fact quite sufficient to prove the early existence of the people as a separate tribe. It is highly probable that an ancient race bearing that name in Kurdistan (see Xenoph. Cyr. 2, 1, 34; Anab. 4, 3, 4; 5, 5, 17) was the original source of the nation, who were there trained in predatory habits, and accustomed, long before their appearance in history, to make excursions into the neighboring deserts, a view quite in harmony with the part assigned to them in this book.

2. Strong objections are made to the passage chap. 27, from Tobit 2, 12:7 to the end of the chapter. Here Job describes the ultimate fate of the godless hypocrite in terms which some critics hold to be in direct contradiction with the whole tenor of his arguments in other discourses. Dr. Kennicott, whose opinion is adopted by Eichhorn, Froude, and others, held that, owing to some confusion or omission in the MS., the missing speech of Zophar has been put into the mouth of Job. The fact of the contradiction is denied by able writers, who have shown that it rests upon a misapprehension of the patriarch's character and fundamental principles. He had been provoked under circumstances of peculiar aggravation into statements which at the close of the discussion he would be anxious to guard or recall: he was bound, having spoken so harshly, to recognize, what, beyond doubt, he never intended to deny, the general justice of divine dispensations even in this world. Moreover, he intimates a belief or presentiment of a future retribution, of which there are no indications in any other speaker (see Tobit 2, 12:8). The whole chapter is thoroughly coherent: the first part is admitted by all to belong to Job; nor can the rest be disjoined from it without injury to the sense. Ewald says, “Only a grievous misunderstanding of the whole book could have misled the modern critics who hold that this passage is interpolated or misplaced.” Other critics have abundantly vindicated the authenticity of the passage (Hahn, Schlottmann, etc.). As for the style, E. Rénan, a most competent authority in a matter of taste, declares that it is one of the finest developments of the poem. It certainly differs exceedingly in its breadth, loftiness, and devout spirit from the speeches of Zophar, for whose silence satisfactory reasons have already been assigned (see the analysis). This last argument, however, applies rather to chap. 28, which may, without any impeachment of the integrity of the poem, be regarded as an embellishment representing the times and sentiments of the final editor (i.e. Solomon).

3. The last two chapters of the address of the Almighty have been rejected as interpolations by many, of course rationalistic, writers (Stuhlman,  Bernstein, Eichhold, Ewald, Meier), partly because of an alleged inferiority of style, partly as not having any bearing upon the argument; but the connection of reasoning, involved, though, as was to be expected, not drawn out, in this discourse, has been shown in the preceding analysis; and as for the style, few who have a true ear for the resonant grandeur of ancient Hebrew poetry will dissent from the judgment of E. Rénan, whose suggestion, that it may have been written by the same author at a later date, is far from weakening the force of his observation as to the identity of the style.

4. The speech of Elihu presents greater difficulties, and has been rejected by several rationalists, whose opinion, however, is controverted not only by orthodox writers, but by some of the most skeptical commentators. The former support their decision on the apparent, and, to a certain extent, the real difference between this and other parts of the book in tone of thought, in doctrinal views, and, more positively, in language and general style. Much stress also is laid upon the facts that Elihu is not mentioned in the introduction nor at the end, and that his speech is unanswered by Job, and unnoticed in the final address of the Almighty. These points were observed by very early writers, and were accounted for in various ways. On the one hand, Elihu was regarded as a specially inspired person (Schlottmann, p. 53). In the Seder Olam (a rabbinical system of chronology) he is reckoned among the prophets who declared the will of God to the Gentiles before the promulgation of the law. S. Bar-Nachman (12th century) notes his connection with the family of Abraham as a sign that he was the fittest person to expound the ways of God. The Greek fathers generally follow Chrysostom in attributing to him a superior intellect, while many of the best critics of the last two centuries consider that the true dialectic solution of the great problems discussed in the book is to be found in his discourse.

On the other hand, Jerome, who is followed by Gregory, and many ancient as well as modern writers of the Western Church, speak of his character and arguments with singular contempt. Later critics, chiefly rationalists, see in him but an empty babbler, introduced only to heighten by contrast the effect of the last solemn and dignified discourse of Job. The alternative of rejecting his speech as an interpolation was scarcely less objectionable, and has been preferred by Stuhlman, Bernstein, Ewald, Rénan, and other writers of similar opinions in other countries. A candid and searching examination, however, leads to a different conclusion. It is proved (see Schlottmann, Einl. p. 55) that there is a close internal connection between  this and other parts of the book. There are references to numerous passages in the discourses of Job and his friends; so covert as only to be discovered by close inquiry, yet, when pointed out, so striking and natural as to leave no room for doubt. Elihu supplies exactly what Job repeatedly demands a confutation of his opinions, not merely produced by an overwhelming display of divine power, but by rational and human arguments, and proceeding from one not, like his other opponents, bigoted and hypocritical, but upright, candid, and truthful (comp. 33:3, with 6:24, 25). The reasonings of Elihu are moreover such as are needed for the development of the doctrines inculcated in the book, while they are necessarily cast in a form which could not without irreverence be assigned to the Almighty. As to the objection that the doctrinal system of Elihu is in some points more advanced than that of Job or his friends, it may be answered, first, that there are no traces in this discourse of certain doctrines which were undoubtedly known at the earliest date to which those critics would assign the interpolation, whereas it is evident that if known they would have been adduced as the very strongest arguments for a warning and consolation.

No reader of the Psalms and of the Prophets could have failed to urge such topics as the resurrection, the future judgment, and the personal advent of Messiah. Secondly, the doctrinal system of Elihu differs rather in degree than in kind from that which has been either developed or intimated in several passages of the work, and consists chiefly in a specific application of the mediatorial theory, not unknown to Job, and in a deeper appreciation of the love manifested in all providential dispensations. It is quite consistent with the plan of the writer, and with the admirable skill shown in the arrangement of the whole work, that the highest view as to the object of afflictions, and to the source to which men should apply for comfort and instruction, should be reserved for this, which, so far as regards the human reasoners, is the culminating point of the discussion. Little can be said for Lightfoot's theory that the whole work was composed by Elihu, or for E. Rénan's conjecture that this discourse may have been composed by the author in his old age; yet these views imply an unconscious impression that Elihu is the fullest exponent of the truth. It is satisfactory to know that two of the most impartial and discerning critics (Ewald and Rénan); who unite in denying this to be an original and integral portion of the work, fully acknowledge its intrinsic excellence and beauty.  There is no difficulty in accounting for the omission of Elihu's name in the introduction. No persons are named in the book until they appear as agents, or as otherwise concerned in the events.

Thus Job's brethren are named incidentally in one of his speeches, and his relatives are, for the first time, in the concluding chapter. Had Elihu been mentioned at first, we should of course have expected him to take part in the discussion, and the impression made by his startling address would have been lost. Job does not answer him, nor, indeed, could he deny the cogency of his arguments, while this silence brings out a curious point of coincidence with a previous declaration of the patriarch (6:24, 25). Again, the discourse, being substantially true, did not need correction, and is therefore left unnoticed in the final decision of the Almighty. Nothing, indeed, could be more in harmony with the ancient traditions of the East than that a youth, moved by a special and supernatural impulse to speak out God's truth in the presence of his elders, should retire into obscurity when he had done his work. More weight is to be attached to the objection resting upon diversity of style and dialectic peculiarities. The most acute critics differ indeed in their estimate of both, and are often grossly deceived (see Schlottmann, p. 61); still, there can be little doubt as to the fact. It may be accounted for either on the supposition that the author adhered strictly to the form, in which tradition handed down the dialogue — in which case the speech of a Syrian might be expected to bear traces of his dialect — or that the Chaldaic forms and idioms, which are far from resembling later vulgarisms or corruptions of Hebrew, and occur only in highly poetic passages of the oldest writers, are such as peculiarly suit the style of the young and fiery speaker (see Schlottmann, Einl. p. 61). It has been observed, and with apparent truth, that the discourses of the other interlocutors have each a very distinct and characteristic coloring, shown not only in the general tone of thought, but in peculiarities of expression (Ewald and Schlottmann). The excessive obscurity of the style, which is universally admitted, may be accounted for in a similar manner. A young man speaking under strong excitement, embarrassed by the presence of his elders and by the peculiar responsibility of his position, might be expected to use language obscured by repetitions, and, though ingenious and true, yet somewhat intricate and imperfectly developed arguments, such as, in fact, present great difficulties in the exegesis of this portion of the book.

VI. Commentaries. — The following is a list of the exegetical helps on the whole book exclusively, the most important being designated by an asterisk  [\*] prefixed: Origen. Selecta (in Opp. 2, 499); also Scholia (in Bibl. Patr. Gallandii, 14); Anon. Commentarius (in Origen's Opp. 2, 850); Athanasius, Excerpta (in Opp. 1, 2, 1003); Jerome, Commentarius (in Opp. Suppos. 11, 566); Philippus, Expositio (in Jerome's Opp. Spur. 3, 833; also in Bede's Opp. 4; also Basil. 1527, fol.), Augustine, Annotationes (in Opp. 3, 823); Chrysostom, Homilioe. (in Opp. Spur. 6, 681); Ephrem Syrus, Scholia (in Syriac, in Opp. 3, 1-20); Gregory, Moralia (in Opp. 1, 1; also translation in English, Oxford, 1844-50, 4 vols. 8vo); Olympiodorus, etc., Catena (Lugdunum, 1586, 4to London. 1657, folio) ; Bruno Astensis, In Jobum (in Opp. 1); Rupert, In Jobum (in Opp. 1, 1034); Peter of Blois, Compendium (in Opp. 3, 19); Aquinas, Commentarii (in Opp. 1; also Ven. 1505, fol.; Rom. 1562, 4to), Banolas (i.e. Ralbag), פֵּרוּשׁ (Ferrara, 1477, 4to; with various supercomments, Naples, 1486, 4to; and in Bomberg's Rabbinic Bibles), Arama, מֵאַיר (Salonica, 1517, folio; Riva da Trento, 1562, 4to; Ven. 1567, 4to); Bugenhagen, Adnotationes (Argent. et Basil. 1526, 8vo); Bucer, Commentaria (Argent. 1528, folio); OEcolampadius, Exegemata (Basil. 1531, fol., 1533, 1536, 4to; Genev. 1532, 1553, 1578, fol.; in French, (Genev. 1562, 4to); Borrhäus, Commentarius (Argent. 1532, Basil. 1539, 1544, Genev. 1590, fol.); Cajetan, Commentarius (Rom. 1535, folio); Is. ben-Salomon (ha-Kohen), פֵּרוּשׁ (Constantin. 1545, 4t6); Titelmann, Elucidatio (Paris, 1548, 1550, 8vo; 1553, 12mo; Lugd. 1554, Antw. 1566, 12mo); Ferus, Explicatio (Col. 1558, 1574, Lugdun. 1567, 8vo); Lutzius, Adnotationes (Basil. 1559, 1563, 8vo); Calvin, Sermons (in French. Genev. 1563, 1611, fol.; in Lat. ib. 1569, 1593, fol. [also in Opp. 3]; in Eugl., Lond. 1584, fol.; in Germ., Herb. 1587, 4 vols. 4to); Strigel, Scholia (Lipsiae, 1566, 1571, 1575, 8vo); Steuch, narrationes (Ven. 1567, 4to); Fobian (Mos. b.-El.), תִּרְגּוּם, etc. (modern Greek in Heb. characters, Constantinople, 1576, 4to), Ibn-Jaish (Bar. ben-Is.), מָקוֹר בָּרוּךְ [includ. Ecclesiastes] (Constant. 1576, fol.); Marloratus, Expositio (Genev. 1581, 4to); De Huerga, Commentaria [on ch. 1-18, includ. Cant.] (Complut. 1582, fol.) , Beza, Commentarius (Genev. 1583, 1589, 1599, 4to); Stunica, Commentaria (Tolet. 1584, Romae, 1591, 4to); Lavater, Conciones (Tigur. 1585, fol.) ; Rollock, Commentarius (Geneva, 1590, 8vo); Duran (Sim. ben-Zemach), אוֹהֵב מַשְׁפָּט (Venice, 1590,4to; also in Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible); Farissol (Abr.b.-Mard.), פֵּרוּשׁ (in the Rabbinic Bibles); Mord. b.-Jacob (of Cracow), פֵּרוּשׁ (Prague, 1597, 4to); \*De Pineda [Roman Cath.], Commentarii (Madrit. 1597-1601, 2 vols. folio; Colon.  1600, 1605, 1685, Antwp. 1609, Venet. 1619, 1709, Ursel. 1627, Paris, 1631, Lugdun. 1701, fol.) Alschech, חֶלְקִת מְחוֹקֵק (Venice, 1603, 4to; Jesnitz, 1722, fol.); Feuardentius, Homilioe [on prose parts] (Par. 1606, fol.); Strack, Predigten (Cassel, 1607, 4to); Humfry, Dialogue (Lond. 1607, 4to); Joannes a Jesu Maria, Paraphrasis (Rom. 1611, 4to), Piscator, Commentarius (Herb. 1612, 8vo); De Pineda, Commentarius (Colon. 1613, 1701, fol.); Rühlich, Predigten (Wittenb. 1617, 3 vols. 4to) ; Janson, Enarrratio (Lovan. 1623, 1643, folio); Quarles, Meditations (London, 162-1, 4to); Sanctius, Commentarii (Lugd. 1625, folio; Lips. 1712, 4to); Olearius, Predigten (Lpzg. 1633, 1665, 1672, 4to); Drusius, Scholia (Amsterd. 1636, 4to; also in Crit. Sac.); Diodati, Explications [includ. Psalm, etc.] (in French, Genev. 1638, 4to); Vavassor, Metaphrasis (Par. 1638, 12mo, 1679, 8vo; Francf. 1654, 4to); Bolducius, Commentaria (Par. 1638, 2 vols. fol.); Abbott, Paraphrase (Lond. 1640, 4to); Cocceius, Diagrammata (Franec. 1644, fol.; also in Opp. 1) ; Corderius, Elucidatio (Antw. 1646, 1656, fol.) ; Schultetus, Analysis (Stet. 1647, Francf. 1684, fol.); Sennault. Paraphrase (London, 1648, 4to); Meiern, Commentari [including Prov., etc.] (L.B. 1651, fol.); Codureus, Scholia (Paris, 1651, 4to); Caryl, Exposition (London, 1651, 1664, 1694, 6 vols. 4to; 1666, 1677, 2 vols. fol.); Witzleben, Jobi gens (Sorae, 1656, 4to); Leigh, Adnotationes [including other poet. books] (Lond. 1657, fol.); Durham, Exposition (London, 1659, 8vo); Chemnitz, Persona Jobi (Jen. 1665, 4to, and since); Brenius, Notoe (transl. by Cuper, Amst. 1666, 4to); Zeller, Auslegung (Hamb. 1667, 4to); Spanheim, Historia (Genev. 1670, 4to; L. B. 1672, 8vo); Mercer, Commentarius (Genev. 1673, L. Bat. 1651. folio); Hack, Postill (Hamb. 1674, 4to); Hottinger, Analysis (Tigur. 1679, 8vo); \*Seb. Schmidt, Commentarius (Argent. 1680, 1690, 1705, 4to); Fabricius, Predigten (Norimb. 1681, 4to); Patrick, Paraphrase (Lond. 1685, 8vo); Clark, Exercitations [poetical] (Edinb. 1685, fol.); Van Hoecke, Vytlegging (Leyd. 1697, 4to); Hutcheson, Lectures (London, 1699, fol.); Blackmore, Paraphrase (Lond. 1700, folio); Antonides, Verklaaring (Leyd. 1700, 4to; in Germ. F. a. M. 1702, 4to); Stisser, Predigten (Lpz. 1704, 4to); Isham, Notes [includ. Prov., etc.] (Lond. 1706, 8vo); Kortüm, Anmerk. (Lipsiae, 1708, 4to); Daniel, Analysis (in French, Leyd. 1710, 12mo); Ob. ben-J. Sphorno, צֶדֵק מַשְׁפִּט (in the Rabb. Bibles and in Duran's Comment.; in Latin, Gotha, 1713-14, 3 vols. 4to); Egard, Erläuterung (Halle, 1716, 4to); Michaelis, Notoe (Halle, 1720, 4to); Scheuchzer, Naturwissensch., etc. (Zur. 1721, 4to); Distel, De salute  uxoris Jobi (Alt. 1722, 4to); Is. ben-Salomon Jabez, יַרְאִת שִׁדִּי (in the Amst. Rabb. Bible, 1724); Von der Hardt, In Jobum (vol. 1, Helmst. 1728, fol. [vol. 2 never appeared, having been, it is said, consigned to the flames by the author himself as absurd]); Crinsoz, Notes (in French, Rotterd. 1729, 4to); Hardouin, Paraphrase (in French, Par. 1729, 12mo); Duguet, Explication [mystical] (Par. 1732, 4. vols. 12mo); Anon. Explication (in French, Par. 1732, 2 vols. 12mo); Fenton, Annotations [includ. Psalm] (London, 1732, 8vo); Hoffmann, Erklärung (Hamb. 1734, 4to); S. Wesley, Dissertationes (Lond. 1736, fol.); Vogel, Commentarius (Lugd. 1757, 2 vols. 4to; abridged, ibid. 1773, 8vo); \*Schultens, Commentarius (L.B. 1737, 2 vols. 4to), also Animandversiones (Tr. ad Rh. 1708, 8vo), and Observationes (Amst. 1748, 8vo) ; abridged by Grey (Lond. 1741, 8vo) and by Vogel (Hal. 1773-4, 2 vols. 8vo); Baumgarten, Auslegung (pt. 1, Hal. 1740, 4to); Oetinger, Anmerkung. (F. a. M. 1743, 8vo); Koch, Anmerkung. (Lemg. 1743-7, 3 vols. 4to); Bahrdt, Erklärung (Lipsiae, 1744, 4to); Bellamy, Paraphrase (Lond. 1748, 4to); Reinhard, Erklär. (Lpz. 174950, 2 vols. 4to); Hodges, Scope, etc. (London, 1750, 4to, 1756, 8vo; Dubl. 1758, 8vo); Garnet Dissertation (Lond. 1751, 4to); Chappelow, Paraphrase (Camb. 1752, 2 vols. 4to); Heath, Essay (London, 1755, 4to; ib. 1756, 4to); Peters, Dissertation [against Warburton] (Lond. 2d ed. 1757, 8vo); Boullier, Observationes (Amst. 1758, 8vo); Stuss, De Epopoea Joboea (Gotha, 1758, 4to); Ceruti, Giobbo (Rome, 1764, 1773, 8vo), J. Uri-Scheraga, בֵּית יִעֲקֹב אֵשׁ (F. a. O. 1765, fol.); Sticht, De colloquio Dei cum Satana (Altona, 1766, 4to); Grynaeus, Anmerkung. (Basel, 1767, 4to); Froriep, Ephraemiana in J. (Lipsiae, 1769, 8vo); Cube, Uebers. (Berl. 1769-71, 3 vols. 8vo); Meintel, Erklärung (Nürnb. 1771, 4to), also Metaphrasis (ibid. 1775, 4to); Scott, Remarks (London, 1771, 4to, 1773, 8vo); Anon. Hist. of Job (Lond. 1772, 8vo); Dresler, Erläut. [on parts] (Herb. 1773, 8vo); Eckermann Umschreibung (Lüb. 1778, 4to); also Animadversiones (ibid. 1779, 8vo); Reiske, Conjecturoe [includ. Proverbs] (Lips. 1779, 8vo); Dessau, פֶּשֶׁר דָּבָר (Berl. 1779, 4to); Sander, Hiob (Lpz. 1780, 8vo); Moldenhauer, Uerbersetz. (Lpz. 1780-1, 2 vols. 8vo); Hufnagel, Anmerk. (Erlang. 1781, 8vo); Kessler, Anmerkung. (Tübingen, 1784, 8vo); Schnurrer, Animadversiones [on parts] (Tüb. 1787 sq., 2 pts. 4to); Greve, Notoe [on last ch.] (Davent. 1788, 4to); Dathe, Notoe [includ. Prov., etc.] (Hal. 1789, 8vo); Ilgen, Natura Jobi (Lipsiae, 1789, 8vo); Heins, Anmerk. (in Danish, Kiöbenh. 1790, 8vo); Ab. Wolfssohn, תִּרְגּיּם (Prague, 1791, Vienna, 1806, 8vo); Bellermann, Num  sit liber J. historia (Erf. 1792, 4to); also De Jobi indole (ib. 1793, 4to); also Ueber d. Plan Hiob (Berlin, 1813, 8vo); Muntinghe, Anmerk. (in Dutch, Amster. 1794, 8vo); in Germ., Lpz. 1797, 8vo); Jacobi, Annotationes [on parts] (Jen. 1795, 8vo); Garden, Notes (Lond. 1796, 8vo); Bergius, Exercitationes (Upsala, 1796, 8vo); Pape, Versuch (Götting. 1797, 8vo); Wheelden, Delineation, etc. (Lond. 1799, 8vo); Block, Uebers. (Ratzeb. 1799, Hamb. 1804, 8vo); Riedel, Gesänge (Pressb. 1799, 8vo); Satanow, תִּרְגּוּם, etc. (Berlin, 1799, 8vo); Richter, De oetate Jobi (Lipsiae, 1799, 4to); Eichhorn, Uebers. (Lpz. 1800, 8vo; also in his Biblioth. 4, 10 sq.); Kern, Inhalt, etc. (in Bengel's Archiv, 8, 352 sq.); also Observationes (Tüb. 1826, 4to); Stuhlmann, Erläut. (Hamburg, 1804, 8vo); Stock, Notes (Bath, 1805. 8vo); Ottensosser, תֵּרְגּוּם, etc. (Offenb. 1807 [?], 8vo); Pareau, De immortalitate, etc. (Davent. 1807, 8vo); Polozk (Pinch. ben-Jeh.), פַּינְהָס גַּבְעִת (Wilna, 1808, 4to); Gaab, Hiob (Tüb. 1809, 8vo); Elizabeth Smith [ed. Randolph], Annotations (London, 1810. 8vo); \*Good, Notes (Lond. 1812, 8vo); G.H. Bernstein, Zweck, etc. (in Keil's Analekten, 1813, I, 3:1-137); Neumann, Charakteristik, etc. (Bresl. 1817, 4to); Middeldorpf. Syr.-hexapl. etc. (Vratisl. 1817, 4to); Bridel, Commentaire (in part only, Paris, 1818, 8vo); Schärer, Erläut. (Bern, 1818-20, 2 vols. 8vo); Jäger, De integritate, etc. (Tüb. 1820, 8vo); Autenrieth, Hiob (Tüb. 1823, 8vo); Melsheimer, Anmerk. (Mannh. 1823, 8vo); \*Umbreit, Ausleg. (Heidelb. 1824, 1832, 8vo; in Engl., Edinb. 1836-7, 2 vols. 12mo); \*Rosenmüller, Scholia (Lipsiae, 1824, 8vo); Hrubieszow, בַּאוּרַים (Lemberg, 1824, 1834,Warsaw, 1838, 8vo); Hunt, Translation (Bath, 1825, 8vo); Levasseur, Traduction (Par. 1826, 8vo); Blumenfeld, Comment. (in Heb., Vienna, 1826, 8vo); Fry, Exposition (Lond. 1827, 8vo); Böcksel, Erläut. (Hamb. 1830, 8vo); Koster, Uebers. [includ. Eccles.] (Schleswig, 1831, 8vo); G. Lange, Uebers. (Halle, 1831, 8vo); Petri, Commentationes (Brunsw. 1833, 4to); Sachs, Charakt. etc. (in Stud. und Krit. 1834, p. 910 sq.); Jeitteles, תִּרְגּוּם, etc. (Vienna, 1834, 8vo); Knobel, De Jobi argumento (Vratisl. 1835, 8vo); Arnheim, Commentar (Glog. 1836, 8vo); \*Ewald, Erklär. (Gött. 1836, 8vo); Fockens, De Jobeide (Zütphen, 1836, 8vo); \*Lee, Commentary (Lond. 1837, 8vo); Anon. Paraphrase [poetical, on last 10 ch.] (Lond. 1838, 8vo); Dessauer, תִּרְגּוּם, etc. (Pressb. 1838, 8vo); Holzhausen, Uebers. (Gott. 1839, 8vo); Hölscher, Uebers. (Osnab. 1839, 8vo); Laurens, Traduction [includ. Psalms] (Par. 1839, 8vo); \*Wemyss, Job's Times (Lond. 1839, 8vo); \*Hirzel, Erklär. (Lpz. 1839, ed.  Olshausen, 1852, ed. Dillmann, 1864, 8vo); Justi, Erläuter. (Kassel, 1840, 8vo); Jenour, Translation (London, 1841, 8vo); \*Vaihinger, Erläuter. (Stuttg. 1842, 1856, 8vo); Stickel, Benzerk. (Lpzg. 1842, 8vo); J. Wolfson, Erläut. (Lpzg. 1843, 8vo); Gleiss, Beiträge (Hamb. 1845, 8vo); Polak, Ijjob (in Dutch, Amst. 1845, 8vo); Tattam, Tr. from Coptic (London, 1846, 8vo); Heiligstedt, Comment. (in new ed. of Maurer, Lips. et Berl. 1847, 8vo); Welte, Erklär. (Freib. 1849, 8vo); Hahn, Commentary (Berlin, 1849, 8vo); \*Noyes, Notes (Bost. 1850, 1854, 1867, 12mo); Barnes, Notes (N.Y. and Lond. 1850, 1854, 2 vols. 12mo). \*Schlottmann. Erläut. (Berlin, 1851, 8vo); Mercier, Commentarius [including Prov.] (Lugd. 1651, fol.); Froude, Job (in the Westminster Rev. 1853; reprinted in Short Studies, London, 1858); Kempe, Lectures (London, 1855, 12mo); Evans, Lectures (London, 1856, 8vo); Krahmer, Hiob (in the Theol. Literaturbl. 1856); \*Hengstenberg, Hiob (Berl. 1856, 1870 sq., 8vo); Anonym. Illustrationes (Lond. 1856, 8vo); \*Conant, Job (in public. of American Bible Union, N.Y. 1856, 4to and 12mo); Carey, Explanation (Lond. 1858, 8vo); \*Ebrard, Erläut. (Land. 1858, 8vo); C.H. Bernstein, Bar-Hebroei Scholia (Vratislav, 1858, 8vo); Berkholz, Hiob (Riga, 1859, 8vo).; \*Rénan, Livre de Job (Paris, 1859, 1860, 8vo); Crelier, Livre de Job [against Rénan] (Par. 1860, 8vo); Hupfeld, Bedeutung, etc. (in the Zeitschr. f. Christ. Wissensch. Aug. and Sept. 1860); Wagner, Sermons (Lond. 1860, 8vo); Simson, Kritik (Königsberg, 1861, 4to); Leroux, Traduction (Par. 1861, 8vo); Davidson, Commentary (vol. 1, Lond. 1862, 8vo); Odiosus, Erläut. (Berlin, 1863, 8vo); Croly, Job (Lond. 1863, 8vo); Bernard, Job (vol. 1, Lond. 1864, 8vo); Rodwell, Translation (London, 1864, 8vo): \*Delitzsch, Commentar (Lpz. 1864, 8vo; in English, Edinb. 1866, 2 vols. 8vo); Mourad, Oversalt. (Kjobenh. 1865, 8vo); Mathes, Verklaaring (Utrecht, 1866,2 vols. 8vo); Reuss, Vortrag (Strassb. 1869, 8vo); Anon. Notes (Lond. 1869, 4to); Volk, Summa, etc. (Dorpat, 1870, 4to). SEE POETRY.

## Job (2)[[@Headword:Job (2)]]

             (יוֹב, Yob; if genuine, perh. returning, from יוּב= אוּב; Sept. Ι᾿ασούβ.Vulg. Job.) The third-named of the four sons of Issachar (Gen 46:13). elsewhere called JASHUB (Num 26:24; 1Ch 7:1), for which this is probably an erroneous transcription.

## Job Of Rustoff[[@Headword:Job Of Rustoff]]

             first patriarch of the Russo-Greek Church, flourished in the second half of the 16th century. We have already had occasion to refer to the circumstances under which Russia succeeded in establishing an independent patriarchate in her dominions in the biographical sketch of the Greek patriarch Jeremiah (q.v.). This important event took place in 1589, and was solemnly confirmed by the Constantinopolitan patriarch in a synod of the Greek Church held in 1592. The act was also confirmed in 1619 by Theophil, the patriarch of Jerusalem. By the other Oriental patriarchs Job was recognized as the fifth patriarch of the orthodox Church. Of his personal history we are ignorant. See Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3, 291; Stanley, East. Church, p. 435, 436; Strahl, Russ-Kirchengesch. 1, 619. SEE GREEK CHURCH, vol. 3, p. 984, Colossians 2.

## Jobab[[@Headword:Jobab]]

             (Heb. Yobab', יוֹבָב, probably dweller in the desert, from the Arabic; Sept. Ι᾿ωβάβ, but in 1Ch 1:23, τὸν Εὐἱ καὶ τὸν ᾿Ωράμ, v.r. simply Ι᾿ωάβ), the name of several men.

1. The last-named of the sons of Joktan, and founder of a tribe in Arabia (Gen 10:29; 1Ch 1:23), B.C. post 2414. Bochart compares (Phaleg, 2, 29) the Jobaritoe (Ιωβαρῖται) of Ptolemy (6, 7, 24), a people on the eastern coast of Arabia, near the Socalitae, which, after Salmasius, he supposes to be for Jobabitoe; so also Michaelis (Spicileg. 2, 303; Supplem. 1013).

2. Son of Zerah of Bozrah, king of Edom after Bela and before Husham (Gen 36:33-34; 1Ch 1:44-45), B.C. prob. long ante 1617. The supposition that he was identical with the patriarch Job rests only upon the apocryphal addition to the book of Job in the Sept., and is utterly unworthy of credit. SEE JOB.

3. The Canaanitish king of Madon, one of those whose aid Jabin invoked in the struggle with the Israelites (Jos 11:1), B.C. 1617.

4. The first-named of the sons of Shaharaim by one of his wives, Hodesh or Baara of the tribe of Benjamin, although apparently born in Moab (1Ch 8:9), B.C. cir. 1612.

5. One of the “sons” of Elpaal, a chief of Benjamin, at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:18), B.C. probably cir. 588.

## Jobs Disease[[@Headword:Jobs Disease]]

             The opinion that the malady under which Job suffered was elephantiasis, or black leprosy, is so ancient that it is found, according to Origen's Hexapla, in the rendering which one of the Greek versions has made of Job 2:7. It was also entertained by Abulfeda (Hist. Anteisl. p. 26), and, in modern times, by the best scholars generally. The passages which are considered to indicate this disease are found in the description of his skin burning from head to foot, so that he took a potsherd to scrape himself (Job 2:7-8); in its being covered with putrefaction and crusts of earth, and  being at one time stiff and hard, while at another it cracked and discharged fluid (Job 7:5); in the offensive breath, which drove away the kindness of attendants (Job 19:17), in the restless nights, which were either sleepless or scared with frightful dreams (Job 7:13-14; Job 30:17); in general emaciation (Job 16:8); and in so intense a loathing of the burden of life that strangling and death were preferable to it (Job 7:15). In this picture of Job's sufferings the state of the skin is not so distinctly described as to enable us to identify the disease with elephantiasis in a rigorous sense. The difficulty is also increased by the fact that שְׁהַין (shechin', a sore, Sept. ἕλκος) is generally rendered “boils.” But that word, according to its radical sense, only means burning, inflammation — a hot sense of pain, which, although it attends boils and abscesses, is common to other cutaneous irritations. Moreover, the fact that Job scraped himself with a potsherd is irreconcilable with the notion that his body was covered with boils or open sores, but agrees very well with the thickened state of the skin which characterizes the disease. SEE LEPROSY.

## Jobson, Frederick James, D.D[[@Headword:Jobson, Frederick James, D.D]]

             a minister of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection, was born July 6, 1812, at Lincoln, England. He was converted in his eighteenth year, received on trial by the conference, and appointed to the Patrington Circuit in 1834. He soon became known and highly esteemed as a man of superior gifts and excellent spirit. He was a representative of the Wesleyan Church to American Methodism in 1855, and to Australia in 1860. He filled the appointment of book steward fifteen years, and was elected president of the conference in 1869. In 1880 he became a supernumerary, and died at Hull, January 4, 1881. Dr. Jobson published Chapel and School Architecture (1850): — America and American Methodism (1857): — Australia, with Notes by the Way of Egypt (1862). As a preacher, his fine natural temper, his sound judgment, combined with a most vivid imagination, his cultivated taste, and intense earnestness fitted him for that extensive usefulness which, by the grace of God, he achieved. His talents were much in request for funeral sermons and memorial tributes for his brethren in the Methodist body. Three of such productions, to the memory of the Reverend J. Bunting, D.J. Draper, and Dr. Hannah, were published separately. See Minutes of the British Conference, 1881, page 27.

## Joceline[[@Headword:Joceline]]

             bishop OF BATH AND WELLS.

SEE JOHN (KING OF ENGLAND).

## Joceline (2)[[@Headword:Joceline (2)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was elected bishop of the see of Glasgow in 1174, and consecrated by Eskilus, archbishop of Lunden, in Denmark, June 1, 1175, in Charavalle. He died at Melrose in 1199. He enlarged the cathedral of Glasgow, and is said to have rebuilt it in the same state it continues, and dedicated it in 1197. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 235.

## Joceline Of Salisbury[[@Headword:Joceline Of Salisbury]]

             a prelate of the early English Church, flourished from 1142 to 1184. In the controversy of Thomas a Becket with King Henry II on investitures, he played no unimportant part, for he sided with the king in this great ecclesiastical war, and thus fell under the displeasure of the archbishop. SEE INVESTITURE.

The latter, in accordance with his indomitable spirit, soon found a pretext to impress his inferior with his power at Rome by  condemning Joceline for his assent to the royal election or appointment of John of Oxford to the deanery of Salisbury, notwithstanding the archbishop's prohibition. Joceline adhering to his former course, Secket pronounced excommunication against the rebellious prelate, and this act was approved shortly after by pope Alexander III (1166). Of course the bishop remained in his place, but he encountered many difficulties from the subordination of inferior ecclesiastics, as in the case of the monks of Malmesbury about 1180 (comp. Inett, Hist. Engl. Ch. 2, ch. 15, § 19). SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF.

## Jocelyn (or Joceline) Of Wells[[@Headword:Jocelyn (or Joceline) Of Wells]]

             an early English prelate, was born and educated at Wells, Somersetshire, of which he became the bishop in 1206, and was the first to fix the title of Bath and Wells to the old see of Glaston. The monks of Glastonbury purchased their exemption from the territory of the see by parting with four manors to the new diocese of Wells. Jocelyn, with archbishop Langton, was banished on account of obstinacy against king John. After five years exile in France he returned to his see, and devoted himself to the beautifying and enriching of his cathedral. He erected some new prebends, and to the use of the chapter appropriated many churches, increasing the revenues of the offices, and he gave three manors to the episcopal see. He, with Hugo, bishop of Lincoln, was the first founder of St. John's, in Wells, and at his own cost built a chapel at Wokey, and another at Wells. The cathedral of Wells was his masterpiece, however. He died November 19, 1242. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 3:93.

## Jocelyn, George Bemis, D.D[[@Headword:Jocelyn, George Bemis, D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at New Haven, Connecticut, January 3, 1824. Shortly afterwards, with his parents, he removed to Cincinnati, and from thence, in 1830, to New Albany, Indiana, where he was converted at the age of fourteen. In 1842 he graduated at Indiana Asbury University. He was licensed to preach in 1843, and in the same year was admitted to Indiana Conference, and appointed to Paoli Circuit. In 1844 he was sent to Rockport, where his health soon failed; at his own request he was discontinued, and, removing to Vincennes, Indiana, opened a select school. A few months later in the same year he was placed in charge of the preparatory department of Vincennes University, which position he held till September, 1849, when he returned to New Albany and opened the De Pauw Female College.

In 1853 he was elected professor of mathematics and natural science in Whitewater College, and in 1855 to the presidency of the same institution. Failure of health led him to  spend 1856 as agent for a western railway company, and for the Northwestern University. In 1857 he was transferred to Iowa, and appointed to Fifth Street Church, Des Moines; in 1859 to Zion Church, Burlington; and in 1861 was elected president of Iowa Wesleyan University at Mount Pleasant, serving meantime as pastor of University and Asbury Chapel. In 1864 he was elected president of Albion College, Michigan, and transferred from the Iowa to the Detroit Conference. Resigning his presidency in 1869, he was transferred to the Michigan Conference, and stationed at Division Street, Grand Rapids. In 1871 he was re-elected president of Albion College, which office he sustained till his death, January 27, 1877. Dr. Jocelyn possessed large natural endowments, intellectual and spiritual, which he patiently and thoroughly cultured, placing him in the foremost rank of instructors of his age. As a preacher he had few superiors in power of thought, perspicuity of style, and impressiveness of manner. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1877, page 105; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Joch, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Joch, Johann Georg]]

             a German theologian, born at Rotenburg, in Franconia, in 1685, became professor of theology at Wittenberg, and died in 1731. To him belongs the credit of having been the first to assert the superiority of practical Christianity over the then prevailing pietism, in the principal stronghold of Lutheran theology, the cathedra Lutheri of Wittenberg. While yet at Jena, the center of pietism in the beginning of the 18th century, he was, both as a student and as private tutor, one of the disciples of Spener, and an ardent pietist; but when he became superintendent of the gymnasium of Dortmund, where dogmatics and polemics alone filled the churches and the halls of learning, Joch turned his attention to the subjects of conversion and second birth. He was of course involved in a controversy, but he seems to have been quite successful, for in 1726 he was made a professor of theology at Wittenberg. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. See Augusti, Der Pietismus in Jena, etc. (Jena, 1837) Göbel, Gesch. d. Christl. Lebens in d. rh.-westph. ev. Kirche.

## Jochanan Bar-Napacha[[@Headword:Jochanan Bar-Napacha]]

             a distinguished rabbi, was born in Judaea about A. D. 170. He is said to have studied under Judah Hakkodesh and other Jewish teachers, and is believed to have formed a school of his own at Tiberias when quite a youth. His history, like that of all other distinguished rabbis of that period has been so intermingled with extraordinary legends that it is well nigh impossible to arrive at anything definite concerning his life. So much appears certain, that he lived to a very old age, instructing very nearly to his last hour (in 279). He is by some Hebraists supposed to have collected all the works written on the Jerusalem Talmud (q.v.); but this seems  unreasonable. See J. Fürst, Biblioth. Judaica, 2:94, 99; Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, 4, 285 sq. SEE JUDAH HAK-KODESH. (J.H.W.)

## Jochanan Ben-Zachal[[@Headword:Jochanan Ben-Zachal]]

             a Jewish rabbi of some note, and contemporary of the celebrated Gamaliel II, whom he succeeded in the patriarchal dignity, was born about B.C. 50. But little is known of his personal history. He is said to have been a decided peace man, and to have greatly discouraged any revolutionary efforts of his suffering countrymen. This may account for the esteem in which he was held at the court of Vespasian, who was always found ready to oblige his Jewish friend. Jochanan Ben-Zachai is regarded as the restorer of Jewish learning and scholastic habits after the destruction of the Temple, by the founding of a school at Jabneh, and a new sanhedrim, of which he was the first president, thus presenting to the unfortunate and dispersed race another center in place of the lately destroyed capital. How long he served his people at Jabneh is not well known; Grätz inclines to put it at about ten years (comp. Frankel, Monatsschrift [1852. p. 201 sq.]). He died about A.D. 70. For details, see Grätz, Gesch. der Juden, 4, ch. 1; Basnage, Hist. des Juifs, 5, 15 sq.; 9, 95 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Jochanan Of Gischala[[@Headword:Jochanan Of Gischala]]

             SEE JOHN OF GISCHALA.

## Jochanan, Isaac ha-Lewi[[@Headword:Jochanan, Isaac ha-Lewi]]

             SEE ISAAC LEVITA.

## Jochanan, Salomo[[@Headword:Jochanan, Salomo]]

             a convert from Judaism, was a native of Posen. In 1657 he was baptized at Dantzic, was in 1659 professor of Hebrew there, and died July 1, 1683. He published, Programma de Jubilaeis Hebraeorum (Dantzic, 1658): — Demonstrationes 38, Jesum Christum Verum et Eternum Messiam Esse (Frankfort, 1660): — Der verheissene Messias (Dantzic, 1683): — Zertheilte Finsterniss, oder Widerlegung des Buches Fajumi's von Israels Erlosung (1681). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:97. (B.P.)

## Jochebed[[@Headword:Jochebed]]

             (Heb. Yoke'bed, יוֹכֶבֶד, Jehovah is her glory; Sept. Ιωχαβέδ or Ι᾿ωχάβεδ, the wife of Amram, and mother of Miriam, Aaron, and Moses (Num 26:59). B.C. 1738. In Exo 6:20 she is expressly declared to have been the sister of Amram's father, and consequently the aunt of her husband. As marriage between persons thus related was afterwards forbidden by the law (Lev 18:12), various attempts have been made to show that the relationship was more distant than the text in its literal meaning indicates. But the mere mention of the relationship implies that there was something remarkable in the case. The fact seems to be, that where this marriage was contracted there was no law forbidding such alliances, but they must in any case have been unusual, although not forbidden; and this, with the writer's knowledge that they were subsequently interdicted, sufficiently accounts for this one being so pointedly mentioned. The candor of the historian in declaring himself to be  sprung from a marriage afterwards forbidden by the law, delivered through himself, deserves especial notice. — Kitto. In Num 26:59, Jochebed is stated to have been “the daughter of Levi, whom her mother bore to Levi in Egypt,” from which it likewise appears that she was literally the sister of Kohath, Levi's son and Amram's father (Exo 6:16; Exo 6:18. On the chronology, see Brown's Ordo Soeclorum, p. 301). The courage and faith of this tender mother in braving Pharaoh's edict by her ingenious secretion and subsequent exposure of the infant Moses (Exo 2:1-10) are alluded to with commendation by the apostle (Heb 11:23), and were signally rewarded by divine providence; to her pious example and precepts the future lawgiver doubtless owed much of that integrity which so eminently characterized him. SEE MOSES.

## Joda[[@Headword:Joda]]

             (Ι᾿ωδά), a corrupt form (1 Esdr. 5, 58) of the name of JUDAH SEE JUDAH (q. v), the Levite (Ezr 3:9).

## Joed[[@Headword:Joed]]

             (Heb. Yoed', יוֹעֵד, Jehovah is his witness; Sept. Ι᾿ωάδ), son of Pedaiah, father of Meshullam, and grandfather of Sallu, which last was one of the Benjamites who resided in Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh 11:7). B.C. considerably ante 538.

Joed

(Heb. Yoël', יוֹאֵל, Jehovah is his God; Sept. and N.T. Ι᾿ωήλ), the name of at least twelve men.

1. The oldest of the two sons of Samuel, appointed by him as judges in Beer-sheba, where their maladministration led to the popular desire for a monarchy (1Sa 8:2). SEE SAMUEL. In 1Ch 6:28, by a clerical error, he is called VASHNI SEE VASHNI (q.v.). B.C. cir. 1094. He appears to have been the father of Heman, the Levitical singer (1Ch 6:33; 1Ch 15:17).

2. A descendant of Reuben (but by what line does not appear), and father of Shemaiah or Shema, several incidents in the history of whose posterity are related (1Ch 5:4; 1Ch 5:8). B.C. considerably ante 1092.  3. Brother of Nathan of Zobah, and one of David's famous warriors (1Ch 11:38); called IGAL SEE IGAL (q.v.) in the parallel passage (2Sa 23:36);

4. The third named of the four sons of Izrahiah, a chieftain of the tribe of Issachar (1Ch 7:3). B.C. prob. cir. 1017.

5. A chief Levite of the family of Gershom, at the head of 130 Temple servitors (1Ch 15:7; 1Ch 15:11); probably the same with the third of the “sons” of Laadan (1Ch 23:8), and also with the son of Jehiel, who, with Zetham his brother, had charge of the “treasures of the house of the Lord” (1Ch 26:22). B.C. 1042.

6. Son of Pedaiah, and prince of the half tribe of Manasseh west (1Ch 27:20). B.C. 1014.

7. Son of Pethuel, and second of the twelve minor prophets (Joe 1:1). His history is only known from the contents of the book that bears his name.

## Joel, Book Of[[@Headword:Joel, Book Of]]

             I. Personal Circumstances. —

1. Birthplace. — Pseudo-Epiphanius (2, 245) records a tradition that the prophet Joel was of the tribe of Reuben, born and buried at Bethhoron (v.r. Bethoim, etc.), between Jerusalem and Caesarea. It is most likely that he lived in Judaea. for his commission was to Judah, as that of Hosea had been to the ten tribes (Jerome, Comment. in Joel.). He exhorts the priests, and makes frequent mention of Judah and Jerusalem (1, 14; 2, 1, 153 32; 3, 1, 12, 17, 20, 21). It has been made a question whether he were a priest himself (Winer, Realw.), but there do not seem to be sufficient grounds for determining it in the affirmative, though some recent writers (e.g. Maurice, Prophets and Kings, p. 189) have taken this view.

2. Date. — Various opinions have been held respecting the period in which Joel lived. It appears most probable that he was contemporary with Amos and Isaiah, and delivered his predictions in the reign of Uzziah, B.C. cir. 800. This is the opinion maintained by Abarbanel, Vitringa, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Holzhausen, and others (see D.H. v. Kölln, Diss. de Joel oetate, Marb. 1811; Jäger, in the Tübing. theol. Zeitschr. 1828, 2, 227). Credner  (Joel, p. 38 sq.), with whom agree Movers (Chronicles 119 sq.), Hitzig (Kleine Proph. p. 4), and Meier (Joel, p. 16 sq.), places him in the time of Joash; Bertholdt (Einleit. 4, 1604) in that of Hezekiah; Cramer and Eckermann in Josiah's reign; Jahn (Einl. 2, 476) in Manasseh's; and Schröder still later; while some have placed him during the Babylonian captivity (Steudel, in Bengel's Archiv., 2, 232), and even after it (Vatke. Bibl. Theol. p. 462). The principal reason for the above conclusion; besides the order of the books (the Sept., however, places Joel after Amos and Micah), is the special and exclusive mention of the Egyptians and Edomites as enemies of Judah, no allusion being made to the Assyrians or Babylonians, who arose at a later period.

II. Contents. — We find, what we should expect on the supposition of Joel being the first prophet to Judah, only a grand outline of the whole terrible scene, which was to be depicted more and more in detail by subsequent prophets (Browne, Ordo Soecl. p. 691). The scope, therefore, is not any particular invasion, but the whole day of the Lord. “This book of Joel is a type of the early Jewish prophetical discourse, and may explain to us what distant events in the history of the land would expand it, and bring fresh discoveries within the sphere of the inspired man's vision” (Maurice, Prophets and Kings, p. 179). The proximate event to which the prophecy related was a public calamity, then impending on Judaea, of a twofold character: want of water, and a plague of locusts, continuing for several years. The prophet exhorts the people to turn to God with penitence, fasting, and prayer, and then, he says, the plague shall cease, and the rain descend in its season, and the land yield her accustomed fruit — nay, the time will be a most joyful one; for God, by the outpouring of his Spirit, will impart to his worshippers increased knowledge of himself, and, after the excision of the enemies of his people, will extend through them the blessings of true religion to heathen lands. Browne (Ordo Soecl. p. 692) regards the contents of the prophecy as embracing two visions, but it is better to consider it as one connected representation (Hengstenberg, Winer). For its interpretation we must observe not isolated facts of history, but the idea. The swarm of locusts was the medium through which this idea, “the ruin upon the apostate Church,” was represented to the inward contemplation of the prophet; but, in one unbroken connection, the idea goes on to penitence, return, blessing, outpouring of the Spirit, judgments on the enemies of the Church (1Pe 4:17), final establishment of God's kingdom. All prior destructions, judgments, and victories are like the  smaller circles, the final consummation of all things, to which the prophecy reaches, being the outmost one of all. There are thus four natural divisions of the entire book.

1. The prophet opens his commission by announcing an extraordinary plague of locusts, accompanied with extreme drought, which he depicts in a strain of animated and sublime poetry under the image of an invading army (Joe 1:1-2; Joe 1:11). The fidelity of his highly wrought description is corroborated and illustrated by the testimonies of Shaw, Volney, Forbes, and other eminent travelers, who have been eye witnesses of the ravages committed by this most terrible of the insect tribe. SEE LOCUST.

It is to be observed that locusts are named by Moses as instruments of the divine justice (Deu 28:38-39), and by Solomon in his prayer at the dedication of the Temple (1Ki 8:37). In the second chapter the formidable aspect of the locusts, their rapid progress, their sweeping devastation, the awful murmur of their countless throngs, their instinctive marshalling, the irresistible perseverance with which they make their way over every obstacle and through every aperture, are delineated with the utmost graphic force (Justi, Die Heuschrecken-Verwüstung Joel 2, in Eichhorn's Bibliothek, 4, 30-79). Dr. Hengstenberg calls in question the reality of their flight, but, as it appears to us, without adequate reason. Other particulars are mentioned which literally can apply only to locusts, and which, on the supposition that the language is allegorical, are explicable only as being accessory traits for filling up the picture (Davidson, Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 310).

Maurice (Prophets and Kings, p. 180) strongly maintains the literal interpretation of this judgment. Yet the plague contained a parable in it which it was the prophet's mission to unfold (comp. “heathen,” 1, 6). Hence a figurative interpretation was adopted by an early paraphrast, Ephrem the Syrian (A.D. 350), who supposes that by the four different denominations of the locusts were intended Tiglath-pileser, Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar. The Jews, in the time of Jerome (A.D. 400), understood by the first term the Assyrians and Chaldeans; by the second, the Medes and Persians; by the third, Alexander the Great and his successors, and by the fourth, the Romans. By others, however, the prophecy was interpreted literally, and Jerome himself appears to have fluctuated between the two opinions, though more inclined to the allegorical view. Grotius applies the description to the invasions by Pul and Shalmaneser. Holzhausen attempts to unite both modes of interpretation,  and applies the language literally to the locusts, and metaphorically to the Assyrians. It is singular, however, that, if a hostile invasion be intended, not the least hint is given of personal injury sustained by the inhabitants; the immediate effects are confined entirely to the vegetable productions and the cattle. Dr. Hengstenberg, while strongly averse from the literal sense, is not disposed to limit the metaphorical meaning to any one event or class of invaders. “The enemy,” he remarks, “are designated only as north countries. From the north, however, from Syria, all the principal invasions of Palestine proceeded. We have, therefore, no reason to think exclusively of any one of them; nor ought we to limit the prophecy to the people of the old covenant. Throughout all centuries there is but one Church of God existing in unbroken connection. That this Church, during the first period of its existence, was concentrated in a land into which hostile irruptions were made from the north was purely accidental. To make this circumstance the boundary stone of the fulfilment of prophecy were just as absurd as if one were to assert that the threatening of Amos, ‘By the sword shall all sinners of my people die,' has not been fulfilled in those who perished after another manner” (Christology Keith's translation, 3, 104). In accordance with the literal (and certainly the primary) interpretation of the prophecy, we should render אֶתאּהִמּוֹרֶהas in our A.V., “the former rain,” with Rosenmüller and the lexicographers, rather than “a (or the) teacher of righteousness,” with margin of A.V., Hengstenberg, and others. The allusion to the Messiah which Hengstenberg finds in this word, or to the ideal teacher (Deu 18:18), of whom Messiah was the chief, scarcely accords with the immediate context.

2. The prophet, after describing the approaching judgments, calls on his countrymen to repent, assuring them of the divine placability and readiness to forgive (Joe 2:12-17). He foretells the restoration of the land to its former fertility, and declares that Jehovah would still be their God (Joe 2:18-26; comp. Müller, Anmerk. ib. 2, 16, in Brenz. and Verd. Biblioth. 2, 161).

3. The אֵחֲרֵיכֵןof 3:1 in the Hebrew, “afterwards,” 2:27 of the A.V., raises us to a higher level of vision, and brings into view Messianic times and scenes (comp. Tysche, Illustratio vaticinii. Joelis 3 [Gött. 1788]; Steudel, Disq. in Joelis 3 Tübing. 1820]). Here, says Steudel, we have a Messianic prophecy altogether. If this prediction has ever yet been fulfilled, we must certainly refer the event to Acts 2. The best commentators are  agreed upon this. We must not, however, interpret it thus to the exclusion of all reference to preparatory events under the earlier dispensation, and still less to the exclusion of later Messianic times. Acts 2 virtually contained the whole subsequent development. The outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost was the ἀπαρχη, while the full accomplishment and the final reality are yet to come. But here both are blended in one, and the whole passage has therefore a double aspect (see Dresde, Proph. Joelis de effusione Sp. S. [Witt. 1782]). The passage is well quoted by Peter from the first prophet to the Jewish kingdom. His quoting it shows that the Messianic reference was the prevailing one in his day, though Act 2:39 proves that he extended his reference to the end of the dispensation. The expression “all flesh” (Act 2:17) is explained by the following clauses, by which no principle of distribution is meant, but only that all classes, without respect of persons, will be the subjects of the Spirit's influences. All distinction of races, too, will be done away (comp. Joe 2:32 with Rom 10:12-13).

4. Lastly, the accompanying portents and judgments upon the enemies of God (ch. 3, A.V.; 4, Hebrews), and their various solutions, according to the interpreters, in the repeated deportations of the Jews by neighboring merchants, and sale to the Macedonians (1Ma 3:41; Eze 27:13), followed by the sweeping away of the neighboring nations (Maurice); in the events accompanying the crucifixion, in the fall of Jerusalem, in the breaking up of all human polities. But here again the idea includes all manifestations of judgment, ending with the last. The whole is shadowed forth in dim outline, and, while some crises are past, others are yet to come (comp. 3:13-21 with Matthew 24 and Revelation 19). SEE DOUBLE SENSE.

III. The style of Joel, it has been remarked, unites the strength of Micah with the tenderness of Jeremiah. In vividness of description he rivals Nahum, and in sublimity and majesty is scarcely inferior to Isaiah and Habakkuk (Couz, Diss. de charactere poetico Joelis [Tüb. 1783]). “Imprimis est elegans, clarus, fusus, fluensque; valde etiam sublimis acer, fervidus” (Lowth, De Sacra Poesi Hebr. Prael. 21). Many German divines hold that Joel was the pattern of all the prophets. Some say that Isa 2:2-4; Mic 4:1-3, are direct imitations of him. Parts of the New Test. also (Rev 9:2 sq.; Rev 14:18) are pointed out as passages in his style.

The canonicity of this book has never been called in question,  IV. Commentaries. — The special exegetical helps on the book of Joel as a whole are the following, to the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Ephrem Syrus, Explanatio (in Syr., in Opp. 5, 249); Hugo a St. Victor, Annotationes (in Opp. 1); Seb. Münster, Commentarius (Aben- Ezra's, Basil. 1530, 8vo).; Luther, Enarratio [brief, with Amos and Obadiah] (Argent. 1536, 8vo); also Commentarius (Vitemb. 1547, 4to; both in German, Jen. 1553, 4to; and, together with Sententioe, in Opp. 3, 497; 4, 781, 821); Seb. Tuscan, Commentarius (Colon. 1556, fol.); Topsell, Commentarius (London, 1556, 1613, 4to; also in Engl. ib. 1599, 4to); Mercier, Commentarius [on first five minor proph.] (Paris, s. a. fol.; Lugd. 1621, 4to) ; Genebrard, Adnotationes (from Aben-Ezra and others, Paris, 1563, 4to); Draconis, Explicatio [with Micah and Zechariah] (Vitemb. 1565, fol.; and later separately); Selnecker, Anmerkungen (Lpz. 1578, 4to); Schadaeus, Synopsis (Argent. 1588, 4to); Matthias, Proelectiones (Basil. 1590, 8vo); Simonis, Joel propheta (Cracov. 1593, 4to); Bunny, Enarratio (Lond. 1583, 1595, 8vo); Bonerus, Paraphrasis (F. ad O. 1597, 4to); Wolder, Diexodus (Vitemb. 1605, 4to); Gesner, Comment. (Vitemb. 1614. 8vo); Tarnovius, Commentarius (Rost. 1627, 4to) ; Ursinus, Commentarius (Francf. 1641, 8vo); Strahl, Erklär. (Wittenb. 1650, 4to); Leusden, Explicatio [Rabbinical, includ. Obad.] (Ultraj. 1657, 8vo); De Veil, Commentarius (Par. 1676, 8vo); \*Pocock, Commentary (Oxf. 1691, fol.; in Latin, Lipsiae, 1695, 4to) ; Hase, Analysis (Brem. 1697, 4to); \*Van Toll, Vitlegginge (Utrecht, 1700, 4to); Schurrmann, Schaubühne (Wesel, 1700, 4to; in Dutch, ib. 1703, 4to); Zierold, Auslegung [mystical] (Francfort, 1720, 4to); J.A. Turretin, in his De S. S. Interpretatione, p. 307-45 (ed. Teller, Tr. ad Rh. 1728, 8vo); Chandler, Commentary (Lond. 1735, 4to); Richter, Animadversiones (Vitemb. 1747, 8vo), Baumgarten, Auslegung (Halle, 1756, 4to); Cramer, Commentarius (in his Scyth. Denkm. Kiel and Hamb. 1777-8, p. 143-245); Couz, Dissertatio, etc. (Tüb. 1783, 4to); Büttner, Joel vates (Coburg, 1784, 8vo); Eckermann, Erklärung (Tüb. u. Lpz. 1786, 8vo); Justi, Erläuterung (Lpz. 1792, 8vo); Wiggers, Erklärung (Gött. 1799, 8vo); Horsley, Notes (in Bibl. Crit. 2, 390); M. Philippson, מנְחָה טְהוֹרָה[including Hosea] (Dessau, 1805, 8vo); Swanborg, Notoe (Upsala, 1806, 8vo); \*Rosenmüller, Scholia (in vol. 7, pt. 1, Lipsiae, 1827, 8vo); Schröder, Anmerk. [includ. other poet. books] (in Harfenklänge, etc., Hildsh. 1827, 8vo; also separately, Lpz. 1829, 8vo); Holzhausen, Weissagung, etc. (Götting. 1829, 8vo); \*Credner, Erklärung [Rationalistic]  (Halle, 1831, 8vo); \*Meier, Erklärung (Tüb. 1844, 8vo); Robinson, Homilies (Lond. 1865, 8vo). SEE PROPHETS, MINOR.

8. A chief of the Gadites, resident in Bashan (1Ch 5:12). B.C. cir. 782.

9. A Levite, son of Uzziah or Azariah, and father of Elkanah, of the family of Kohath (1Ch 6:36), and one of those who cooperated with Hezekiah in his restoration of the Temple services (2Ch 29:12). B.C. 726. In 1Ch 6:24 he is called SHAUL by an evident error of transcribers.

10. A descendant of Simeon, apparently one of those whose enlarging families compelled them to emigrate to the valley of Gedor, whose aboriginal inhabitants they expelled (1Ch 4:35). B.C. cir. 712.

11. Son of Zichri, and prefect of the Benjamites resident at Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh 11:9). B.C. 536.

12. One of the “sons” of Nebo, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:43). B.C. 459.

## Joel, David[[@Headword:Joel, David]]

             a Jewish writer, was born at Schwerin, in the duchy of Posen, in 1813. After having completed his studies he was rabbi at Schwersentz and then at Krotoschin. In 1879 he was called to the Talmudic chair of the Rabbinical Seminary at Breslau, where he died, September 8, 1882. He is the author of מדרש הזהר, or Die Religions philosophie des Sohar (Leipsic, 1849). (B.P.)

## Joel, Heymann[[@Headword:Joel, Heymann]]

             a Jewish rabbi, who died at Hirschberg, in Silesia, December 20, 1884, published, Das Prinzip der Patriarchen (Diisseldorf, 1857): — Festpredigten fur die hohen Festtage des Jahres (2d ed. Hirschberg, 1872). (B.P.)

## Joelah[[@Headword:Joelah]]

             (Heb. Yoëlah', יוֹעֵאלָה, derivation uncertain; Sept. Ι᾿ωηλά v.r. Ι᾿ελία, Vulg. Joëla), one of the two sons of Jeroham of Gedor, mentioned along with the brave Benjamite archers and others who joined David's fortunes at Ziklag (1Ch 12:7). B.C. 1055.

## Joezer[[@Headword:Joezer]]

             (Heb. Yoë'zer, יוֹעֶזֶר, Jehovah is his help; Sept. Ι᾿οζαάρ v.r. Ι᾿ωζαρά), one of the Korhites who reinforced David while at Ziklag, and remained among his famous bodyguard (1Ch 12:6). B.C. 1055.

## Joga[[@Headword:Joga]]

             in Hinduism, is the world's age, according to which the whole Indian chronology is regulated. The earth, according to this system, stands 12,000 divine years, of which each contains 360 common years, together, 4,320,000 of our years. These 4,000,000 years are divided into four Jogas, which have their particular names. The first is called Krita-Joga, and lasts 4000 divine years; the second, Treta-Joga, lasting 3000 divine years; the third, Dwapar-Joga, lasting 2000 divine years; and the last is called Kali- Joga. In this we live, and it lasts 1000 divine years. Between each of these Jogas there is a twilight period, after the first, of 800 divine years, after the second, of 600 divine years, after the third, of 400 divine years, after the fourth, of 200 divine years. This entire period is called Maha-Joga, or Sadir-Joga. 1000 Maha-Jogas are 4,320,000,000 of our years, and this makes one day of Brahma.

The night is equally long, together, 8,640,000,000. In this night all things are dissolved until Brahma wakes up and re-enlivens them. Such a Sadir-Joga, taken 360 times, forms a year of Brahma, namely, 3,110,400,000,000 of our years. Brahma lives 100 such years, namely, 311,040,000,000,000. After Brahma's death an equally long period of destruction follows. After 622,080,000,000,000 years Brahma comes to life again, and the circle of days and nights begin anew. The last mentioned figure forms a day of Vishnu; 360 of these days form one of his years. His life lasts 100 such years, making a round sum of 22,394,880,000,000,000,000. Probably Shiva would have a still longer life had the Shivaites not made their god immortal.

## Joga (2)[[@Headword:Joga (2)]]

             SEE HINDUISM; SEE VISHNU.

## Jogbehah[[@Headword:Jogbehah]]

             (Heb. Yogbah', יָגְבִּהּ, only with ה paragogic, יָגְבְּהָה, lofty; Sept. Ι᾿εγεβαά, but ὕψωσαν αὐτάς in Numbers; Vulg. Jegbaa), a place  mentioned (between Jazer and Beth-nimrah) among the “fenced cities and folds for sheep” rebuilt by the Gadites (Num 32:35). It lay on the route of Gideon when pursuing the nomadic Midianites, near Nobah, beyond Penuel, in the direction of Karkor (Jdg 8:11). These notices correspond sufficiently with the locality of the ruined village El-Jebeiha (Robinson's Researches, 3, Append. p. 168), laid down on Robinson's and Zimmerman's maps on the edge of the desert east of Jebel el-Fukeis.

## Jogee[[@Headword:Jogee]]

             SEE YOGEE.

## Jogi[[@Headword:Jogi]]

             in Hinduism, are penitents who torture themselves, either for money or as an act of piety, in the most severe manner.

## Jogli [[@Headword:Jogli ]]

             (Heb. Yogli', יָגְלַי, exiled; Sept. Ι᾿εκλί), the father of Bukki, which latter was the Danite commissioner for partitioning the land of Canaan (Num 34:22). B.C. ante 1618.

## Joguegeir[[@Headword:Joguegeir]]

             in Hindu mythology, is the principal enemy of the eastern Buddha, and seems to be identical with Deuwadet. He is represented as a child, wound about by an angry snake; although it seems not to be the child, but the snake, that is the evil daemon, for Krishna killed the monstrous snake Kalinak, as a child, by treading on its head.

## Jogues, Isaac[[@Headword:Jogues, Isaac]]

             a French Jesuit missionary, was born in Orleans, January 10, 1607. He entered the Jesuit school at Rouen in 1624, studied theology in Paris, and took orders in 1636. He was sent as a missionary to Canada the same year, and reached Quebec July 2. He labored earnestly among the Hurons and Dinoudadies for several years. In 1642, in company with father Raymbault, he went to Sault Ste. Marie to establish a mission among the Algonquins. He returned to Quebec with a party of Hurons for supplies for the mission, and on his way back fell into an ambuscade of Iroquois, when. almost the whole party was killed and Jogues taken prisoner. He was now subjected to the most cruel treatment, and afterwards condemned to death. He became aware of his impending fate through the Dutch citizens of Albany, and effected his escape. He made his way to New Amsterdam (New York), and from there sailed to Europe. He returned to Canada in 1644, and in 1646 went with M. Bourdon to confirm the peace in the Mohawk castles.. Peace being established, he set out, September 27 of the same year, to found a Mohawk mission, but was put to death by the Mohawks at Caughnawaga (now Fonda), N.Y., October 18, 1646. A Life of Jogues, by the Reverend Felix Martin, appeared at Paris in 1873.

## Jogues, Or Yugs[[@Headword:Jogues, Or Yugs]]

             is a name among the Hindus for periods of extraordinary length spoken of in their mythological chronology.

## Joha[[@Headword:Joha]]

             (Heb. Yocha', יוֹחָא, probably contracted for יוֹחִיָּה, whom Jehovah revives), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿ωαζαέ v.r. Ι᾿ωζαέ) A person mentioned as a Tizite, along with his brother Jediael, the son of Shimri, among David's famous bodyguard (1Ch 11:45). B.C. 1046.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿ωαχά v.r. Ι᾿ωδά) The last named among the Benjamite chiefs, descendants of Beriah, resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:16). B.C. apparently 588 or 536.

## Johanan[[@Headword:Johanan]]

             (Heb. Yochanan', יוֹחָנָן, a contracted form of the name JEHOHANAN; comp. also JOHN), the name of several men. SEE JEHOHANAN, 3, 4, 6.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿ωνάν v.r. Ι᾿ωανάν.) The eighth of the Gadite braves who joined David's band in the fastness of the desert of Judah (1Ch 12:12). B.C. cir. 1061.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿ωανάν.) One apparently of the Benjamite slingers and archers who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:4). B.C. 1055.

3. (Sept. Ι᾿ωανάς v.r. Ι᾿ωανάν, Ι᾿ωνάς.) Son of Azariah and father of Azariah, high priests (1Ch 6:9-10, where perhaps an erroneous repetition of names has occurred). He is thought by some to have been the same with JEHOIADA (2Ch 24:15). Josephus, however (Ant. 10, 8, 6), seems to call him JORAM, and the Seder Olam JEHOAHAZ, whom it places in the reign of Jehoshaphat. SEE HIGH PRIEST.

4. (Sept. Ι᾿ωανάν.) The oldest son of king Josiah (1Ch 3:15). He must have been born in the fifteenth year of his father's age, and he seems to have been of so feeble a constitution as not to have survived his father. B.C. cir. 635-610. SEE JEHOAHAZ, 2.

5. (Sept. Ι᾿ωνά, in Jeremiah Ι᾿ωάναν and Ι᾿ωάνναν; Josephus Graecizes the name as John, Ι᾿ωάννης, Ant. 10, 9, 2). The son of Careah (Kareah), and one of the Jewish chiefs who rallied around Gedaliah on his appointment as governor by the Chaldeans (2Ki 25:23; Jer 40:8). It was he that warned Gedaliah of the nefarious plans of Ishmael, and offered to destroy him in anticipation, but the unsuspecting governor refused to listen to his prudent advice (Jer 40:13; Jer 40:16). After Gedaliah's assassination, Johanan pursued the murderer, and rescued the people taken away by him as captives to the Ammonites (Jer 41:8; Jer 41:13; Jer 41:15-16). He then applied to Jeremiah for counsel as to what course the remnant of the people should pursue, being apprehensive of severe treatment at the hands of the Chaldean authorities, as having interfered with the government (Jer 42:1; Jer 42:8); but, on hearing the divine injunction to remain in the land, he and his associates violated their promise of obedience, and persisted in retiring, with all their families and effects (carrying with them the prophet himself), to Tahpanes, in Egypt (Jer 43:2; Jer 43:4-5), where, doubtless, they were seized by the Chaldeans. B.C. 587.

6. (Sept. Ι᾿ωάναν.) Son of Katan (Hakkatan), of the “sons” of Azgad, who returned with 110 males from Babylon with Ezra (Ezr 8:12). B.C. 459.

7. (Sept. Ι᾿ωάναν.) A son of Tobiah, who named Meshullam's daughter (Neh 6:18). B.C. 446.

8. (Sept. Ι᾿ωανάν.) A chief priest, son (? grandson) of Eliashib, named as last of those whose contemporaries the Levites were recorded in “the book of the Chronicles” (Neh 12:22-23). He appears to be the same called JEHOHANAN (in the text, but “Johanan” in the Auth. Vers.) in Ezr 10:6; also JONATHAN, the son of Joiada and father of Jaddua, in Neh 12:11; comp. 22. B.C. prob. 459.

9. (Sept. Ι᾿ωανάμ.) The fifth named of the seven sons of Elioenai, of the descendants of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:24). He is apparently the same with the NAHUM mentioned among the ancestry of Christ (Luk 3:25. See Strong's Harm. and Expos. of the Gosp. p. 16, 17). B.C. somewhat post 406. SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

## Johannes[[@Headword:Johannes]]

             (Ι᾿ωαννής, the Greek form of the name John or Jehohanan) occurs in this form in the A.V. of two men in the Apocrypha.

1. A son of Acatan (1Es 8:38); the JOHANAN of Ezr 8:12.

2. A “son” of Bebai (1Es 9:29); the JEHOHANAN of Ezr 10:28.

## Johannites[[@Headword:Johannites]]

             SEE KNIGHTS OF MALTA.

## Johannsen, Johann Christian Gottberg[[@Headword:Johannsen, Johann Christian Gottberg]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born June 20, 1793, at Nortorf, Holstein. In 1818 he was preacher at Glickstadt, was called in 1825 as pastor primarius of St. Peter's at Copenhagen, and died in 1858, doctor of theology. He published, Aufschwung zu dem Ewigen (Altona, 1820, 2 parts): — Ueber die Grundsatze eines Lehrbuches der christl. Religion (ibid. 1823): — Religionsvortrage fur denkende Verehrer Jesu (ibid. 1828,2 parts): — Untersuchung der Rechtmassigkeit der Verpflichtung, etc. (ibid. 1833): Die Anfange des Symbolzwanges, etc. (Leipsic, 1847): — Die  augsburgische Confession (ibid. eod.). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:624 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:337, 473, 751; 2:16, 74, 100, 180, 234; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:99. (B.P.)

## Johlsohn, J. Joseph[[@Headword:Johlsohn, J. Joseph]]

             a Jewish scholar of some renown, was born in Fulda in 1777. Being the son of a rabbi, he was instructed from his early youth in the language and literature of the Old Testament, in which he became a great adept. When quite young, he left his native place and went to Frankfort-on-the-Main, where he engaged in private tuition, pursuing himself, at the same time, an extended course of study in languages and metaphysics. Later he removed to Kreuznach, and became professor of Hebrew, etc., in a public academy, but was called back in 1813 by the government to the professorial chair of Hebrew and religion in the Jewish academy at Frankfort, known as the “Philantropin.” Johlsohn's activity in this once renowned capital of the German empire fell in a time marked in Jewish annals as a period of agitation. The reform movement, SEE JUDAISM, which shortly after  developed more fully, was just budding, and he, partaking more or less of that spirit, earnestly labored for the introduction of sermons in the vernacular, hours of devotion on the Christian Sabbath, etc. To further encourage this awakening of a religious spirit, especially in the young, he published

(1) a hymn book entitled Gesangbuch für Israeliten (Frkf. 1816, and often, 8vo): — also

(2) a valuable work on the fundamentals of the Jewish religion, entitled שרשי חֹדת, with an Appendix describing the manners and customs of the Hebrews (Frkf. 2d ed. 1819): —

(3) A Chronological History of the Bible, in Heb., with the moral sayings of the Scriptures, seven Psalms with Kimchi's Commentary, a Hebrew Chrestomathy with notes, and a glossary called תולדות אבות (1820; 2d ed. 1837): —

(4) The Pentateuch translated into German, with Annotations (1831): —

(5) The sacred Scriptures of the Jews, translated into German, with Annotations (of which only 2 vols. were ever published), vol. 2 containing Joshua, Samuel, and Kings (1836): —

(6) A Hebrew Grammar for Schools, entitled יסודי הלשין forming a second part to the new ed. of the Chrestomathy (1838): —

(7) A Hebrew Lexicon, giving also the synonyms, with an appendix containing an explanation of the abbreviations used in the Rabbinical writings, entitled ערמִלים (1840): —

(8) A historical and dogmatic Treatise on Circumcision (1843). Johlsohn died in Frankfort June 13, 1851. See Stern, Gesch. des Judenthums, p. 181 sq.; Allgem. Zeitung des Judenth. 1851, p. 356; Kayserling (Dr. M.), Biblioth. jüd. Kanzelredner (Berlin, 1870), p. 382; Stein, Israelit. Volkslehrer, 1, 140 sq.; Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 2, 99 sq.; Kitto, s.v.

## John[[@Headword:John]]

             (Ι᾿ωάννη, the Greek form of Jehohanan; comp. Josephus, Ant. 8, 15, 2), a common name among the Jews after the captivity.

I. In the Apocrypha the following occur under this rendering in the A.V.:

1. The father of Matathias, of the Maccabean family (1Ma 2:1). SEE MACCABEES.

2. The son of Accos, and father of Eupolemus, which latter was one of the envoys sent by Judas Maccabaeus to Rome (1Ma 8:17; 2Ma 4:11).

3. Surnamed Caddis (q.v.), the eldest son of the same Matathias, and one of the Maccabean brothers (1Ma 2:2, Johanan; less correctly Joseph in 2Ma 8:22). He had been sent by his brother Jonathan on a message to the Nabathaeans, when he was taken prisoner by “the children of Jambri” (q.v.), from Medeba, and appears to have been put to death by them (1Ma 9:35-36; 1Ma 9:38)

4. One of the persons sent by the Jews with a petition to the Syrian general Lysias (2Ma 11:17).

5. The son of Simon Maccabaeus (1Ma 13:53; 1Ma 16:1-2; 1Ma 16:9; 1Ma 16:19; 1Ma 16:21; 1Ma 16:23), better known by the epithet HYRCANUS SEE HYRCANUS (q.v.).

II. In the New Testament the following are all that are mentioned, besides JOHN THE APOSTLE and JOHN THE BAPTIST, who are noticed separately below:

1. One of the high priest's family, who, with Annas and Caiaphas, sat in judgment upon the apostles Peter and John for their cure of the lame man and preaching in the Temple (Act 4:6), A.D. 29. Lightfoot identifies him with R. Johanan Ben-Zachai, who lived forty years before the destruction of the Temple, and was president of the great synagogue after its removal to Jabne, or Jamnia (Lightfoot, Cent. Chor. Matth. praef. ch. 15; see also Selden, De Synedriis, 2, ch. 15). Grotius merely says he was known to Rabbinical writers as “John the priest” (Comm. in Acts 4). — Smith.

2. The Hebrew name of the evangelist MARK SEE MARK (q.v.), who throughout the narrative of the Acts is designated by the name by which he was known among his countrymen (Act 12:12; Act 12:25; Act 13:5; Act 13:13; Act 15:37).

III. In Josephus the following are the most noteworthy of this name, besides the above and JOHN OF GISCHALA, whom we notice separately below:

1. A high priest (son of Judas, and grandson of Eliashib), who slew his brother Jesus in the Temple, thereby provoking the vengeance of Bagoses, the Persian viceroy under Artaxerxes (Ant. 11, 7, 1). He corresponds to the Jonathan (q.v.), son of Joiada, of Neh 12:10-11. SEE HIGH PRIEST.

2. Son of Dorcas, sent by the Sicarii with ten executioners to murder the persons taken into custody by John of Gischala on his arrival in Jerusalem (Josephus, War, 4, 3, 5).

3. Son of Sosas, one of the four popular generals of the Idumaeans who marched to Jerusalem in aid of the zealots at the instance of John of Gischala (Josephus. War, 4, 4, 2). He was possibly the same with John the Essene, spoken of as commander of the toparchy of Shamma at an earlier stage of the war (ib. 2, 20, 4; comp. 3, 2, 1). He was mortally wounded by a dart during the final siege (ib. 5, 6, 5).

## John "The Constant," Elector Of Saxony (1525-32)[[@Headword:John "The Constant," Elector Of Saxony (1525-32)]]

             one of the most zealous of the princely supporters of the Reformation, was born at Meissen, June 30, 1468. He early imbibed a love for a military life, and in several campaigns under Maximilian I, against the Hungarians and Venetians, displayed great decision and courage. When the Reformation struggle began he was already fifty years of age, but followed it up, from the very beginning, and with his son, John Frederick, soon became a follower of Luther, of whose sermons he often took notes. He bade the priests of his realm preach the gospel and administer the sacraments according to the institution of Christ. At the diet of Spires, in 1526, he openly espoused the cause of Luther, in connection with the other evangelical princes. He was threatened by a league of Catholic princes, formed at Breslau in 1528, with exile from his land and people unless he delivered up Luther and restored the old order of things.

He expressed his refusal to comply by marshalling his troops, which, however, it did not become necessary to use. At the second diet of Spires, in 1529, he signed a protest against the action of the majority, which forbade all religious innovations or discussions on the mass until the convention of an ecumenical council. He acknowledged obedience to the emperor, except where it conflicted with the honor of God and the salvation of souls. At the diet of Augsburg, in 1530, his conduct was heroic. In spite of all personal annoyances he stood firmly by the side of the evangelicals. In 1531 he entered into a league of defence with the evangelical princes and cities for six years, which forced upon the emperor the religious peace of Nuremberg, July 23, 1532. He died August 16 of the same year. Luther preached his funeral sermon from 1Th 4:13-18, and Melanchthon pronounced a memorial address soon after in Latin. Luther honored him as a pious, sincere prince. John was a man of peace, and yet a good soldier of Christ. See Spalatin's Biography, in Mencke, Script. rerum Germ. 3:1003 sq.; Ranke, Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation, 1-3; Gretschel-Bulau, Geschichte des sachsischen Volkes und Staates, 1:419 sq.; Plitt, Einleitung in die Augustana; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## John (2)[[@Headword:John (2)]]

             is the name of several early Scotch prelates:

1. Consecrated bishop of the see of Glasgow in 1115. Some time after he made a visit to the Holy Land. He rebuilt and adorned the cathedral church, and consecrated it in July, 1136; divided the diocese into two archdeaconries of Glasgow and Teviotdale, set up the offices of dean, subdean, chancellor, treasurer, sacrist, chantor, and succentor, and settled a prebend upon each of them out of the donations he had received from the king. He was witness to a charter of St. David's to the monastery of Newbottle in 1140. He died May 28, 1147. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 232.

2. A monk of Sais, in Normandy, and bishop of the see of the Isles about 1151. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 297.

3. Consecrated (with Hugh) bishop of St. Andrews in 1178. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 12.

4. Bishop of Caithness in 1185, and witness to king William in a donation to the abbey of Kinloss, at the time when Hugo was chancellor of the kingdom. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 206.

5. Bishop of Galloway in 1189. He became a monk of Holyrood House in 1206, and died in 1209. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 272.

6. Bishop of Aberdeen about 1200, and such in 1201. He died in 1207. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 105.

7. Probably bishop of the Isles in 1226. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 299.

8. Bishop of Dunkeld in 1356, and was still such in 1365. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 84.

9. Probably bishop of the Isles about 1388. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 304.

10. Bishop of Ross in 1420, and witness in the same year to a resignation made by William Graham of his barony of Kerdale into the hands of Thomas, earl of Moray. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 189.

11. Bishop of the Isles about 1490, and privy-councillor to king James IV, from whom he received the abbacy of Icolumkill in 1507. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 305.

12. Bishop of Argyle in 1499. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 288.

13. Joannes Electus Sodoren, sat in the Parliament in 1524. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 306.

## John (Called Also Jeannelin), Abbot Of Fecamp[[@Headword:John (Called Also Jeannelin), Abbot Of Fecamp]]

             France, was born in the neighborhood of Ravenna. His family name Labbe supposes to have been Dalye, or D'Alye. He came to France with William, abbot of St. Benigne of Dijon, and studied under that learned man. He practiced medicine with success; but William going to Fecamp to reform the abbey, and install there a colony of Benedictines, John accompanied him, was made prior, and finally succeeded William as abbot. He reformed several convents, and by his firm adherence to discipline embroiled himself with many prelates, sustained, however, in every instance by the pope. In 1054 he visited England, where he was welcomed by king Edward, but, having subsequently undertaken a journey to the Holy Land, he was made prisoner by the Mohammedans, and is said to have only returned to France in 1076. He died Feb. 2, 1079. He wrote a book of prayers, the preface of which is to be found in Mabillon, Analecta, 1, 133, and three chapters in. the Meditationes S. Augustini. He is also considered as the author of a treatise, De Divina Contemplatione, publ. in 1539, under the title of Confessio Theologica, and attributed to John Cassien, etc. See Gallia Christ. 11, col. 206; Hist. Litt. de la France, 8, 48; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, 26, 531.

## John (I, Patriarch) Of Constantinople[[@Headword:John (I, Patriarch) Of Constantinople]]

             SEE CHRYSOSTOM.

## John (II, Patriarch) Of Constantinople[[@Headword:John (II, Patriarch) Of Constantinople]]

             SEE JOHN THE CAPPADOCIAN.

## John (II, Patriarch) Of Constantinople (2)[[@Headword:John (II, Patriarch) Of Constantinople (2)]]

             SEE JOHN THE SCHOLAR (1).

## John (ST.) The Evangelists Day[[@Headword:John (ST.) The Evangelists Day]]

             the festival in honor of John the beloved disciple, the brother of James. The first trace of this festival, held on December 27, occurs in the writings of “the venerable” Bede. It is presumed that the observance of it at first was only local. The Council of Lyons, A.D. 1240, ordered that it should be perpetually and universally celebrated.

## John (St.), Christians Of[[@Headword:John (St.), Christians Of]]

             SEE SABIANS.

## John (Surnamed Lackland) King Of England[[@Headword:John (Surnamed Lackland) King Of England]]

             and youngest son of Henry II, was born at Oxford Dec. 24, 1166. After the conquest of Ireland, his father, in accordance with a bull from the pope authorizing Henry II to invest any one of his sons with the lordship of Ireland, appointed him to the government of that country in 1178, and he removed thither in 1185; but he failed so utterly in the task that he was recalled in a few months. He had always been the favorite of his father, and is said to have caused his death by joining his elder brothers in rebellion against Henry (of course, the controversy with Thomas a Becket, and his remorse after the archbishop's death, contributed no little to the sudden death of Henry II). Upon his brother Richard's succession he obtained a very favorable position in the English realm; indeed, so many earldoms were conferred on him that he was virtually sovereign of nearly one third of the kingdom. But this by no means satisfied John, by nature base, cowardly, and covetous. During the absence of his brother on a crusade, he sought even to obtain for himself the crown, but failed signally, earning only a very unenviable reputation for himself, while greatly increasing the affection of the English people for Richard. Upon the death of the latter, John, by express wish of Richard on his death bed, ascended the long-  coveted throne (May 26, 1199). The accusation that John avoided the claims of Arthur, the son of his elder brother Geoffrey, by imprisoning him and then privately putting him out of the way, are questions which belong to secular historians. It remains for us to state here only that king Philip Augustus of France, who had espoused John's cause in opposition to Richard, now espoused the cause of Arthur, and involved John in a war in which the latter was severely the loser, France regaining by 1204 the provinces that had been wrested from her. Far more serious were the results of another contest into which he was drawn, in 1205, by the death of the archbishop of Canterbury, and which forms a most important chapter in the history of investiture. Insisting upon the royal right of investiture, John first waged war against his own clergy, until finally Innocent III also took up the gauntlet, and thus drew upon himself not only the formidable hostility of the whole body of the national clergy, but also of one of the ablest and most imperious pontiffs of Rome, SEE INNOCENT III.

The question at issue was, of course, the election of a successor to the lately vacated archbishopric. It had hitherto been the custom of the clergy to defer the election to any vacancies in their ranks until the king had favored them with a conge d'elire. In this instance some of the juniors of the monks or canons of Christ Church, Canterbury, who possessed the right of voting in the choice of their archbishop, had proceeded to the election without such a grant from the royal chair, and chosen Reginald, their subprior, as successor, and installed him in the archiepiscopal throne before daylight.. Having enjoined upon him the strictest secrecy, they sent him immediately to Rome to secure the pontiff's confirmation of their act. The foolish Reginald, however, disclosed the secret, and it came to the ears of the king and the suffragan bishops of Canterbury. He at once caused the canons of Christ Church to proceed to a new election, and suggested John de Gray, bishop of Norwich, for the honorable position, who was accordingly installed, likewise against the wish of the suffragran bishops. These appealed to Rome, and John and the canons of Canterbury were forced to do likewise. This afforded Innocent III, ever on the alert to make his imperial power felt, a valuable opportunity to place forever at his own disposal one of the most important dignities in the Christian Church. Acceding to the doctrine of the invalidity of Reginald's election, he maintained that the new vacancy could only have been declared such by the sovereign pontiff, and that therefore the choice of the bishop of Norwich also was illegal, and put forth as the candidate for the primacy cardinal Langton, an Englishman by birth, but a devoted follower of the papal  prince. Of course the monks, however reluctantly, acted on the suggestion of the supreme head of the Church; but John by no means gave his adhesion to an act the important results of which he could well foresee. He at once initiated violent measures against the native clergy, determined to retain for the crown the rights of investiture (q.v.).

Innocent III, however, finding that he could not conquer the stubborn John by kind measures, at first mildly hinted the interdict, and in 1208 actually subjected the whole kingdom to this ecclesiastical chastisement, and the year following added to it the excommunication of John himself, absolving his subjects from their allegiance to him, and permitting them even to depose him from the throne. But John paid little heed to this display of “ecclesiastical thunder,” and in the midst of it even ventured to engage in war with Scotland, and with an energy quite uncommon to him suppressed all rebellious outbursts in his own domains. Innocent, finding his “ecclesiastical artillery” to be inefficient against England's king, entered into league with Philip Augustus, and caused the latter to prepare for an invasion of England. This undertaking soon brought John to terms, and in 1213 (May 13) he at last consented to submit to all the demands of the Holy See, of which the admission of the pope's nominee, Stephen de Langton, to the archbishopric of Canterbury, was the first. Nay, he even yielded much more than could have consistently been asked of him by the Roman see, and perpetrated an act of disgraceful cowardice, which has heaped everlasting infamy on his memory. Two days after, he made over to the pope the kingdoms of England and Ireland, to be held by him and by the Roman Church in fee, and took to his holiness the ordinary oath taken by vassals to their lords (see Reichel, The Roman See in the Middle Ages, p. 251 sq.). It is not to be wondered at that the Roman see now readily conceded to the demand of John that hereafter there should be an oblivion of the past on both sides, and that the bull of excommunication should be revoked by the pope, while, in return, John was obliged to pledge that of his disaffected English subjects those who were in confinement should be liberated, and those who had fled or been banished beyond seas should be permitted to return home. Philip, whose ambition was not a little mortified by this sudden agreement of pope and king, persisted in his invasion scheme, though no longer approved by Rome; but the French fleet was totally defeated in the harbor of Damme, 300 of their vessels were captured and above 100 destroyed. Subsequent events, however, proved more favorable to France, and aggravated the discontent at home against John. At length the English barons, tired of their tyrannical ruler, after vainly petitioning for more liberal concessions,  assembled at Stamford to wage war themselves against him, and marched directly on London, where they were hailed with great joy by the citizens. The king; fearing for his throne, now gladly consented to a conference.

They met the king at Runnymead, and, as a result of this meeting, they obtained, on June 15th, 1215, the Great Charter (Magna Charta), the basis of the English Constitution. The pope, who had constantly opposed the English in their revolutionary movements, soon after annulled the charter, and the war broke out again. The barons now called over the dauphin of France to be their leader, and Louis landed at Sandwich on May 30th, 1216. In attempting to cross the Wash, John lost his regalia and treasures, was taken ill, and died at Newark Castle on Oct. 19th, 1216 in the 49th year of his age. “All English historians paint the character of John in the darkest colors: and the history of his reign seems to prove that to his full share of the ferocity of his line he conjoined an unsteadiness and volatility, a susceptibility of being suddenly depressed by evil fortune, and elated beyond the bounds of moderation and prudence by its opposite, which gave a littleness to his character not belonging to that of any of his royal ancestors. He is charged, in addition, with a savage cruelty of disposition, and with the most unbounded licentiousness, while, on the other hand, so many vices are not allowed to have been relieved by a single good quality” (Engl. Cyclopedia, s.v.). Of course this may all be due to the fact that John has had no historian, that his cause expired with himself, and that every writer of his story has told it in the spirit of the opposite and victorious party; and, further, that the intense disgust always felt by every class of his countrymen at his base surrender of his kingdom in vassalage to the pope may have led them to regard with less distrust all adverse reports respecting his general character. See Milman, Lat. Christ. 5, ch. 5; Hallar, Middle Ages; Lingard, Hist. of England, 2, ch. 2; Hume, Hist. of Engl. 1, ch. 11; Gieseler, Ch. Hist. 3, § 54; Neander, Ch. Hist. 7, 235 sq.; Inett, Hist. Enql. Ch. 2, ch. 19 sq.; Riddle, Papacy, 2, 212 sq. (J.H.W.)

## John (VI, Patriarch) Of Constantinople[[@Headword:John (VI, Patriarch) Of Constantinople]]

             was appointed by the emperor, Philippicus Bardanes, A.D. 712, for his Monothelite opinions and his rejection of the authority of the sixth ecumenical (third Constantinopolitan) council. Cyrus, the predecessor of John, was deposed to make way for him, according to Cave. John was deposed, not long after his elevation, in consequence, apparently, of the deposition of his patron Philippicus, and the elevation of Artemius or Anastasius II. Theophanes does not notice the fate of John, but records the elevation of his successor, Germanus, metropolitan of Cyzicus, to the patriarchate of Constantinople A.D. 715. John wrote Ε᾿πιστολὴ πρὸς Κωνσταντῖνον τὸν ἁγιώτατον πάπαν ῾Ρώμης ἀπολογετική (Epistola ad Constantinum Sanctissimum Papam Romanum Apologetica), in which he defends certain transactions of the reign of Philippicus. This letter is published in the Concilia (6, col. 1407, ed. Labbe; 12, col. 196, ed. Mansi). It had previously been published in the Auctarium Novum of Combefis, 2, 211. See Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. 11, 152; Cave, Hist. Lit. 1, 619; Smith, Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, 2, 593.

## John A Lasco[[@Headword:John A Lasco]]

             SEE LASCO.

## John Agricola[[@Headword:John Agricola]]

             SEE AGRICOLA.

## John Alasco[[@Headword:John Alasco]]

             SEE LASCO.

## John Alexandrinus[[@Headword:John Alexandrinus]]

             SEE JOHN THE LABORIOUS.

## John Archaph[[@Headword:John Archaph]]

             (Α᾿ρχάφ), an Egyptian schismatic of some note, was a contemporary of Athanasius. He was a devoted follower of Melitius, who, just before his death, which occurred shortly after his condemnation by the Council of Nice (A.D. 325), made John the Meletian bishop of Memphis, and intrusted to him also the leadership of the Melitian as a body. John, supported by the Arians, renewed the attacks against the orthodox party, and the schism soon became as violent as ever. Athanasius, now patriarch of Alexandria, and leader of the orthodox party, was the great object of attack; and John and his followers sought to throw on him the odium of originating the disturbances, and of persecuting his opponents; and, especially, they charged him with the murder of Arsenius, a Melitian bishop, whom they had secreted in order to give color to the charge. Athanasius (q.v.), on his part, appealed to the emperor, Constantine the Great, charging John and his followers with unsoundness in the faith, with a desire to alter the decrees of the Nicene Council, and with raising tumults and insulting the orthodox; he also objected to them as being irregularly ordained. He refuted their charges, especially the charge of murder, ascertaining that Arsenius was alive, and obliged them to remain quiet. John professed to repent of his disorderly proceedings and to be reconciled to Athanasius, and returned with his party into the communion of the orthodox Church, but the reconciliation was not sincere or lasting; troubles broke out again, and a fresh separation took place, John and his followers either being ejected from communion by the Athanasian party, or their return opposed. The Council of Tyre (A.D. 335), in which the opponents of Athanasius were triumphant, ordered them to be readmitted; but the emperor, deeming John to be a contentious man, or at least thinking that his presence was incompatible with the peace of the Egyptian Church, banished him (A.D. 336), just after he had banished Athanasius into Gaul. The place of his exile and his subsequent fate are not known — Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. 2, 21, 22, 25, 31; Athanasius, Apol. contra Arianos, c. 65,  67, 70, 71; Tillemont, Mémoires, vol. 6 passim, vol. 7 passim; Neale, Hist. Eastern Ch. (Alexandria) 1, 131; Smith, Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog, 2, 587.

## John Argyropulus[[@Headword:John Argyropulus]]

             (Α᾿ργυροποῦλος), one of the learned Greeks whose flight into Western Europe contributed so powerfully to the revival of learning, was born at Constantinople of a noble family, and was a presbyter of that city, on the capture of which (A.D. 1453) he is said by Fabricius and Cave to have fled into Italy; but there is every reason to believe that his removal was antecedent to that event, and that he was in Italy several times previously. A passage cited by Tiraboschi (Storia della Lett. Italiana, 6, 198) makes it likely that he was at Padua A.D. 1434, reading and explaining the works of Aristotle on natural philosophy. In A.D. 1439 an Argyropulus was present with the emperor John Palaeologus at the Council of Florence (Michael Ducas, Hist. Byzant. c. 31), and, though it is not certain that this was our John, it yet seems very probable. In A.D. 1441 he was at Constantinople, as appears from a letter of Francesco Filelfo to Pietro Perleoni (see Philelphus, Epistol. 3), engaged in public teaching, but it is uncertain how long he had been established there. Probably he had returned some time between A.D. 1434 and 1439, and accompanied Bessarion to and from the Council of Florence. Among his pupils at Constantinople was Michael Apostolius. During his abode in Italy, after his last removal thither in 1453, he was honorably received by Cosmo de' Medici, and was made preceptor to Lorenzo de' Medici, the celebrated son of Pietro, in Greek and in the Aristotelian philosophy, especially in ethics. When Lorenzo succeeded to the throne in A.D. 1469 he established a Greek academy in that city, and in it Argyropulus read and expounded the classical Greek writers to the Florentine youth. From Florence he removed to Rome, on account of the plague which had broken out in the former city; the time of his removal is not ascertained, but it was before 1471. At Rome he obtained an ample subsistence by teaching Greek and philosophy, and especially by publicly expounding the works of Aristotle. He died at the age of seventy from an autumnal fever said to have been brought on by eating too freely of melons, but the year of his death is variously stated; all that appears to be certainly known is that he survived Theodore Gaza, who died A.D. 1478. The attainments of Argyropulus were highly estimated in his own and the succeeding age. Thus it is related of Theodore Gaza that, when he found that Argyropulus was engaged in translating some pieces of Aristotle, on  which he had also been occupied, he burnt his own versions, that he might not, by provoking any unfavorable comparison, stand in the way of his friend's rising reputation. The works of Argyropulus are as follows: Original works —

1. Περὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐκπορεύσεως De Processione Spiritus Sancti; printed with a Latin version in the Groecia Orthodoxa of Leo Allatius, 1, 400-418: —

2. Oratio quarta pro Synodo Florentina, cited by Nicolaus Comnenus Papadopoli in his Proenotiones Mystagogioce. We do not know if this has been published, or whether it is in Latin or Greek: —

3. Commentarii in Ethica Nicomachea (Florence, 1478). This work comprehends the substance of his expository lectures on the Nicomachian ethics of Aristotle, taken down and published by Donatus Acciajuoli, who is mentioned as a pupil of Argyropulus: —

4. Commentarii in Aristotelis Metaphysica, published with Bessarion's version of that work (Paris, 1515, fol.). The other original works of Argyropulus are scattered in MSS. through the libraries of Europe (of which a full list is given by Smith, ut infra). He also translated the Proedicabilia, or De quinque vocibus of Porphyry, and the Homilioe S. Basilii in Hexaemeron. His version of Porphyry was printed with his translations of Aristotle at Venice in 1496, and that of Basil at Rome in 1515. — See Hody, De Groecis Illustribus, p. 187-210; Wharton in Cave, Hist. Litt. 2, Appendix, p. 168; Fabricius, Bibl. Groec. 3, 496. etc.; 11, 469, etc.; Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2, 587.

## John Baptist[[@Headword:John Baptist]]

             a French missionary priest in the latter part of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. The son of the emperor of Cochin China, Gya-Long, having come to France with the bishop of Adran in 1787, concluded a treaty with king Louis XVI, by which the latter was to aid him in regaining his throne, which he had lost by a revolution. Events prevented Louis from keeping his promise, but Gya-Long, having regained his kingdom, called to his court the bishop of Adran, who became his prime minister, and John Baptist, who had acted as general vicar to the bishop. He also enacted  several laws favoring Roman Catholicism. The bishop of Adran died in 1817, and Gya-Long himself in 1819. His successor being opposed to Christianity John Baptist left Huë-Foo, the capital of the empire of Annam, where he had resided, travelled through the East, and in 1827 settled in the convent of St. Francis at Macao, where he died July 9, 1847. He is said to have left a collection of interesting documents on China and the other countries he visited. See Le Constituionnel, Oct. 17, 1847. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 26:567. (J.N.P.)

## John Baptist Of Salerno[[@Headword:John Baptist Of Salerno]]

             a Jesuit, and friend of pope Clement XI, was born in 1670. He accompanied the nephew of the pope, Albani, to Germany and Poland as theological adviser, and succeeded in converting Frederick Augustus of Saxony to the Church of Rome. In acknowledgment of this deed John Baptist was made cardinal, and died in 1729. He is the author of Specimen Orientalis Ecclesice (Rome, 1706). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## John Bessarion[[@Headword:John Bessarion]]

             SEE BESSARION.

## John Borellus[[@Headword:John Borellus]]

             SEE JOHN OF PARMA.

## John Buridanus[[@Headword:John Buridanus]]

             a celebrated Nominalist of the 14th century, was born at Bethune, in Artois. He is reputed to have been a pupil of Occam, then to have lectured with great ability and success in Paris, and to have risen to the distinction of rector of the university of that city about 1330, and to have quitted that place only after the Realists had gained the ascendency, SEE REALISM and SEE NOMINALISM, and to have assisted in the founding of the university at Vienna. He was looked upon by his contemporaries as one of the most  powerful adversaries of Realism, and distinguished himself also by his rules for finding the middle term in logic, a species of contrivance denominated by some the Ass's Bridge, as well as by his inquiries concerning free will, wherein he approached the principles of Determinatism, maintaining that we necessarily prefer the greater of two goods. As for the celebrated illustration which bears his name, of an ass dying for hunger between two bundles of hay, it is not to be found in his writings, which. are, Quoestiones in X libb. Ethicorum Aristot. (Paris, 1489, fol.; Oxford, 1637, 4to): — Quoest. in Polit. Arist. (Par. 1500, fol.): — Compendium Logicoe (Ven. 1499, fol.): — Summula de Dialecticâ (Paris, 1487, fol.); etc. Complete editions of his works were published at Paris in 1500, 1516, and 1518. See Bayle, Histor. Dict. art. Buridanus; Tennemann, Gesch. der Phil. 8, 2, 914 sq.; Man. of Philos. (transl. by Morell), p. 246.

## John Chrysostom[[@Headword:John Chrysostom]]

             SEE CHRYSOSTOM.

## John Climacus[[@Headword:John Climacus]]

             SEE JOHN THE SCHOLAR, 2.

## John Cyparissiota[[@Headword:John Cyparissiota]]

             (Κυπαρισσιώτης), surnamed the Wise, an ecclesiastical writer, lived in the latter half of the 14th century, not in the middle of the 12th, as erroneously stated by Labbe in his Chronologia Brevis Ecclesiasticorum Scriptorum. Cyparissiota was an opponent of Gregory Palamas (q.v.) and his followers (the believers in the light of Mount Tabor), and most of his works (of which some were written after 1359) had reference to that controversy. They compose a series of five treatises, but only the first and fourth books of the first treatise of the series, Palamiticarum Transgressionum Libri 4, have been published. They appeared, with a Latin version, in the Auctarium Nocissimum of Combefis, 2, 68-105, and the Latin version was given in the Bibliotheca Patrumn, 21, 476, etc. (ed. Lyons, 1677). Cyparissiota wrote also ῎Εκθεσις στοιχειώδης ῥήσεων θεολογικῶν (Expositio Materiarum eorum que de Deo a Theologis dicuntur). The work is divided into one hundred chapters, which are subdivided in ten decades or portions of ten chapters each, from which arrangement the work is sometimes referred to by the simple title of Decades. A Latin version of it by Franciscus Turrianus was published at Rome in 1581, 4to, and was reprinted in the Bibliotheca Patrum, 21, 377, etc. — Combefis, Auctar. Novissim. 2, 105; Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. 11, 507; Cave, Hist. Litt. vol. 2, Appendix by Gery and Wharton, p. 65; Oudin, De Scriptor. et Scriptis Ecclesiasticis, 3, 1062; Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2, 594.

## John De Dieu[[@Headword:John De Dieu]]

             (JOHANNES A DEO), saint, founder of the order of charity, was born at Monte-Mor-el-Novo, Portugal, March 8, 1495. An unknown priest stole him from his father, a poor man called Andrea Ciudad, and afterwards abandoned him at Oropesa, in Castile. After roving about many years, he was led to dedicate himself to a religious life by the preaching of John of Avila, whom he heard at Grenada. So excited became he, that, according to Richard and Glraud, he went through the town flogging himself, and never stopped till he went, half dead, to the hospital. He resolved to devote himself to the care of the sick, and changed his family name for de Dieu (a Deo), by permission of the bishop of Tui. In 1540 he opened the first house  of his order at Seville, and died March 8, 1550, without leaving any set rules for his disciples. In 1572 pope Pius V subjected them to the rule of St. Augustine, adding a vow to devote themselves to the care of the sick, and sundry other regulations. SEE CHARITY, BROTHERS OF. John de Dieu was canonized by pope Alexander VIII, October 16, 1690. He is commemorated on the 8th of March. See Castro et Girard de Ville-Thierri, Vies de St. Jean de Dieu; Baillet, Vies des Saints, March 8; Heliot, Histoire des Ordres Monastiques, vol. 4, ch. 18; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 26, 442 sq.

## John De La Rochelle[[@Headword:John De La Rochelle]]

             a French theologian, was born in the early part of the 13th century, probably in the city of La Rochelle. He joined the Franciscans, and studied under Alexander de Hales, whom he succeeded in 1238, but resigned in 1253 in favor of St. Bonaventura. He died at Paris in 1271, according to Luc Wadding. John de la Rochelle was a successful teacher, yet his works did not enjoy much renown, probably because he did not follow the mystical tendency of the times. Among his works we notice commentaries on a number of the books of the Bible; sermons, preserved in the MS. collections of divers libraries, chiefly in that of Troyes, France; De Anima,  MSS. in the library of St. Victor; and he is also considered the author of some other works, but on doubtful grounds. He is especially deserving of notice as one of the first, if not the first who attempted to explain Aristotle's Περὶ ψυχῆς, a task of which he ably disposed. Thomas Aquinas probably availed himself of this work. See Cas. Oudin, De Script. Eccles.; Histoire Litt. de la France, 19, 171; B, Haureau, De la Philosophie Scolastique, 1, 475; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 26, 548. (J. N.P.)

## John Duns Scotus[[@Headword:John Duns Scotus]]

             SEE DUNS SCOTUS.

## John Eleemosynarius[[@Headword:John Eleemosynarius]]

             SEE JOHN THE ALMSGIVER.

## John Frederick[[@Headword:John Frederick]]

             elector of Saxony. SEE REFORMATION; SEE SAXONY.

## John Gallensis[[@Headword:John Gallensis]]

             SEE CANON LAW, vol. 2, p. 88 (2).

## John Goch[[@Headword:John Goch]]

             SEE GOCH.

## John Howard[[@Headword:John Howard]]

             an eminent English Baptist minister, was born at Oxford, March 24, 1791. He received his collegiate education at the University of Edinburgh, and having decided to. enter the ministry in the Baptist denomination, began his labors at Haverford-West, where he remained for some time, and then removed to Reading. Subsequently he accepted a call to become the pastor of a large congregation worshipping in Devonshire Square, Bishopsgate, London. In 1831 he visited America. Returning to England, he once more took up his residence in Reading, where he became again a pastor, though not of the same church with which he had before been connected. Here for several years he continued to reside, until he retired from the pastorate and removed to Bristol. He died there, December 17, 1873. Mr. Hinton was a somewhat voluminous writer. Among the works which he published were his Memoirs of William Knife a distinguished Baptist missionary to the West Indies: — A history of the United States (2 volumes, 4to), of which several editions have been published: — Theology: — Elements of Natural History, besides many smaller productions on the voluntary principle in education and religion. His works have been collected in seven volumes. (J.C.S.)

## John Hyrcanus[[@Headword:John Hyrcanus]]

             SEE HYRCANUS.

## John I, Pope Of Rome[[@Headword:John I, Pope Of Rome]]

             a Tuscan by birth, ascended the papal throne Aug. 13, 523. About this time the bigoted Eastern emperor Justus II had issued an edict against heretics of all denominations, commanding them to be put to death wherever found in his dominions; but, as it was principally aimed against the detested Manichaeans, all went well until, in 524, the emperor issued another edict, this time against the Arians of Italy. Their patron Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, was induced to intercede for them in Byzantium, and he dispatched an embassy for this purpose, headed by the orthodox pope John himself, who had thus to plead a cause for which he had no sympathy. The latter promised, in undertaking the mission, to procure the revocation of the edict and in this he succeeded, but, failing to procure also the emperor's permission for all those who had forsaken Arianism unwillingly to return to their former faith, and Theodoric fearing that the whole work on the part of the pope was a piece of deception, and that the Romans, with the bishop at their head instead of seeking relief from the intolerance  of Greek orthodoxy, solicited aid against the Goths, imprisoned the pope on his arrival at Ravenna, where he died May 18, 526. A Roman tradition reports, not without some complacency, that in Constantinople the emperor bowed down before the bishop of Rome, and that at high mass the seat of the latter, by his special request, was raised above that of the patriarch; seemingly, of course, a concession of superiority to the Roman see. John is numbered among the martyrs. Two letters are ascribed to him by Baronius and others, but they are now generally rejected. See Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 2, 312 sq.; Riddle, Papacy, 1, 199.

## John II[[@Headword:John II]]

             Pope, a Roman by birth, surnamed Mercurius, succeeded Boniface II in the Roman see in 532, being elected by the clergy and the people of Rome after considerable agitation and many simoniacal practices, and confirmed by king Athalaric, for which confirmation a certain payment was fixed by an edict of the same king. The emperor Justinian, in a letter addressed to him shortly after his accession, after earnest assurances of his endeavor to unite the Western and Eastern churches, makes full confession of superior power belonging to the Roman hierarchy, designating him as “the head of the holy Church.” The only other important events in his life are his decision on the Trinity question in favor of Justinian (q.v.) SEE ACOEMETAE and in the case of othe bishop of Riez (q.v.). He died in 535. See Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 2, 333 sq.; Riddle, Papacy, 1, 203.

## John III[[@Headword:John III]]

             the patriarch, surnamed THE SCHOLAR (1), was born at Sirimis, near Antioch, towards the middle of the 6th century. He became successively attorney, then presbyter of Antioch, and finally, in 565, patriarch of Constantinople under Justinian I. He died in 577. He prepared a large Collectio canonum under fifty headings, which became authoritative in the whole Greek Church. He is also considered as the author of a collection of ecclesiastical rules and regulations under the title Nomocanon (both in Justelli, Biblioth.juris canonici [Paris, 1662], 2, 499, 603, 660). He is also said to have delivered a dissertation on the doctrine of the Trinity which involved him in a controversy with the renowned so-called Tritheist John Philoponus (Phot. Cod. 75).

## John III (2)[[@Headword:John III (2)]]

             Pope, a native of Rome, was elected to succeed Pelagius I in 560, and was confirmed by the exarch of Ravenna in the name of the emperor Justinian. Like many of his predecessors, he used his powers mainly for the aggrandizement of the Roman see. He is noted for his interference in behalf of the two French bishops of Embrun and of Gap, who had been deposed by local councils for improper conduct. Though known to be guilty, he ordered their restoration, which Gontram, the Burgundian king, was only too happy to enforce in opposition to the French clergy. But the Gallican Church, which had with very great hesitancy permitted the restoration of the guilty men, soon proved them to be unworthy of ecclesiastical office, and a new French council confirmed their previous deposition. John died in 574. See Riddle, Papacy, 1, 210; Bower, History of the Popes, 2, 426 sq.  Pope, a Dalmatian by birth, was consecrated Dec. 25, 640. He displayed great zeal in founding convents and endowing the churches of Rome. But he is noted especially for his strife against his Greek rival. The Monothelite creed of the patriarch Sergius, promulgated by the emperor Herodius as ἔκθεσις, was denounced by John as heresy, and condemned by a Roman synod A.D. 641. John defended Honorius from the charge made by the Eastern Church that he was guilty of the Monothelite heresy, and Eutychius informs us that, before his death (Oct. 12, 642), the emperor Constans gave John IV the promise of withdrawing the ἴκθεσις, but the controversy continued under his successors. See Bower, History of the Popes, 3, 24 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 754.

## John IX[[@Headword:John IX]]

             Pope, a Benedictine of Tivoli, was consecrated to the pontifical office June, 898. He held two councils, one at St. Peter's, where the wrong done to his  badly-abused predecessor Formosus was redressed; the other at Ravenna, which passed an act for the better protection of Church property against thieves and incendiaries. John displayed an honest zeal in defending the rights and regulating the discipline of the Church. His rival for the papal throne, Sergius (q.v.), he successfully combated, and, by authority of a council he had called, excommunicated him, with several other ecclesiastical accessories. John died July, 900. On his life, see Muratori, vol. 3, pt. 2; on the synods, Mansi, vol. 18. See also Milman, Latin Christianity, 3, 112 sq.; Bower, History of the Popes, 5, 77 sq.

## John Jejunator[[@Headword:John Jejunator]]

             SEE JOHN THE FASTER.

## John Maro[[@Headword:John Maro]]

             SEE MARONITES.

## John Niciota[[@Headword:John Niciota]]

             (from Nicius, probably the city of that name in the Thebais), also surnamed the Recluse, patriarch of the Jacobite Alexandrian Church, flourished in the early part of the 6th century, and was in the patriarchal chair from 507 to 517. He is noted for his violent opposition to the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, and is said to have refused communication with any that did not expressly anathematize them, and to have promised the emperor Anastasius two hundred pounds of gold if he would procure their final and decisive abrogation (see Neale, Hist. East. Ch. [Alexandria] 2, 26, 27; Theophanes, s.a. A.D. 512). Among the Jacobites, who in his day enjoyed especial favors at the imperial court (a period on which, says Neale, “the Jacobite writers dwell with peculiar complacency,” and in which “their heresy had gained a footing which it never before or since possessed”), John Niciota, better known as patriarch John II of Alexandria, is reckoned among the saints. He is believed to be the author of a learned work against the Pelagians, addressed to pope Gelasius. Some think it was written by John I of Alexandria, but it is in all probability the production of John Niciota, and was written before his accession to the patriarchal chair. (J.H.W.)

## John Of Alexandria[[@Headword:John Of Alexandria]]

             SEE JOHN NICIOTA; SEE JOHN TALAIA.

## John Of Antioch (1)[[@Headword:John Of Antioch (1)]]

             a prelate of the early Greek Church, distinguished for the part he took in the controversy between Cyril and Nestorius, flourished in the first half of the 5th century, and succeeded Theodotus in the patriarchate of Antioch about A.D. 427. Favorably disposed towards Nestorius, who is said to have been a schoolmate of his in the monastery of St. Euprepius, near Antioch, he was forced to take decided ground against Cyril by the impolitic conduct of the latter at the Council of Ephesus (q.v.). Among the Eastern bishops who came with John of Antioch to attend the council, he was the acknowledged leader, and we need not wonder, therefore, that he swayed them all in favor of Nestorius, when, on arriving at Ephesus, they learned that the sessions had not only commenced, but that Nestorius had already been actually condemned without their sanction. As long as Irenaeus (q.v.) and Candidius succeeded in maintaining the Nestorians at the court of the emperor Theodosius, John proved faithful to his course taken at Ephesus; but when he found the Cyrillian party gaining the upper hand, he slowly modified his position until a reconciliation with Cyril followed (A.D. 432). He now turned actually against his former friend Nestorius, and after much trouble and opposition, which he vanquished, partly by persuasion, partly by deposing the pertinacious, the other Eastern bishops also — in provincial councils held at Antioch (A.D. 432), Anazarbus (A.D. 433), and Tarsus (A.D. 434) — declared for Cyril and the decrees of the third Ecumenical Council. Nay, it is said that John of Antioch was even the man who instigated the emperor to make the banishment of Nestorius perpetual; no doubt actuated by a desire to convince the Cyrillians of the truthfulness of his conversion. In the controversy with Theodore of Mopsuestia he took more liberal ground, declining, at a council held in 438, to condemn the writings and opinions of Theodore; according to Liberatus, he even appeared in his defense. John died in 441 or 442. He is spoken of by Gennadius (De Viris Illustribus, c. 54) as possessed of great rhetorical power. He wrote

(1) Ε᾿πιστολαί (Epistoloe) and Α᾿ναφοραί (Relationes) respecting the Nestorian controversy and the Council of Ephesus, of which several are contained in the various editions of the Concilia: —  (2) ῾Ουιλία (Homilia), the homily or exhortation delivered at Chalcedon, just after the Council of Ephesus, to the people of Constantinople, with the aim to animate them to continue steadfast in their adherence to the old Nicene Confession; a fragment of it we have in the Concilia: —

(3) Περὶ τῶν Μεσαλιανιτῶν (De Messalianis), a letter to Nestorius, enumerated by Photius (Bibl. Cod. 32) among the episcopal and synodical papers against that heretical body, contained in the history or acta of the Council of Side (A. D. 383): —

(4) Contra eos qui una tantum substantia asserunt adorandum Christum (only known to us by Gennadius; probably the work from which the passages are taken with which Eulogius credits John of Antioch). See Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2, 586 sq.; Tillemont, Memoires, vol. 14; Mansi, Concilia, 4, 1259 sq.; Neale, Hist. East. Ch. (Alexandria), 1, bk. 2, sect. 2 and 3; Hefele, Conciliengesch. 2, 178 sq.: Schaff, Ch. Hist. Ai, § 138-140; Milman, Latin Christianity, 5, 224 sq.; Gibbon, Decl. and Fall Rom. Emp. ch. 47.

## John Of Antioch (2)[[@Headword:John Of Antioch (2)]]

             surnamed Codonatus, the successor of Petrus Gnapheus, or Fullo (the Fuller), after his deposition, in the patriarchate of Antioch, A.D. 447. John had previously been bishop of Apamea; but, after holding the patriarchate three months, he was deposed by a synod of Eastern bishops, and succeeded by Stephen. Theophanes incorrectly places the appointment of John after Stephen's death. Both John and his predecessor Petrus had been, at the instigation of Acacius of Constantinople, excommunicated by the pope; yet, after the deposition of John, the same Acacius procured his elevation to the bishopric of Tyre. Theophanes incorrectly ascribes this appointment to Calendion of Antioch. See Theophanes, Chronog. p. 110, etc., ed. Paris (p. 88, etc., ed. Venice; p. 199, etc., ed. Bonn); Valesius, Not. ad Evagrii H.E. 3, 15, and Observationes, Eccles. ad Evagrium, 2, 8. — Smith, Dict. Greek and Roman Biog. 2, 586.

## John Of Antioch (3)[[@Headword:John Of Antioch (3)]]

             surnamed Scholasticus, an eminent Greek legist, flourished in the 6th century. He entered the Church, and became patriarch of Constantinople (564-578). He compiled a collection of ecclesiastical laws, which greatly surpassed in extent and method those which preceded it, and which has  remained the basis of canon law in the Greek Church. Another of his works, entitled Nomocanon, was an attempt to harmonize Justinian's constitutions relating to the Church with the older rules. Both works were for many centuries held in high estimation, and were inserted in Voell and Justel's Bibl. juris canonici veteris (Paris, 1961), 2, 603-789. See Fabricius, Bibl. Groeca. 11, 100; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 26:530. (J.N.P.)

## John Of Avila[[@Headword:John Of Avila]]

             (Juan de Avila), the apostle of Andalusia in the 16th century, was born at Almodovar del Campo, a small city of the province. of Toledo, about the year 1500. His father intended him for the profession of law, but, after a short stay at the University of Salamanca, he returned home, and spent three years in strict asceticism. Then, after extended studies in philosophy and theology under Domingo de Soto, he commenced preaching with great success. His popularity excited envy, and he was imprisoned for a very short time by the Inquisition. After preaching for nine years in Andalusia, he visited also Cordova, Granada, Baeza, Montilla, etc., where his sermons — chiefly in honor of the Virgin Mary — proved a great success. The highest ecclesiastical offices were now offered him; pope Paul III contemplated even creating him cardinal, but John preferred to continue the work of an itinerant missionary. With a view to the early religious education of the people, and to elevate their moral standing permanently, he established schools at Seville, Ubeda, Baeza, Granada, Cordova, and Montilla. His health failed him, however, and he remained for twenty years sick at the latter place, which accounts for his not accompanying the archbishop of Granada to the Council of Trent. Here he composed his Epistolario espiritual (2 vols. 4to), which has been translated into several languages. He died May 10, 1569. His Life has been written by Luis le Granada (see Obras del V. P. AI. Luis de Granada, Madrid, 1849; Luis Munnoz, Vida del Ven. Varon el Maestro Juan de Avila; Antonio de Capmany, Teatro historico de la elocuencia Espannola). See Fr. J. Schirmer, Werke des Juan de Avila (Sermones del santissimo sacramento; de la incarnacion del Hijo de Dios; del Espiritu Santo; las festivitates de la santissima virgen Maria, etc.), Regensburg, 1856. — Herzog, Real- Encyklopädie, 6, 737.

## John Of Bassora[[@Headword:John Of Bassora]]

             is the name of a prelate of the Eastern Church who flourished at Bassora, the ancient Bostra, from A.D. 617-650, after whom one of the liturgies of the Oriental Church is named. He was formerly supposed to be the author of it, but Neale thinks it of later date, and supposes it had its origin in the northern parts of Arabia. See Neale, Hist. of East. Church, Introd. p. 328 (6).

## John Of Beverly[[@Headword:John Of Beverly]]

             SEE BEVERLY.

## John Of Bruges[[@Headword:John Of Bruges]]

             SEE JORIS, DAVID; SEE ANABAPTISTS.

## John Of Capistran[[@Headword:John Of Capistran]]

             SEE CAPISTRAN.

## John Of Chur[[@Headword:John Of Chur]]

             (surnamed Riitberg). From the beginning of the 14th century we often meet in the mystic writings of South Germany with the name of Friends of God (q.v.). One of them was John of Chur, the son of a rich merchant. Suddenly arrested in a wild career, he gave himself up entirely to mystical contemplations. He renounced all his fortune, to which he had fallen heir by the death of his father, and distributed it for benevolent purposes. He regarded suffering as a special gift of divine grace, and even evil thoughts, doubts, and impure desires he believed were to be patiently endured rather than striven against, for they were dispensed by God. He taught that the perfect man "has become one with God, when he wants nothing else except what God wills." About the year 1357 he sought to unite his friends who were of the same spirit into a society. From indications in his writings, we conclude that Chur, or Coire, in the canton of the Grisons, Switzerland, was his native city. In 1365 he determined to separate himself from the bustle of the town, and in company with two friends, led by a little black dog, they went into a mountain, where they built a chapel. By and by they were joined by two others,. and of these "five men," John of Chur speaks in a separate treatise. He probably died in 1382. His writings consist of letters and tracts. See Acquoy, Het Klooster te Windesheim en Zijn Inoloed (Utrecht, 1875); Preger, in the Zeitschrift fur die historische Theologie (1869), 1:109 sq., 137 sq.; Der Gottesfreund im Oberland und Nikolaus von Basel, in the Historisch-politische Blatter (Munich, 1875), 75; Der Gottesfreund im Oberland, in the Jahrbuch fur schweizerische Geschichte (Zurich, 1877); Besuch eines Cardinals beim Gottesfreund im Oberland, in the Theolog. Quartalschrift (Tubingen, 1876), 4; Jundt, Les Amis de  Dieu au Quatorzieme Siecle (Paris, 1879); Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## John Of Citrus[[@Headword:John Of Citrus]]

             (now Kitro or Kidros), in Macedonia, the ancient Pydna, was bishop of that see about A.D. 1200. He is the author of Αποκρίσεις πρὸς Κωνσταντῖνον Α᾿ρχιεπίσκοπον Δυῤῥαχίου τὸν Καβάσιλαν (Responsa ad Constantinum Cabasilum, Archiepiscopum Dyrrachii), of which sixteen answers, with the questions prefixed, are given with a Latin version in the Jus Groeco-Romanorum of Leunclavius (Frankf. 1596, folio), 5, 323. A larger portion of the Response is given in the Synopsis Juris Groeci of Thomas Diplovaticius (Diplovatizio). Several MSS. of the Responsa contain twenty-four answers, others thirty-two; and Nicholas Comnenus Papadopoli, citing the work in his Proenotiones Mystagogicoe, speaks of a hundred. In one MS. he is mentioned with the surname of Dalassinus. Allatius, in his De Consensu, and Contra Hottingerum, quotes De Consuetudinibus et Dogmatibus Latinorum as the production of John of Citrus. See Fabricius, Bibl. Groeca, 11, 341, 590; Cave, Hist. Lit. 2. 279; Smith. Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, 2, 593.

## John Of Constantinople[[@Headword:John Of Constantinople]]

             SEE JOHN THE DEACON; SEE JOHN THE FASTER.

## John Of Cornwall[[@Headword:John Of Cornwall]]

             was an eminent theologian of the 12th century whom both England and France claim as their own. Little is known of his life. He appears to have studied at Paris under Peter Lombard and Robert of Melun, and to have died towards the close of the 12th century. Great uncertainty also prevails respecting his writings; still he is generally considered as the author of a work entitled Eulogium (publ. by Martène, Anecdota, 5, col. 1637). It is a special treatise on the human nature of Christ, refuting the subtle distinctions of Gilbert de la Porrée and other scholastic theologians, who maintained that Christ, quoad hominem, could not be considered as a mere person, aliquis; or, in other words, his humanity was but a contingent or accidental form of his nature. This doctrine had already been condemned by pope Alexander III in the Comucil of Tours (1163). Casimir Oudin considers him also as the author of Libellus de Canone mystici libaminis, contained in the works of Hugo of St. Victor, vol. 2, etc. See Cas. Oudin, De Script. Eccles.; Hist. Lit. de la France, vol. 14. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gèn. 26, 543.

## John Of Crema[[@Headword:John Of Crema]]

             a cardinal who flourished in the first half of the 12th century, is celebrated for his exertions in behalf of the cause of pope Calixtus II against his adversary Burdin, and especially for his activity in the English Church, whither he was sent by pope Honorius II, in 1126, to enforce the laws of celibacy on the English clergy. How successful he was in this mission may be best judged from the sudden termination of his stay on the English continent. Not only did the English clergy violently oppose the cardinal's efforts, but he was even entrapped into a snare that must have considerably annoyed the eminent Roman Catholic ecclesiastic. Says Lea (Hist. Sacerdotal Celib. p. 293; compare Inett,. Hist. Eng. Ch. 2, chap. 8), the cardinal, “after fiercely denouncing the concubines of priests, and expatiating on the burning shame that the body of Christ should be made by one who had just left the side of a harlot, he was that very night surprised in the company of a courtesan, though he had on the same day celebrated mass.” Although instrumental, after his return to Rome, in the election of pope Innocent II (1130), the latter afterwards forsook him, and John for a time espoused the cause of the rival pope, Anacletus, returning, of course, again to obedience to Innocent II as soon as he had learned that by such an act only he could advance his own interests. The time of his death is not known, to us.

## John Of Cressy[[@Headword:John Of Cressy]]

             SEE JOHN THE MONK.

## John Of Damacus[[@Headword:John Of Damacus]]

             (JOHANNES DAMASCUS, Ι᾿ωάννης Δαμασηκνός) (1), one of the early ecclesiastical writers, and the author of the standard textbook of dogmatic theology in the Greek Church, was born at Damascus about the year 676. His oratorical talents caused him to be surnamed Chrysorrhoas (golden stream) by his friends (the Arabs called him Mansur). Little is known of his life except that he belonged to a high family, was ordained priest, and entered the convent of St. Sabas at Jerusalem, where he passed his life in  the midst of literary labors and theological studies. The other details found concerning him in his biography by John, patriarch of Jerusalem, are considered untrustworthy. According to this writer, John Damascenus's father was a Christian, and governor of the province of Damascus, then in the hands of the Saracens, and John was ably educated by an Italian monk. Under Leo the Isaurian and Constantine Capronymus he zealously defended image worship both by his pen and tongue, and even went to Constantinople on that account. A legendary story relates that Leo, who was then a decided iconoclast, forged a treasonable letter from John to himself, which he contrived to pass into the hands of the caliph, who sentenced John to have his right hand cut off, when the severed hand was restored to the arm by a miracle. About that time, however, John withdrew from the caliph's court to the monastery of St. Saba, near Jerusalem, where he passed the remainder of his life in ascetic practices and study. He died between 754 and 787. In the former year we find his last public act, a protest against the Iconoclastic Synod at Constantinople, and in the latter the (Ecumenical Council of Nice honored his memory with a eulogy. The Greek Church commemorates him on November 29 and December 4, and the Roman Catholic Church on May 6. Church writers agree in considering John Damascenus as superior to all his contemporaries in philosophy and erudition; yet his works, though justifying his reputation, are deficient in criticism.

The most important literary achievement of Damascenus is the Πηγὴ γνώσεως (Source of Knowledge), comprising the following three works:

1. Κεφάλαια Φιλοσοφικά, or Dialectics, which treats almost exclusively of logical and ontological categories, based mainly on Aristotle and Porphyry: —

2. Περὶ αἰρέσεων ἐνσυντονία, De hoeresibus, containing in 103 articles a chronological synopsis of the heresies in the Christian Church, with a few articles on the errors of pagans and Jews (the first eighty are really the work of Epiphanius; the remainder partly treat of the heresies from the time of Epiphanius to that of the image controversies, according to Theodoretus, Sophronius, Leontius of Byzantium, etc., and partly of fictitious sects, which merely represent possible, not actual errors of belief): —

3. The third and most important work, to which the former two were really simply the introduction, is entitled ῎Εκδοσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς πίστεως  ὀρθοδόξου, Doctrines of the Orthodox Church, collected from the writings of the Church fathers, especially Gregory of Nazianzum, Athanasius, Basil the Great, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Cyril, Nemesius, and others. The whole work is divided into 100 sections or four books (the latter is probably a later arrangement), and treats of the following subjects:

(a) God's existence, essence, unity, and the possibility of knowing him. Though John teaches that it is neither impossible to know God, nor possible to know him all; that his essence is neither expressible nor entirely inexpressible, he nevertheless inclines to the transcendental character of the idea of God, assigning to human thought incapacity for its conception, and referring man, in the end, as Areopagites does, to the record of divinely revealed truth. It may be considered as a characteristic feature of his theology that it principally dwells on God's metaphysical attributes, hardly touching the ethical question.

(b) The Trinity, to which he gives great prominence. He not only repeats the doctrines of the Greek Church, as well as the arguments of the Greek fathers, but resumes a scientific construction of the dogma within the established creed, though admitting that there are certain bounds to the inquiry, which human reason cannot scale (Α᾿δύνατον γὰρ εὑρεθῆναι ἐν τῆ κτίσει εἰκόυα ἀπαραλλάκτως ἐν ἑαυτῆ τὸν τρόπον τῆς ἁγίας τριάδος παραδεικνύουσαν). The Trinity, therefore, cannot be adequately conceived nor defined. His real object in the discussion seems to be to found the personality of the λόγος and of the πνεῦμα ἃγιον upon the unity of the divine essence, and, further, to describe the nature of coexistence, and of personal difference in the Triune, and the reciprocal relations of the three persons — –περιχώρησις–with all attainable strictness, and he attempts to achieve this result rather by the negative process of excluding fallacies than by positive demonstration. Whenever he ventures upon the latter he fluctuates between Peripateticism, tending to Tritheism and Platonism, leading almost imperceptibly to Sabellianism and Modalism.

(c) Creation, Angels, and Doemons. On these he simply collects the doctrines of his predecessors, closing with a somewhat lengthy exposition of his views on heaven, heavenly bodies, light, fire, winds, water, earth, also chiefly based on the authority of the fathers. Some singular opinions of his own he attempts to support by scriptural passages.  (d) Man, his creation and nature, are so treated by him that they may aptly be termed a psychology in nuce. Here he again depended on Aristotle and other Greek authors, in part directly, and in part through the medium of Nemesius, περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπου. Like a genuine son of the Greek Church, he lays particular stress on the doctrine of free will and its efficacy for good, and treats in connection therewith of the doctrines of providence and predestination, following in the footsteps of Chrysostom and Nemesius.

(e) Man's fall is merely adverted to in the vague oratorical manner of Semipelagian writers, without the least regard for the great development which this doctrine had received in the Western Church.

(f) The doctrine of the person of Christ is argued with greatest fullness, and he evinces no little ingenuity and dialectic skill in treating of the personal unity in Christ's twofold nature (which he conceived as enhypostasis, not anhypostasis, of the human nature in the Logos), of the communicatio idiomatum (which, however, amounts to merely a verbal one), and of volition and the operation of volition in Christ. This exposition of Christology is followed by controversial tracts against the Acephali: περὶ συνθετου φύσεως; and against the Monothelites: περὶ τῶν ἐν Χριστῶ δύο θελημάτων καὶ ἐνεργειῶν καὶλοιπῶν φυσικῶν ίδιωμάτων, etc. (comp. Baur, Gesch. d. Dreieinigkeit, 2, 176 sq.; Christologie, 2, 257).

(g) Baptism (which is allegorically represented as sevenfold) he holds to be necessary for the forgiveness of sin and for eternal life. Body and soul, to be purified and saved, need regeneration, which comes from the water and the Spirit.

(h) Faith “is the acceptance of the παράδοσις τῆς ἐκκλησίας καθολικῆς, and of the teachings of Scripture; it is also confidence in the fulfilment of God's promises and in the efficacy of our prayers. The former depends on ourselves, the latter is a gift of the Holy Spirit.” On the relation of faith to works, on regeneration and sanctification, he but imperfectly repeats the Semipelagian views of the earlier Greek teachers. His remarks on the cross and on adoration reflect the miraculous spirit of the times.

(i) The Eucharist John teaches to be the means by which God completes his communication of himself to man, and thus restores him to immortality. Transubstantiation, in the full acceptance of the term, he does not teach,  though Romanists have tried to interpret his writings in favor of their views. He admits, it is true, that the Eucharist is the actual body of Christ, but he does not consider it identical with that which was glorified in heaven, and does not deem the bread and wine mere accidental phenomena.

(j) On Mary, the Immaculate Conception, Relics, and the Worship of Images, he expresses himself more explicitly in separate treatises. The authority for adoring the cross, images, etc., he finds, not in Scripture, but in tradition.

(k) In his remarks on the Scriptures he alludes simply, and that very briefly, to inspiration, and the value of Holy Writ, repeats the canon of the O.T. according to Epiphanius, and includes in the books of the N.T. the canons of the apostles according to the Trullan canon. Incidentally he also adverts to the four different formulas used in Scripture to designate Christ and the origin of evil, which he holds can neither be assigned to God, nor to an evil principle independent of God. Celibacy John attempts to vindicate by the Scriptures; he alludes to the abrogation of circumcision, to anti-Christ, resurrection, and the last judgment. These are the principal contents of John's main work. He has by no means done equal justice to all its parts; the important questions of atonement, sin, grace, and the means of salvation, receive only a cursory notice. The style of his discourse, owing to the diversity of his sources, is not uniform; while, for the most part, it has strength and fluency, it sometimes lapses into rhetorical prolixity and affectation. John was particularly inclined to the philosophy of Aristotle, and wrote various popular tracts, in which he collected and illustrated that philosopher's principles. He wrote also letters and treatises against heretics, especially against the Manichaeans and Nestorians. His works have been collected by Le Quien under the title Opera omnia Damasceni Joh. quoa extant, etc., Gr. and Lat. (Venet. 1748, 2 vols. 8vo). This edition contains Κεφάλαια φίλοσοφικά; Περὶ αἱρέσεων; ῎Εκδοσις ἀκριβὴς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως; Πρὸς τοὺς διαβάλλοντας τὰς ἁγίας εἰκόνας; Λίβελλος περὶ ὀρθοῦ προνοήματος; Τόμος; Κατὰ Μανιχαίων Διάλογος; Διάλογος Σαρακηνοῦ καὶ Χριστιανοῦ; Περὶ δρακόντων; Περὶ ἁγίας Τριάδος; Περὶ τοῦ τρισαγίου ὕμνου; Περὶ τῶν ἁγίων νηστειῶν; Περὶ τῶν ὀκτὼ τῆς πονηρίας πνευμάτων; Εἰσαγωγὴ δογμάτων στοιχειώδης; Περὶ συνθέτου φύσεως; Περὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ δύο θελημάτων καὶ ἐνεργειῶν καὶ λοιπῶν φυσικῶν ἰδιωμάτων; ῎Επος ἀκριβέστατον κατὰ θεοστυγοῦς αἱρέσεως τῶν Νεστοριανῶν; Πασχάλιον; Λόγος ἀποδεικτικὸς  περὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ σεπτῶν είκόνων; Περὶ τῶν ἀζύμων; ῾Ιερὰ παράλληλα, etc.

John of Damascus is now generally regarded as one of the ablest men of the Greek Church in the 8th century; but he by no means, on that account, deserves to be honored with the title of “philosopher.” He was not an independent inquirer, but simply “an acute and diligent compiler and expounder of what others had thought, and the Church received.” “He was,” as an American ecclesiastic has well put it, “in design, method, and spirit, the precursor of the scholastic theologians. They, indeed, lived in another quarter of the globe from Syria, spoke a different language, and drew their materials from a different source. With them Augustine was the chief authority, whereas Damascenus followed Gregory of Nazianzum and other Greek fathers as his principal guides. The spirit of the age no doubt acted in a similar way upon both. It was considered unsafe, both in a religious and in a civil point of view, to think differently from the Church and its reverend teachers. In the West, as well as in the East, Aristotle had come to be regarded as an oracle. These circumstances may account, in part, for the similarity which we perceive both in the Greek theologian and in Peter of Lombardy, the first great scholastic theologian of the Latin Church. But no one who has compared the orthodox faith of the one with the sentences of the other can well doubt that some of the early translations of the former were employed in the composition of the latter. It cannot, probably, be far from the truth to say that, while Augustine is the father of the scholastic theology as to the matter of it, the learned Greek of Damascus was the father of it as to its form.”

John of Damascus is generally considered as the restorer of the practice of chanting in the Greek Church, and he is also named as the author of a number of hymns yet in use in that Church. It is by no means proved, however, that he was the inventor of musical notation, as some have affirmed. Copies of a MS. treatise on Church music, of which he is considered the author, are to be found in several European (public) libraries: it was published by abbé Gerbert in the 2d vol. of his treatise De Cantu et Musica Sacra. It was translated into French by Villoteau in his memoir Sur l' État actuel de l'Art musical en Egypte (in Description de l'Egypte, 14, 380 sq.). See Jean de Jerusalem, Vie de St. Jean de Damas (in Surius, Vitoe Sanctorum, May 6); Lenström, De fidei orthod. auctore J. Damasceno (Upsal. 1839); Fabricius, Bibl. Groeca, 9, 682-744; Cave, Hist. Litt. 1, 482 (Lond. ed. 1688); Ceillier, Histoire gén. des auteurs  sacrés, 18, 110 sq.; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 20, 420; Christian Rev. 7, 594 sq.; Hagenbach, Doctrines (see Index); Fétis, Biog. des Musiciens.

## John Of Damascus (2)[[@Headword:John Of Damascus (2)]]

             SEE JOHN OF JERUSALEM (3).

## John Of Darlington[[@Headword:John Of Darlington]]

             an Irish prelate, was a native of Darlington, Durham, trained a Dominican, and a great clerk, "qui literatura pollebat excellenter et cursilio" (Mat. Paris). Henry III made him his confessor, "which argueth his piety, that so devout a prince used him in so conscientious an office." He afterwards became archbishop of Dublin, being the choice of pope John XXI, in order to settle impartially the rival claims of William de la Corner, king's chaplain, the choice of the prior and convent of Trinity Church, and of Fromund le Brup, the pope's chaplain, the elect of the dean and chapter of St. Patrick's. The pope set both aside. John was also collector of Peter's Pence in Ireland to popes John XXI, Nicholas III, and Martin IV. He wrote many books. Returning to England, he died in 1284, and was buried at Preaching Friars. See Fuller, Worthies of England, 1:486.

## John Of Drandorf[[@Headword:John Of Drandorf]]

             a Saxon Hussite, renowned as one of the ablest of the German reformers before the Reformation, was born of noble parentage at Slieben, or Schlieben, in the diocese of Meissen, about the beginning of the 15th century. He studied at Dresden under the celebrated Peter Dresdensis, then went to Prague, and further imbibed reformatory opinions, and finally completed his studies at the newly-founded University of Leipzig. Unable to obtain ordination on account of his heretical proclivities, he travelled through Germany and Bohemia, preaching against all unfaithful shepherds of the Roman Church, and finally succeeded in gathering a congregation, first at Weinsberg, then at Heilbronn. The civil authorities, however, interfered, and he was imprisoned and transported to Heidelberg, there to be judged by the faculty of the university, which took so active a part in the trial and condemnation of Huss and Jerome at the Council of Constance. The faculty met February 13, 1425, and, after a few days' hearing, John of Drandorf was condemned as a heretic, and was burned at Worms in great haste, lest the laymen, as these doctors have it, should partake of his heretical spirit. See Krummel, in Theol. Stud. und Krit. 1869, 1, 130 sq. (J.H.W.)

## John Of Egypt[[@Headword:John Of Egypt]]

             (JOANNES ÆGYPTIUS), a Christian martyr who suffered in Palestine in the Diocletian persecution, is spoken of by Eusebius, who knew him personally, as the most illustrious of the sufferers in Palestine, and especially worthy of admiration for his philosophic (i.e. ascetic) life and  conversation, and for the wonderful strength of his memory. After the loss of his eyesight he acted as anagnostes, or reader in the church, supplying the want of sight by his extraordinary power of memory. He could recite correctly whole books of Scripture, whether from the Prophets, the Gospels, or the apostolic Epistles. In the seventh year of the persecution, A.D. 310, he was treated with great cruelty; one foot was burned off, and fire was applied to his sightless eyeballs for the mere purpose of torture. As he was unable to undergo the toil of the mines or the public works, he and several others (among whom was Silvanus of Gaza), whom age or infirmity had disabled from labor, were confined in a place by themselves. In the eighth year of the persecution, A.D. 311, the whole party, thirty-nine in number, were decapitated in one day by order of Maximin Daza, who then governed the eastern provinces. See Eusebius, De Miartyrib. Paloestinoe, sometimes subjoined to the eighth book of his Hist. Eccles. c. 13; Smith. Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. 2, 585.

## John Of Euchaita[[@Headword:John Of Euchaita]]

             (Euchaitoe or Euchania) (a city afterwards called Theodoropolis) was archbishop of Euchaita (Μητροπολίτης Εùχαϊvτων), and lived in the time of the emperor Constantine and Monomachus (A.D. 1042-1054), but nothing further is known of him. He was surnamed Mauropus (Μαυρόπους), i.e. “Blackfoot.” He wrote a number of iambic poems, sermons, and letters. A volume of his poems was published by Matthew Bust (Eton, 1610, 4to). They were probably written on occasion of the Church festivals, as they are commemorative of the incidents of the life of Christ or of the saints. An Officium, or ritual service, composed by him, and containing three canones or hymns, is given by Nicolaus Rayaeus in his dissertation De Acolouthia Officii Canonici, prefixed to the Acta Sanctorum, Junii, vol. 2. John wrote, also, Vita S. Dorothei Junioris, given in the Aeta Sanctorumn, Junii, 1, 605, etc. Various sermons for the Church festivals, and other works of his, are extant in MS. See Fabricius, Biblioth.  Orient. 8, 309, 627, etc.; 10, 221, 226; 11, 79; Cave, Hist. Liter. 2, 139; Oudin, De Scriptoribus et Scriptis Eccles. 2, 606; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. 2, 595.

## John Of Falkenberg[[@Headword:John Of Falkenberg]]

             surnamed Jacobita de Saxonia, or Doctor de Pratensis, a German Dominican, is celebrated for the zeal with which he defended pope Gregory XII in the Council of Constance. He also endeavored to defend the regicidal opinions of John Petit, but he failed in both instances. He next at the request of the Knights of the Cross, wrote a libel against Wladislas Jagellon, king of Poland, for which he was declared a heretic, and condemned to imprisonment for life at Rome. Pope Martin V, however, liberated him a few years after, and John, encouraged, now demanded of Paul of Russdorf, grand master of the Knights of the Cross, the price of the libel he had written. The latter offering him but a small amount, John of Falkenberg insulted him, whereupon he was again imprisoned, and condemned to be drowned. He escaped, however, retired to the convent of Kampen, and wrote against the order. He was present at the Council of Basle, in 1431, and died shortly after. See Echard, Script. Ord. Froed.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 26, 563.

## John Of Flanders[[@Headword:John Of Flanders]]

             a Flemish prelate, was the son of Guy, count of Flanders. He became at first provost of St. Peter of Lille, and of St. Donatian of Bruges. Nicholas III provided him with the bishopric of Metz, January 2, 1280, but he neglected the duties of that charge, and only took its revenues to acquire grounds at Flanders. After a short time he was appointed bishop of Liege, and took possession of his new Church, October 31, 1282. In 1285 he got into difficulties with the sheriffs of Liege, and left the city, taking with him his clergy, and retiring into the borough of Huy. His exile lasted twenty- two months. After his return to Liege he made a league with his brother-in-  law, the duke of Brabant, against Renaud, count of Guelders. In 1288, while hunting, according to the custom of those times, he was seized and imprisoned for five months, until he paid a ransom. He died October 14, 1292. He published, in 1287, Synodal Statutes, collected by D. Martene, Thes. Anecd. 4:829. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## John Of Gischala[[@Headword:John Of Gischala]]

             son of Levi, named after his native place, SEE GISCHALA, was one of the most celebrated leaders of the unfortunate Jews of Galilee in their final struggle with the Romans, A.D. 66-67. Of his personal history we know scarcely anything. The only writer to whom we can go for information – Josephus — is prejudiced, because John of Gischala proved the most formidable rival of the renowned Jewish historian, and he is on that account depicted by Josephus in a very disparaging manner. His deeds, however, indicate to every fair-minded person that he belonged to that class of men  who, for the defense of their country, readily ignore all other duties. We are furthermore encouraged to give credence to the noble picture which Grätz (Gesch. der Juden, 3, 396) has drawn of John, when we remember that the virtuous and learned Simon ben-Gamaliel was a devoted and life- long friend of our hero. (By this it must, however, by no means be inferred that we are ready to accept Grätz's views on the character of Josephus, for which we refer our readers to the art. JOSEPHUS.) Though by nature Josephus' superior, more particularly in the art of warfare, he readily submitted himself to the commands of the man whom the Sanhedrim had seen fit to invest with superior authority. Not so patriotic was the conduct of Josephus, who, in his jealousy, hesitated not to put every obstacle in the way of John, so as to prevent the success of his noble and patriotic efforts.

This impolitic conduct of Josephus towards all who seemed to present any likelihood of becoming rivals in office continued until the people's attention was directed to it, and their anger against him was so great that his very life was in danger. Instead, however, of profiting by this sad experience, Josephus, in his vanity and blindness, continued, so soon as he felt that the danger had passed, his animosity towards his colaborers, especially towards John of Gischala, whom he hesitated not to accuse even of having headed the attacks upon his life (Josephus, Life, 18, 19), a reproach which was not in the least deserved by John, who, however great his disappointment in Josephus, never sought relief by violent measures. It is true that, when he found the people's confidence in Josephus restored, he sent messengers to Simon ben-Gamaliel and to the Sanhedrim to remove the man in whom public confidence was so misplaced. Ordered to the defense of his native place, John did everything in his power to strengthen the fortification of Gischala, and when, after a long siege from the experienced troops of Titus, he found it impossible to hold the city with his handful of countrymen, more accustomed to the ploughshare than to the sword, he made his escape by a game of strategy which his enemy could never forgive him. Having obtained an armistice from the Romans on pretense that the day was their Sabbath, he improved the opportunity to make his escape with his forces to Jerusalem.

The sacred city was at this time unfortunately divided of itself, anarchy reigned within the walls, and it was with great difficulty that John succeeded in rallying the people to their defense against a common enemy. He actually aroused them to sally forth against the Roman invaders, and succeeded in destroying the first works erected by them to besiege the city. Not so happy were they in their future undertakings. Defeat after defeat finally obliged John to seek refuge in the  tower of Antonia. Soon after followed the fall of Jerusalem (A.D. 70), and John now sought refuge in a neighboring cave, determined not to fall into the hands of Titus. But hunger soon proved even a more formidable foe than the Romans, and John gladly went forth from his hiding place to surrender himself to them, who, in their pride and the savage state of that age, hesitated not to increase the mental agonies of the poor Jew by marching him, with 700 other fellow countrymen, at the head of the victorious legions to the Eternal City, to enhance the magnificence of his public triumph. The grand spectacle over, John was imprisoned at Rome, and died in a dungeon of broken heart. Not so lucky, even, was his brother in arms, Simon bar-Giora (q.v.), who was dragged through the streets of Rome by a rope; and finally executed, in accordance with Roman custom which demanded a human sacrifice in honor of a victory gained over their enemies. See Josephus, War, 4, 2 sq.; Grätz, Geschichte d. Juden, vol. 3, ch. 14 and 15; Raphall, Post Bibl. Hist. of the Jews, 2, 416 sq. (J.H.W.)

## John Of Gorz[[@Headword:John Of Gorz]]

             a French monk of some note who flourished in the 10th century, was born at Vendiere, near Pont-a-Mousson, and studied theology under Berner, deacon of Toul. After joining various convents — among the last that of the Recluses — and not finding that earnest piety and strict ascetic life which he sought to impose upon himself, he finally gathered a few true friends of like mind in the convent of Gorz, presented to them by bishop Adalbert, of Mayence. In the latter part of his life, Otho the Great sent him as ambassador to Abderrahman II, in Cordova. His biography was written by a friend and contemporary, St. Arnulph (died 984), and is given by Pertz, Monum. 4, 335.

## John Of Jerusalem (1)[[@Headword:John Of Jerusalem (1)]]

             originally a monk, was bishop of Jerusalem (A.D. 386) when not much more than thirty years of age (Jerome, Epist. 82, 8). Some speak of him as patriarch, but Jerusalem was not elevated to the dignity of a patriarchate until the following century. John was a man of insignificant personal appearance (Jerome, Lib. contra Joan. c. 10), but he was generally celebrated for eloquence, talent, and learning.. He was acquainted, at least in some degree, with the Hebrew and Syriac languages, but it is doubtful it he was acquainted with Latin. He is said to have been at one period an Arian, or to have sided with the Arians when they were in the ascendant under the emperor Valens (Jerome, Lib. contra Joan. c. 4, 8). For eight years after his appointment to the bishopric he was on friendly terms with St. Jerome, who was then living a monastic life in Bethlehem or its neighborhood; but towards the close of that period strife was stirred up by Epiphanius of Constantia (or Salamis), in Cyprus, who came to Palestine to ascertain the truth of a report which had reached him, that the obnoxious sentiments of Origen were gaining ground under the patronage of John. Epiphanius' violence against all that had even the appearance of Origenism led him into a controversy with John also. SEE EPIPHANIUS.

Whether John really cherished opinions at variance with the orthodoxy of that time, or only exercised towards those who held them a forbearance which was looked upon with suspicion, we do not know; but he became again involved in squabbles with the supporters of orthodox views. He was  charged by them with favoring Pelagins, who was then in Palestine, and who was accused of heresy in the councils of Jerusalem and Diospolis (A.D. 415), but was in the latter council acquitted of the charge, and restored to the communion of the Church. SEE PELAGIUS.

In the controversies waged against Chrysostom, John of Jerusalem always sided decidedly with Chrysostom. SEE CHRYSOSTOM.

John wrote, according to Gennadius (De Viris Illustr. c. 30), Adversus Obtrectatores sui Studii Liber, in which he showed that he rather admired the ability than followed the opinions of Origen. Fabricius and Ceillier think, and with apparent reason, that this work, which is lost, was the apologetic letter addressed by John to Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, which resulted in a reconciliation between John and Jerome. No other work of John is noticed by the ancients; but in the 17th century two huge volumes appeared, entitled Joannis Nepotis Sylvani, Hierosolym. Episcopi 44, Opera omnia quoe hactenus incognita, reperiri potuerunt: in unum collecta, suoque Auctori et Auctoritati tribus Vindiciarum libris asserta per A.R.P. Petrum Wastelium (Brussels, 1643, fol.). The Vindiciae occupied the second volume. The works profess to be translated from the Greek, and are as follows:

(1) Liber de Institutione primorum Monachorumn, in Lege Veteri exortorum et in Nova perseverantium, ad Capirasium Monachum. Interprete Aymerico Patriarcha Antiocheno. This work is mentioned by Trithemius (apud Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. 10, 526) as “Volumen insigne de principio et profectu ordinis Carmelitici,” and is ascribed by him to a later John, patriarch of Jerusalem (in the 8th century). It is contained in several editions of the Bibliotheca Patrum, in which work, indeed, it seems to have been first published (vol. 9, Par. 1589, fol.), and in the works of Thomas a Jesu, the Carmelite (1, 416, etc., Cologne, 1684, folio). It is generally admitted to be the production of a Latin writer, and of much later date than our John: —

(2) in stratagemata Beati Jobi Libri 3, a commentary on the first three chapters of the book of Job, often printed in Latin among the works of Origen, but supposed to belong neither to him nor to John: —

(3) In S. Matthoeum, an imperfect commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, usually printed, under the title of Opus inperfectum in Matthoeum, among the works of Chrysostom, in the Latin or Graeco-Latin editions of that  father, but supposed to be the work of some Arian or Anomoean about the end of the 6th or some part of the 7th century: —

(4) Fragmenta ex Commentario ad prima Capita xi S. Marci, cited by Thomas Aquinas (Catena Aurea ad Evang.) as a work of Chrysostom: —

(5) Fragmenta ex Commentario in Lucam, extant under the name of Chrysostom, partly in editions of his works, partly in the Latin version of a Greek Catena in Lucam published by Corderius (Antw. 1628, folio), and partly in the Catena Aurea of Thomas Aquinas: —

(6) Homilioe 58, almost all of them among those published in the works of Chrysostom. There is no good reason for ascribing any of these works to John; nor are they, in fact, ascribed to him except by the Carmelites. See Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. 9, 299; 10, 525, etc.; Cave, Hist. Litt. 1, 281, etc.; Dupin, Nouv. Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques, 3, 87, ed. Par. 1690; Smith, Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, 2, 596.

## John Of Jerusalem (2)[[@Headword:John Of Jerusalem (2)]]

             A synodical letter of John, who was a patriarch of Jerusalem early in the 6th century, and his suffragan bishops assembled in a council at Jerusalem A.D. 517 or 518, to John of Constantinople [John of Cappadocia], is given in the Concilia (vol. 5, col. 187, etc., ed. Labbe; 8, 1067, ed. Mansi).

## John Of Jerusalem (3)[[@Headword:John Of Jerusalem (3)]]

             [or OF DAMASCUS, 2]. Three extant pieces relating to the Iconoclastic controversy bear the name of John of Jerusalem, but it is doubtful how far they may be ascribed to the same author, hence we add them herein simply under a separate heading. They are,

1. Ι᾿ωάννου εὐλαβεστάτου τοῦ ῾Ιεροσολυμίτου μοναχοῦ Διήγησις, or Joannis Hierosolymitani reverendissimi Monachi Narratio, a very brief account of the origin of the Iconoclastic movement, published by Combefis among the Scriptores post Theophanem (Par. 1685, fol.), and reprinted at Venice, A.D. 1729, as part of the series of Byzantine historians; it is also included in the Bonn edition of that series. It is also printed in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Gallandius, 13, 270: —

2. Διάλογος στηλιτευτικὸς γενόμενος παρὰ πιστῶν καί ὀρθοδόξων καὶ πόθον καὶ ζῆλον ἐχόντωνπρὸς ἔλεγχον τῶν ἐναντίων τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ὀρθοδόξων ἡμῶν  πατέρων or Disceptatio invectiva quoe habita est a fidelibus et orthodoxis, studiumque ac zelum habentibus ad confutandos adversarios fidei atque doctrinoe sanctorum orthodoxorumque patrum nostrorum, first published by Combefis in the Scriptores post Theophanen as the work of an anonymous writer, and contained in the Venetian, but not in the Bonn edition of the Byzantine writers. It is also reprinted by Gallandius (ut supra), p. 352, and ascribed to John of Damascus or John of Jerusalem, some MSS. giving one name, and others giving the other. Gallandius considers that he is called Damascus from his birthplace. The author of this invective is to be distinguished from the greatly celebrated John of Damascus (q.v.), his contemporary, to whom, perhaps, the transcribers of the manuscripts, in prefixing the name Damascus, intended to ascribe the work: —

3. Ι᾿ωάννουμοναχοῦ καὶ πρεσβυτέρου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ λόγος ἀποδεικτιὸς περὶ τῶν ἁγίων καὶ σεπτῶν εἰκόνων,πρὸς πάντας Χριστιανοὺς καὶ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Κονσταντῖνον τὸν Καβαλῖνον καὶ πρὸς πάντας αἱρετικούς, or Joannis Damasceni Monachi ac Presbyteri Oratio demonstrativa de sacris ac venerandis imaginibus, ad Christianos omnes, adversusque Imperatorem Constantinum Cabalinum. The title is given in other MSS., Ε᾿πιστολὴ Ι᾿ωάννου ῾Ιεροσολύμων ἀρχιεπισκόυ, κ. τ. λ.. — Epistola Joannis, or Hierosolysmitani Archiepiscopi, etc. The work was first printed in the Auctarium Novum of Combefis (Paris, 1648, folio), vol. 2, and was reprinted by Gallandius (ut supra), p. 358, etc. Fabricius is disposed to identify the authors of Nos. 1 and 3, and treats No. 2 as the work of another and unknown writer; but Gallandius, from internal evidence, endeavors to show that Nos. 2 and 3 are written by one person, but that No. 1 is by a different writer, and this seems to be the preferable opinion. He thinks there is also internal evidence that No. 3 was written in the year 770, and was subsequent to No. 2. See Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. 7, 682; Gallandius, Bibl. Patrum, 13, Prolegomena, ch. 10, p. 15; Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2, 596.

## John Of Jerusalem (4)[[@Headword:John Of Jerusalem (4)]]

             patriarch of Jerusalem, who flourished probably in the latter half of the 10th century, was the author of a life of Joannes Damascenus, Βίος τοῦ ὀσίου πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ι᾿ωάννου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ συγγραφεὶς παρὰ Ι᾿ωάννου πατριάρχου ῾Ιεροσολύμων (Vita sancti Patris nostri Joannis Damasceni a Joanne Patriarcha Hierosolymitano conscripta). The work is  a translation from the Arabic, or at least founded upon an Arabic biography, and was written a considerable time after the death of John of Damascus (A.D. 756), and after the cessation of the Iconoclastic contest, which may be regarded as having terminated on the death of the emperor Theophilus (A.D. 842). But we have no data for determining how long after these events the author lived. Le Quien identifies him with a John, patriarch of Jerusalem, who was burnt alive by the Saracens in the latter part of the reign (A.D. 963-9) of Nicephorus Phocas, upon suspicion that he had excited that emperor to attack them (Cedrenus, Compend. p. 661, edit. Paris 2, 374, ed. Bonn). This life of John of Damascus was first published at Rome with the orations of Damascenus (De Sacris Imaginibus [1553, 8vo]); it was reprinted at Basel with all the works of John of Damascus A.D. 1575; in the Acta Sanctorum (May 6), vol. 2 (the Latin version in the body of the work [p. 111, etc.], and the original in the Appendix [p. 723, etc.]); and in the edition of the Works of Damascenus by Le Quien, vol. 1 (Paris, 1712, folio). The Latin version is given (s.d. 6 Maii) in the Vitoe Sanctorum of Lippomani, and the De Probatis Sanctorum Vitis of Surius. See Le Quien, Joannis Damasceni Opera, note at the beginning of the Vita S. J. Damasc.; and Oriens Christianus, 3, 466. — Fabricius, Bibl. Groeca. 9, 686, 689; 10, 261; Cave, Hist. Litt. 2, 29; Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2, 598.

## John Of Leitomysl[[@Headword:John Of Leitomysl]]

             SEE LEITOMYSL.

## John Of Leyden[[@Headword:John Of Leyden]]

             SEE BOCCOLD.

## John Of Matha, St.[[@Headword:John Of Matha, St.]]

             founder of the Order of the Holy Trinity (also called Fathers of Mercy in Spain, and Mathurins in Paris), was born at Faucon, in Provence, in 1154, of noble parents. He studied at Paris University, and then entered the Church. “At his first celebration of divine service,” the legend goes, “he beheld a vision of an angel clothed in white, having a cross of red and blue on his breast, with his hands, crossed over each other, resting on the heads of two slaves, who knelt on each side of him; and believing that in this vision of the mind God spoke to him, and called him to the deliverance of prisoners and captives, he immediately sold all his goods, and forsook the world, to prepare himself for his mission.” In conjunction with Felix of Valois he arranged the constitutions of the new order, and together they went to Rome to obtain the approval of pope Innocent III; Felix having had, the legend continues, a similar dream, the. pope gladly complied with their request, and the order was approved Feb. 2, 1199. Gaucher III, of Chatillon, having given them the estate of Cerfroi, they there established their first convent. They also obtained several other convents and hospitals in France and Spain, and a convent and church at Rome.

Having collected large sums of money, John dispatched two of his brotherhood to the coast of Africa, whence they returned with 186 Christians redeemed from the Mussulman's bonds. The year following John himself went to Tunis, preaching on his way all through Spain, and creating many friends for his noble undertaking: he returned with 110 captives. From another voyage he returned with 120 Christians. Hereafter he devoted himself to preaching at Rome. He died there Dec. 21, 1213, and was canonized by Innocent XI, July 30, 1679. He is commemorated on February 8. The dress of the order consists in a flowing white gown, with a red and blue cross on the breast. See P. Ignace Dillaud, Vie de St. Jean de Matha (1695); Baillet, Vies des Saints, Feb. 8; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Gen. 26, 441; Mrs. Jameson, Legends of Monastic Orders, p. 217 sq.

## John Of Meda, St.[[@Headword:John Of Meda, St.]]

             founder, or rather reformer of the order of the Humiliati, was born at Meda, near Como, towards the close of the 11th century. He was a member of the Oldrati family of Milan. After ordination he withdrew to the solitude of Rondenario, near Como, which he subsequently left to join the Humiliati, then a lay congregation. Chosen their superior, he subjected them to the rule of St. Benedict, only changing the appellations of brethren  and monks into canons. He obliged them also to say the Virgin's mass every day, and composed a special breviary for their use, which was called canons' office. The Humiliati (q.v.) thus became a regular order, with clerical and lay members. John of Meda gained a large number of proselytes by his preaching, and was reputed very charitable. He died Sept. 26, 1159, and was canonized a few days after his death by pope Alexander III. See St. Antonin, Hist. part 2, § 15, ch. 23; Sylvestre Maurolyc, Mare Ocean di tutti li Relig.; Moreri, Grand Dict. historique; Richard et Giraud, Biblioth. Sac. — Hoefer, Nouvelle Biog. Générale, 26, 441.

## John Of Monmouth[[@Headword:John Of Monmouth]]

             (so called from the place of his nativity), a doctor of divinity and canon of Lincoln, was chosen bishop of Llandaff in 1296, after a vacancy in that see of seven years, the pope remitting the election to archbishop Kilwarby, who called John of Monmouth. He became a great benefactor to the bishopric, procuring for it, among other revenues, the rectory of Newland. He was a learned and pious theologian. He died April 8, 1323. See Fuller, Worthies of England (ed. Nuttall), 2:434.

## John Of Monte Corvino[[@Headword:John Of Monte Corvino]]

             a celebrated early Roman missionary among the Mongols, belonged to the Franciscan order, and flourished towards the close of the 13th century. He was born in Monte Corvino, a small city in Apulia, and had, previous to his appointment as Eastern missionary, distinguished himself (in 1272) as ambassador of the emperor Michael Palaeologus to pope Gregory X in behalf of a contemplated union of the Eastern and Western churches. He had travelled in the East, and, aware of the opening for Christianity among the Mongols, had urged the Roman see to dispatch missionaries to them; but their efforts proved unsuccessful, and in 1289 he finally, at the instance of pope Nicholas IV, set out for that distant field himself. Of an energetic character, discouraged by no reverses however great, or trials however severe, he finally succeeded in building up a Christian Church. As an instance of his undaunted courage may be cited the fact that he had to buy  the children of natives in order to educate them in Christian doctrines, and through them to influence maturer minds. About 1305 he had some six thousand converts, and the prospect of still greater additions. In 1307 other laborers were sent into the field, and John de Monte Corvino was appointed archbishop (his see was named Cambalu), and the Christian interests were advanced among the Mongols even after John's death (1328), until the downfall of the Mongol dynasty. SEE MONGOLS. (J.H.W.)

## John Of Nepomuk[[@Headword:John Of Nepomuk]]

             (more properly POMUK), a very popular Bohemian saint of the Roman Catholic Church, and honored by them as a martyr of the inviolability of the seal of confession. He was born at Pomuk, a village in the district of Klatau, about the middle of the 14th century. After taking orders, he rose rapidly to distinction. He was created a canon of the Cathedral of Prague, and eventually vicar general of the diocese. The queen, Sophia, the second wife of Wenzel or Wenceslaus IV, having selected him for her confessor, Wenceslaus, himself a man of most dissolute life, conceiving suspicions of her virtue, required of John to reveal to him what he knew of her life from the confessions which she had made to him. John steadfastly refused, and the king resolved to be revenged for the refusal. An opportunity occurred soon afterwards, when the monks of the Benedictine abbey of Kladran elected an abbot in opposition to the design of the king, who wished to bestow it upon one of his own dissolute favorites, and obtained from John, as vicar general, at once a confirmation of their choice. Wenceslaus, having first put him to the torture, at which he himself personally presided, had him tied hand and foot, and flung, already half dead from the rack, into the Moldau (March 1393). These historical facts have been considerably enlarged, and embellished with legendary additions, in his biography by Bohuslav Balbinus. According to these, his birth was signalled by miraculous signs, and after his martyrdom his body was discovered by a miraculous light which issued from it, was taken up, and buried with the greatest honor. Several able Romanist writers have frequently attempted to reconcile the points of conflict between the legend and the historical account. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 749 sq.; Pelzel, Kaiser Wenceslaus, 1, 262 sq.; Wetzer u.Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 725 sq. Dr. Otto Abel (Die Sage v. heil. Johan. v. Nep.). supposes the legend to be a Jesuitical invention, and to date from the restoration of popery in Bohemia, to serve as a popular counterpart to the martyrdom of Huss and Ziska. His  memory is cherished with peculiar affection in his native country. He was canonized as a saint of the Roman Catholic Church by Benedict XIII in 1729, his feast being fixed for the 20th of March. By some historians, two distinct personages of the same name are enumerated — one the martyr of the confessional seal, the other of the resistance to the simoniacal tyranny of Wenceslaus; but the identity of the two is well sustained by Palacky, Gesch. von Bohmen, 3, 62. See Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3, 556 sq.

## John Of Nicklaushausen[[@Headword:John Of Nicklaushausen]]

             a German religious fanatic, flourished, in the second half of the 15th century, at Nicklaushausen, in the diocese of Wurzburg. He was earning his livelihood as a swineherd when it suddenly occurred to him that an attack upon the clergy, and a summons to them to reform their profligate ways, might meet with applause from the people, to whom at this time “the clergy, as a body, had become a stench in their nostrils.” He was not slow openly and loudly to proclaim his mission (in 1476), to which he claimed he had been inspired by the Virgin Mary, and soon immense flocks gathered about him, who came from the Rhine lands to Misnia, and from Saxony to  Bavaria, so that at times he preached to a congregation of 20,000 or 30,000 men. “His doctrines,” says Lea (Hist. Celibacy, p. 397), “were revolutionary, for he denounced oppression both secular and clerical; but he was particularly severe upon the vices of the ecclesiastical body. A special revelation of the Virgin had informed him that God could no longer endure them, and that the world could not, without a speedy reformation, be saved from the divine wrath consequent upon them” (comp. Trithemius, Chronicles Hirsang. ann. 1476). The unfortunate man, who was a fit precursor of Müncer and John of Leyden, was seized by the bishop of Wurzburg, the fanatical zeal of his unarmed followers easily subdued, and he himself suffered, for his rashness, death at the stake a few days after his trial. (J.H.W.)

## John Of Nicomedia[[@Headword:John Of Nicomedia]]

             a presbyter of the Church of Nicomedia, in Bithynia, in the time of Constantine the Great, is noted as the author of Μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου Βασιλέως ἐπισκόπου Α᾿μασείας, Acta martyrii S. Basilei episcopi Amasioe, which is given in the Acta Sanctorum of the Bollandists (Aprilis, vol. 3); the Latin version in the body of the work (p. 417), with a preliminary notice by Henschen, and the Greek original in the Appendix (p. 50). An extract from the Latin version, containing the history of the female saint Glaphyra, had previously been given in the same work (January 1, 771). The Latin version of the Acta Martyrii S. Basilei had already been published by Aloysius Lippomani (Vitoe Sanctor. Patrum, vol. 7) and by Surius (Deprobatis Sanctorum Vitis, s.d. 26 Aprilis). Basilens was put to death about the close of the reign of Licinius, A.D. 322 or 323, and John, who was then at Nicomedia, professes to have conversed with him in prison. Cave thinks that the Acta have been interpolated, apparently by Metaphrastes. See Acta Sanctorum, ll. cc.; Cave, Hist. Litt. 1, 185. — Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2, 601.

## John Of Oxford[[@Headword:John Of Oxford]]

             an English prelate, flourished in the second half of the 12th century, and took an active and important part in the controversy between king Henry II of England and his archbishop Thomas a Becket in behalf of his royal master, whose favor and unlimited confidence he enjoyed. He had attended the Diet at Würzburg in 1165, held to cement a union between Henry and the emperor of Germany, and had there taken the oath of fidelity to the  rival pope of Alexander, Paschal III, whom the emperor supported. For his success in this mission, John, on his return, was rewarded by king Henry II with the appointment of dean of Salisbury. Of course the archbishop, at this time himself claiming the right to fill these positions, disapproved of the appointment, and even suspended and cited before him for trial the bishop of the diocese of Salisbury, who had approved the royal action. (See Inett, History of the English Church, vol. 2, pt. 1, p. 337, note; Robertson, Life of Becket, p. 186; note d; compare art. JOCELINE OF SALISBURY and CLARENDON CONSTITUTIONS.) John, disregarding the archbishop's censures, was finally punished by excommunication (in 1166). The king at once dispatched a special embassy to pope Alexander, John of Oxford being one of the number, and, notwithstanding the archbishop's serious actions against John of Oxford, the pope, anxious to continue friendly relations with the English court, favorably received John, and the latter even measurably succeeded in the object of their mission [see art. BECKET], securing also the pope's confirmation of his appointment as dean of Salisbury. After the, close of the controversy and the return of Becket, John of Oxford was appointed by the king to meet and reinstate the archbishop, a not very moderate reproval to the haughty prelate; and upon the death of the latter John further received evidence of the grateful remembrance of his royal master by the appointment to the bishopric of Norwich (1175), and as such attended the Lateran Council in 1179. The exact time of his decease is not known to us, neither are we aware that he performed any literary work of value; in all probability, his active part in the king's controversy absorbed all his interests. See Milman, Latin Christianity, 4, 364 sq., 408. (J.H.W.)

## John Of Paris[[@Headword:John Of Paris]]

             a celebrated French Dominican of the 13th century, was professor of theology at the University of Paris. He owes his renown to the part he took in the controversy then waging between his king, Philip the Fair, and pope Boniface VIII. The latter, fearing his deposition on the plea that the resignation of his predecessor Celestine was illegal, took every means to advance the doctrine of papal absolutism. Not only in matters spiritual, but also in matters temporal, the pope was to be regarded supreme; in short, to save his office; he carried his schemes, for the enlargement of the papal power to the verge of frenzy. Unluckily for Boniface, however, he found his equal in Philip the Fair, who not only denied the temporal power of the pope, but finally even scorned the foolish conduct of Boniface in seeking to  frighten him by issuing bulls against him and his kingdom. The University of Paris sided with the king, and among his most outspoken friends were John of Paris and Accidius of Rome. The former even published a work against the papal assumptions, entitled De regia potestate papali (in the collection of Goldast, vol. 2), in which he dared to assert that “the priest, in spiritual things, was greater than the prince, but in temporal things the prince was greater than the priest; though, absolutely considered, the priest was the greater of the two.” He also maintained that the pope had no power over the property either of the Church or her subjects. As the kingdom of Christ is a spiritual one, having its foundation in the hearts of men, not in their possessions, so the power conferred on the pope relates simply to the wants or to the advantage of the universal Church.

He also stood up in defense of the independent power of the bishops and priests, and denied that this is derived from God through the mediation of the pope alone, maintaining that it springs directly from God, through the choice or concurrence of the communities. “For it was not Peter, whose successor is the pope, that sent forth the other apostles, whose successors are the bishops; or who sent forth the seventy disciples, whose successors are the parish priests; but Christ himself did this directly. It was not Peter who detained the apostles in order to impart to them the Holy Ghost; it was not he who gave them power to forgive sins, but Christ. Nor did Paul say that he received from Peter his apostolical office, but he said that it came to him directly from Christ or from God; that three years had elapsed after he received his commission to preach the Gospel before he had an interview with Peter.” But more than this he argued. The pope himself was even amenable to a worldly power for his conduct in the papal chair. As such he regarded not simply the Ecumenical Council, but to the secular princes also he believed this right belonged, subject, however, to a demand on the part of the clergy for aid. Neander says (Ch. Hist. 5, 18), “If the pope gave scandal to the Church, and showed himself incorrigible, it was in the power of secular rulers to bring about his abdication or his deposition by means of their influence on him or on his cardinals.” If the pope would not yield, they might so manage as to compel him to yield. They might command the people, under severe penalties, to refuse obedience to him as pope. John of Paris finally enters into a particular investigation of the question whether the pope can be deposed or can abdicate, a query that had been raised by the family of the Colonnas, whom the pope had estranged, and who were. anxious to make null and void the resignation of pope Celestine, and to reassert the latter's claim to the papacy. What conclusions he must have  arrived at on this point may be gathered from the preceding remarks. He distinctly affirmed that, as the papacy existed only for the benefit of the Church, the pope ought to lay down his office whenever it obstructed this end, the highest end of Christian love. Though he measurably served Boniface VIII by his last conclusions, he had yet sufficiently aroused the hatred of the Roman see to fear for his position in the Church; and no sooner did an opportunity present itself to Boniface than John was made to feel the strong arm of his opponent. Having advocated in the pulpit, contrary to the Roman Catholic dogma, of the real presence, a so-called impanation, viz. “that, in virtue of a union of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine, like the union of the two natures in Christ, the predicates of the one might be transferred over to the other,” he was prohibited from preaching by the bishop of Paris. An appeal to the pope, of course, proved futile, and his troubles ended only with his life, in 1304. He embodied his views of the sacrament in his work Determinatio de modo existendi corporis Christi in Sacramento altaris (London, 1686, 8vo): — Correctorium doctrinoe sancti Thomoe. See Neander, Ch. Hist. 4, 340; 5, sect. 1; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. bk. 3, cent. 13, pt. 2, ch. 3, § 14. SEE BONIFACE; SEE PAPACY; SEE LORDS SUPPER.

## John Of Parma[[@Headword:John Of Parma]]

             also called JOANNES BORELLUS or BURALLUS, a learned monk of the 13th century, was born at Parma about 1209. He became a Franciscan, taught theology with great success at the universities of Naples, Bologna, and Paris, and in 1247 was made general of his order by the chapter assembled at Avignon. He showed great zeal for the reformation of convents, and strictly enforced the discipline. In 1249 he was sent to Greece by Innocent IV, with a view to the reconciliation of the Eastern Church, but failed in that undertaking, and returned to Italy in 1251. A chapter held at Rome in 1256 accused him of favoring the heresies of Joachim, abbot of Floris, whose work, The Everlasting Gospel, he edited, and accompanied with a preface of his own (see Farrar, Crit. Hist. Free Thought, p. 86), and he was obliged to resign the generalship of the order. His successor, Bonaventura Fidanza, even caused him to be condemned to imprisonment, but the protection of cardinal Ottoboni, afterwards Adrian V, prevented the execution of the sentence. He was nevertheless obliged to hide himself in the convent of Grecchia, near Rieti. He subsequently set out to return to Greece, but died at Camerino in 1289. He was canonized in the 18th century by the Congregation of Rites. None of his writings were published.  See Hist. Litteraire de la France, 20, 23; Wadding, Script. Ord. Minor.; Fleury, Hist. Eccl.; Ireneo Affo, Memorie degli Scrittori et Litterati Parmigiani; Sbaraglia, Supplem. et castig. ad Script. Ord. S. Francisc.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 26, 550; Moasheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 13, pt. 2, ch. 2, § 33, note. (J.N.P.)

## John Of Ravena[[@Headword:John Of Ravena]]

             SEE NICHOLAS I; SEE RAVENNA.

## John Of Rupescissa[[@Headword:John Of Rupescissa]]

             or ROQUETAILLADE, a French Franciscan, who flourished near the middle of the 14th century, at Aurillac, in Auvergne, is noted for his severe denunciations of the gross immoralities of the clergy of the Roman Church in his day. He was especially opposed to the court at Avignon, and hesitated not to brand the whole papal court as the seat of a great whoredom. Popes Clement VI and Innocent VI imprisoned him on account of his continued remonstrances and prophesying, but even while in prison he wrote much against the papal court and the clergy. He died while in prison, but the cause of his death is not known. His works of interest are,

(1) Vademecum in tribulatione (in Ed. Brown's addition to Orturii Gratii fascic. rer. expectandar. et fugientdar. London, 1690), wherein he handles the French clergy without gloves, and prophesies much trouble to their native land on account of their sins: —

(2) A Commentary on the prophecies of the hermit Cyril of Mount Carmel and of abbot Joachim (q.v.). See Trithemius, De script. Eccles. 100, 611 (in Fabricius, Bib. Eccl. pt. 2, p. 145); Wolfius, Lectt. memorab. cent. 14, p. 623 sq.; Fuhrmann, Handw. der Kirchengesch. 2, 482; Aschbach, Kirch.-Lex. 3, 565. (J.H.W.)

## John Of Salisbury[[@Headword:John Of Salisbury]]

             an eminent English prelate, was born at Salisbury (old Sarum) about 1110. He was first educated at Oxford, and in 1136 went to France, where he continued his studies under Abelard, and many other celebrated French divines of that age. About 1151 he returned to England, and was appointed chaplain of Theobald, archbishop of Canterbury. Sent on a mission to pope Hadrian IV in 1156, he openly approached the latter on the abuses of the Church and of the papacy, though always an earnest advocate of the unity  and liberty of the Church, and the independence of the episcopate from the secular princes. He was an intimate friend and admirer of Thomas a Becket, whose cause he espoused warmly, and whom he followed into exile returning only to England with him in 1170, and after his death secured his canonization. John was called Becket's eye and arm. In 1176 he was appointed bishop of Chartres, and died about 1180. His works, which evince positive Realistic tendencies, and bear evidence of fruitful genius, sound understanding, and great erudition, are, Policraticus s. de nugis curialium et vestigiis philosophorum (Leyden, 1691) (an excellent treatise on the employments, duties, virtues, and vices of great men — a curious and valuable monument of the literature of John of Salisbury's time): — Metaloqicus (Leyd. 1610, Amst. 1664), an exhibition of true and false science; — Entheticus de dogmate philosophorum (pub. by Chr. Petersen, Hamb. 1843): — Vita ac Passio S. Thomoe (a Life of Thomas a Becket), etc. His collective works have been published by J. A. Giles (Lond. 1848, 5 vols. 8vo). See H. Reuter, J. von Salisbury (Berl. 1842); J. Schmidt, Joan Parv. Sarisb., etc. (1838); Hist. Litt. de la France, etc., 14, 89 sq.; Ritter, Gesch. d. Philos. 7, 605; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. s.v. SEE BECKET; SEE PAPACY.

## John Of Scythopolis[[@Headword:John Of Scythopolis]]

             a Greek ecclesiastical writer, who in all probability flourished in the latter part of the 5th century or the beginning of the 6th, wrote a work against the followers of Eutyches and Dioscorus, entitled Κατὰ τῶν ἀποσχιστῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, Contra desertores ecclesoe. It was divided into twelve parts, and was undertaken at the suggestion of a certain prelate, one Julianus, in reply to an anonymous Eutychian writer, who had published a book deceitfully entitled Κατὰ Νεστορίων, Adversus Nestorium, and whom Photius (Bibl. Cod. 95, 107) supposed to be Basilius, a presbyter of Cilicia. This Basilius wrote a reply to John in very abusive style, charging him, among many other things, with being a Manichaean, and with restricting Lent to a period of three weeks, and not abstaining from flesh even in that shortened period. Certain Παραθέσεις, Scholia, to the works of the pseudo Dionysius Areopagita, which Usher has observed to be mingled in -the printed editions of Dionysius with the Scholia of St. Maximus, have been ascribed to John of Scythopolis. Anastasius Bibliothecarius, in the 8th century, made a Latin translation of these mingled scholia, not now extant, in which he professed to distinguish those of Maximus from those of John by the mark of a cross. Fabricius (Bibl. Gr. 7, 9; 10, 707, 710) identifies the Scholia of John with the Commentarii in Dionysium Areopagitam cited by John Cyparissiota as by Dionysius of Alexandria. See Usher, Dissert. de Scriptis Dionys. Areop. suppositis, p. 299, subjoined to his Historia Dogmatica de Scriptoris Vernaculis, etc. (London, 1689, 4to); Cave, Hist. Litt. 1, 466. — Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2, 602.

## John Of Talaia[[@Headword:John Of Talaia]]

             or TALAIDA (otherwise Tabennisiota, Ταβεννισιώτης, from the monastery of Tabenna, near Alexandria; or of Alexandria, from his  patriarchal see; or from the offices which he had previously held, oeconomus [ οἰβεννισιώτης] and presbyter), a celebrated ecclesiastic in the Eastern Church, was one of the deputation sent by Salofaciolus, the twenty-seventh patriarch of Alexandria (A.D. 460-482), shortly before his decease; to the emperor Zeno, to secure his leave for a free election of the next patriarch from among the defenders of the Council of Chalcedon by the clergy and laity of Alexandria. “The emperor,” says Neale (East. Church [Alexand.] 2, 18), “received the deputies graciously, complied with their request, and in the letter which he gave them by way of reply spoke strongly in flavor of John.” Soon after the return of John, Timotheus Salofaciolus died, and John was unanimously elected to succeed him, but was almost immediately expelled from his see by order of the emperor. The cause of his expulsion is differently stated. Liberatus says that he was expelled mainly through the jealousy of Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, to whom, on different occasions, he had failed in paying due attention.

According to Evagrius, who quotes Zacharias as his authority. he was detected in having procured his own election by bribery, and had broken an oath which he had taken before Zeno not to seek for himself the patriarchate. But Neale thinks it doubtful whether John ever took such an oath, and holds that, even if he had, he can see no reason for the harshness with which he was treated, and for his ejection from the see, so long as it was freely proffered to him (which seems clear from the unanimous election). The true reason seems to be John's careless delay of the announcement of his election to the patriarch of Constantinople, sending the message by Illus, who was then in Antioch, instead of dispatching a messenger direct, as he had done in the case of Rome and Antioch, thereby provoking the patriarch of Constantinople, also his selection of Illus for the messenger, when the latter was then the object of jealousy and suspicion to Zeno, if not actually in rebellion against him. John, expelled from Alexandria, first resorted to Illus, then to Antioch; and having, through Illus's intervention, obtained from the patriarch of Antioch and his suffragans a synodical letter commending him to pope Simplicius, departed to Rome to plead his cause there in person. Simplicius, with the usual papal jealousy of the patriarchs of Constantinople, took the side of John; but neither the exertions of Simplicius nor those of his successor Felix could obtain the restoration of the banished patriarch, and John finally accepted from Felix the bishopric of Nola, in Campania, which he held several years, and at last died peaceably (the precise date of his decease is not known). John (whom Theophanes extols for his piety and orthodoxy)  wrote Πρὸς Γελάσιον τὸν ῾Ρώμης ἀπολογία, Ad Gelasium Papam Apologia,in which he anathematized Pelagianism, as well as its defenders Pelagius and Celestius, and their successor Julianus. The work, which is noticed by Photius, is not extant. See Tillemont, Mfmn. vol. 16; Cave, Hist. Litt. 1, 445. — Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2, 602; Neale, Hist. East. Ch. (Alex.) 2, 18 sq.

## John Of The Grate[[@Headword:John Of The Grate]]

             (so-called from an iron grating which surrounded his sepulchre), Saint, bishop and confessor, was a Breton, born in 1098. He made rapid progress in his studies, and was made bishop of Aleth. As a bishop his life was embittered by a series of lawsuits with the monks of Marmoutiers. He wished to remove his episcopal see to the island of St. Malo, Aleth being exposed to pirates. But the monks claimed the Church of St. Malo, the pope decided in their favor, and Lucius II at length condemned John to lose his see. He then retired under the protection of St. Bernard to Clairvaux, until, on the death of Lucius, a monk of Clairvaux (Eugenius III) was elevated to the papal throne. John appealed again and was heard. His rights were restored, and the monks of Marmoutiers were obliged to cede the Church of St. Malo to the bishop. It was during his bishopric that the strange heresy of the fanatical Eon de l'toile (q.v.) broke out, and John tried by persuasion and instruction to disabuse of their heresy such of the enthusiasts as overran his diocese, and succeeded in converting many. John of the Grate died February 1, 1163.

He immediately received popular reverence as a saint, and numerous miracles are said to have augmented the reverence of the people. In 1517 Denis Brigonnet, ambassador of the king to Rome, obtained from Leo X permission for him to be commemorated in a solemn office as a confessor bishop. Monsignor Antoine Joseph des Laurents, last bishop of St. Malo but one, examined John's relics, October 15, 1784. During the revolution they were ordered to be cast into the sea, but the order was countermanded. and the sexton was required to bury them in the common fosse in the cemetery. In November 1799, M. Manet, a priest who had remained through the Reign of Terror in St. Malo, verified the relics. In a sealed box, March 7, 1823, they were deposited in their ancient shrine, and November 16, 1839, by the sanction of the pope, they were finally installed with great ceremony, and are now in the Church of St. Malo. The authorities for the life of John of the Grate are Albertus Magnus of Morlaix, and the letters of Bernard and Nicholas of Clairvaux. His festival is observed as a double by the Church of St. Malo, in Brittany, and his name appears in Saussaye's supplement to the Gallican  martyrology. See Baring-Gould, Lives of the Saints, 2:26 (sub February 1, his day).

## John Of Turrecremata[[@Headword:John Of Turrecremata]]

             SEE TURRECREMATA.

## John Of Wesel[[@Headword:John Of Wesel]]

             SEE WESEL.

## John Of Wessel[[@Headword:John Of Wessel]]

             SEE WESSEL.

## John Parvus[[@Headword:John Parvus]]

             SEE JOHN THE LITTLE.

## John Philoponus[[@Headword:John Philoponus]]

             SEE JOHN THE LABORIOUS.

## John Phocas[[@Headword:John Phocas]]

             (Φοκάς), a Cretan monk and priest, son of Matthaeus, who became a monk in Patmos, had served in the army of the emperor Manuel Comnenus (who reigned A.D. 1143-80) in Asia Minor, and afterwards visited (A.D. 1185) Syria and Palestine, is noted for a short geographical account which he wrote of those countries, entitled ῎Εκφρασις ἐν συνόψει τῶν ὰπ᾿ Α᾿ντιοχείας μέχρις ῾Ιεροσολύμων κάστρων καὶ χωρῶν Συριας και Φοινίκης καὶ τῶν κατὰ Παλαιστινην ἁγίωντορων, Compemidiaria Descriptio Castrorum et Urbium (sic in Allat. vers.) ab Urbe Antiochia usque Hierosolymam, necnon Syrioe Phenicioe, et in Paloestina Sacrorum Locorum, which was transcribed by his son (for he was married before he became a priest), and finally published by Allatius, with a Latin version, in his Σύμμικτα, 1, 1-46. The Latin version is also given in the Acta Sanctorum of the Bollandists, Maii 2, ad init. See Allatius, Σύμμικτα, Proefatiuncula; Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. 4, 662; 8, 99. — Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2, 601.

## John Phurnes[[@Headword:John Phurnes]]

             (Φουρνῆς), a monk of the monastery of Mount Ganus, who flourished in the reign of the emperor Alexis Comnenus (11th century), was an opponent of the Latin Church, and is noted as the author of Α᾿πολογία, Defensio, or Διάλεξις, Disceptatio, a discussion which was carried on with Peter, archbishop of Milan, in the presence of the emperor. If this is the work which John Veccus cites and replies to in his De Unione Ecclsiarum Oratio (apud Allatium, Groecia Orthodoxa, 1, 179, etc.), it appears that the form of a dialogue was assumed for convenience' sake, and that it was not the  dialogue of a real conference. According to Fabricius, Allatius also published in his work De Consensu (sc. De Ecclesioe Occidentalis et Orientalis perpetua Consensione), p. 1153, a work of John which is described as Epistola de Ritibus immutatis in Sacra Communione. Other works of John are extant in MS. See Allatius, Groec. Orthodox. 50, 100; Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. 11, 648, 650. — Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2, 601.

## John Pungens Asinum[[@Headword:John Pungens Asinum]]

             SEE JOHN OF PARIS.

## John Pupper[[@Headword:John Pupper]]

             SEE GOCH.

## John Raithuensis[[@Headword:John Raithuensis]]

             or RAITHENUS, i.e. of Raithus or Raitku (τοῦ ῾Ραϊθοῦ), begumendos or abbot of a monastery at Elim, or the Seventy Springs, on the western coast of the peninsula of Mount Sinai, flourished in the 6th century. He is celebrated on account of the friendly relations he sustained and the influence he exerted over John the Scholar, or John Climacus. It was at the desire of Raithuensis that Climacus wrote the work Κλίμαξ or Scala Paradisi, from which he derives his name, and to which Raithuensis wrote a Commendatio and Scholia. The Ε᾿πιστολὴ τοῦ ἁγίου Ι᾿ωάννου τοῦ ἠγουμένου τοῦ Ραίθοῦ Litteroe Joannis Raithuensis, addressed to Climacus, requesting him to undertake the work, and the answer of Climacus are given by Raderus in the original Greek, with a Latin version, in his edition of the works of Climacus (Paris, 1633, fol.). This version of the Litteroe of Raithuensis, and a Latin version of his Commendatio and Scholia, are given in various editions of the Bibliotheca Patrum: the Litteroe in vol. 3, edit. Paris, 1575; the Litteroe and Commendatio, vol. 5. edit. Paris, 1589 and 1654; the Litterce, Epistola, Commendatio, and Scholia, in vol. 6, pt. 2, ed. Cologne, 1618, and vol. 10, ed. Lyme, 1677. See Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. 9, 523-524; Ittigius, De Biblioth. Patrum. — Smith, Dict. Gr.s and Rom. Biog. 2, 601.

## John Scotus Erigena[[@Headword:John Scotus Erigena]]

             SEE SCOTUS.

## John The Almsgiver[[@Headword:John The Almsgiver]]

             (JOHANNES ELEEMOSYNARIUS), one of the best of the patriarchs of the Eastern Church, was born of noble parentage at Amanthus, in Cyprus, about 550. He had married young, but, losing his wife, he distributed his possessions among the poor, and devoted himself to a life of ascetic practices. So irreproachable was his conduct, and so great his reputation for piety and charity, that, on the murder of Theodore, he was unanimously demanded as successor in the patriarchate. He was appointed by the emperor in A.D. 606. The first years of his reign were quiet; not so the last years, which were marked by the successful invasions of Chosroes II, king of the Persians, during the reign of Phocas, into the Roman possessions of the Orient (compare Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Rom. Empire, ch. 46). From all parts of Syria Christians fled to Alexandria to find a protector in John, and when at last Jerusalem also had fallen (A.D. 619), not content with feeding and clothing the refugees he found right at his own door, he sent large sums of money to the Holy City to redeem Christian captives and prevent further massacre. (The statement that at this fall of Jerusalem “90,000 Christians were massacred, and that principally by the Jews, who purchased them from the Persians on purpose to put them to death” [Neale], has no better basis than the inventions of prejudiced monastics, bent on the destruction of the Jews; Comp. Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 5, 34 sq., 438 sq.). In 620, when the Persians threatened Egypt also, he fled to his native island, and died there a short time after his arrival. He is commemorated in the Oriental Church November 11, and in the Latin January 23. Curiously enough, he is also commemorated by the Jacobites. It is from this John that the famous order of the Hospitallers, in the first instance, derived its name. Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, ascribed to him the authorship of the celebrated Epistola ad Coesarium, with which most Protestant and some Roman Catholic critics credit Chrysostom. Three biographical accounts were written of him:

(1) by Joannes Moschus and Sophronius (no longer extant);

(2) by Leontius, bishop of Neapolis, in Cyprus (translated, between 858 and 867, into Latin by Anastasius Bibliothecarius, and repeatedly printed); found in the Acta Sanctorum of the Bollandists (Jan. 23, 2, 495);

(3) by Simeon Metaphrastes (but not trustworthy). See Neale, Hist. East. Ch. (Alexandria), 2, 52 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, 5, 718 sq.; Fabricius, Biblioth. Groeca, 1, 699, note 20; 8, 322; 10, 262. (J.H.W.)

## John The Baptist[[@Headword:John The Baptist]]

             (Ι᾿ωάννης ὁ βαπτιστήςor simply Ι᾿ωάννης, when the reference is clear, as in Mat 3:4; Mat 4:12; Lat. Joannes [Tacitus, Hist., 5, 12]; Heb. יוֹחָנָןdenoting grace, or favor [see Simonis, Lex. N.T. p. 513]). In the Church John commonly bears the honorable title of “forerunner of the Lord” — antecursor et praeparator viarum Domini (Tertull. ad. Marc. 4, 33); in Greek, πρόδρομος, προάγγελος Κυρίου. The accounts of him which the Gospels present are fragmentary and imperfect; they involve, too, some difficulties which the learned have found it hard to remove; yet enough is given to show that he was a man of a lofty character and that the relation in which he stood to Christianity was one of great importance. Indeed, according to our Lord's own testimony, he was a more honored character and distinguished saint than any prophet who had preceded him (Luk 7:28). SEE PROPHET.

1. John was of the priestly race by both parents, for his father Zacharias was himself a priest of the course of Abia, or Abijah (1Ch 24:10), offering incense at the very time when a son was promised to him; and Elizabeth was of the daughters of Aaron (Luk 1:5), the latter “a cousin” (συγγενής relative) of Mary, the mother of Jesus, whose senior John was by a period of six months (Luke 1). Both parents, too, were devout persons, walking in the commandments of God and waiting for the fulfillment of his promise to Israel. The divine mission of John was the subject of prophecy many centuries before his birth, for Mat 3:3 tells us that it was John who was prefigured by Isaiah as “the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths  straight” (Isa 40:3), while by the prophet Malachi the Spirit announces more definitely, “Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me” (Isa 3:1). His birth — a birth not according to the ordinary laws of nature, but through the miraculous interposition of Almighty power — was foretold by an angel sent from God, who announced it as an occasion of joy and gladness to many, and at the same time assigned to him the name of John, to signify either that he was to be born of God's especial favor, or, perhaps, that he was to be the harbinger of grace. The angel Gabriel, moreover, proclaimed the character and office of this wonderful child even before his conception, foretelling that he would be filled with the Holy Ghost from the first moment of his existence, and appear as the great reformer of his countrymen — another Elijah in the boldness with which he would speak truth and rebuke vice — but, above all, as the chosen forerunner and herald of the long-expected Messiah. These marvellous revelations as to the character and career of the son for whom he had so long prayed in vain were too much for the faith of the aged Zacharias, and, when he sought some assurance of the certainty of the promised blessing, God gave it to him in a judgment — the privation of speech — until the event foretold should happen — a judgment intended to serve at once as a token of God's truth and a rebuke of his own incredulity. And now the Lord's gracious promise tarried not. Elizabeth, for greater privacy, retired into the hill country, whither she was soon afterwards followed by her kinswoman Mary, who was herself the object and channel of divine grace beyond measure greater and more mysterious. The two cousins, who were thus honored above all the mothers of Israel, came together in a remote city, and immediately God's purpose was confirmed to them by a miraculous, sign; for, as soon as Elizabeth heard the salutations of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb, thus acknowledging, as it were, even before birth, the presence of his Lord (Luk 1:43-44). Three months after this, and while Mary still remained with her, Elizabeth was delivered of a son, B.C. 6. The exact spot where John was born is not determined. The rabbins (Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 324; Witsii Miscell. Sacr. 2, 389) fix on Hebron, in the hill country of Judaea; Paulus, Kuinoel, and Meyer, after Reland, are in favor of Jutta, “a city of Juda.” SEE JUTTAH.

On the eighth day the child of promise was, in conformity with the law of Moses (Lev 12:3), brought to the priest for circumcision, and, as the performance of this rite was the accustomed time for naming a child, the friends of the family proposed to call him Zacharias, after the name of his father. The mother, however, required that he should be called John, a  decision which Zacharias, still speechless, confirmed by writing on a tablet, “his name is John.” The judgment on his want of faith was then at once withdrawn, and the first use which he made of his recovered speech was to praise Jehovah for his faithfulness and mercy (Luk 1:64). God's wonderful interposition in the birth of John had impressed the minds of many with a certain solemn awe and expectation (Luk 3:15). God was surely again visiting his people. His providence, so long hidden, seemed once more about to manifest itself. The child thus supernaturally born must doubtless be commissioned to perform some important part in the history of the chosen people. Could it be the Messiah? Could it be Elijah? Was the era of their old prophets about to be restored? With such grave thoughts were the minds of the people occupied as they mused on the events which had been passing under their eyes, and said one to another, “What manner of child shall this be?” while Zacharias himself, “filled with the Holy Ghost,” broke forth in a glorious strain of praise and prophecy — a strain in which it is to be observed that the father, before speaking of his own child, blesses God for remembering his covenant and promise in the redemption and salvation of his people through him of whom his own son was the prophet and forerunner. A single verse contains all that we know of John's history for a space of thirty years, the whole period which elapsed between his birth and the commencement of his public ministry: “The child grew and waxed strong in the spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel” (Luk 1:80).

John it will be remembered, was ordained to be a Nazarite (see Num 6:1-21) from his birth, for the words of the angel were, “He shall drink neither wine nor strong drink” (Luk 1:15). What we are to understand by this brief announcement is probably this: the chosen forerunner of the Messiah and herald of his kingdom was required to forego the ordinary pleasures and indulgences of the world, and live a life of the strictest self-denial in retirement and solitude. The apocryphal Protev. Jac. ch. 22, states that his mother, in order to rescue her son from the murder of the children at Bethlehem which Herod commanded, fled with him into the desert. She could find no place of refuge, the mountain opened at her request and gave the needed shelter in its bosom. Zacharias, being questioned by Herod as to where his son was to be found, and refusing to answer, was slain by the tyrant. At a later period Elizabeth died, when angels took the youth under their care (Fabricius, Cod. Apocryph. p. 117 sq.; comp. Kuhn, Leben Jesu, 1, 163, remark 4). It was thus that the holy Nazarite, dwelling by himself in the wild and thinly-peopled region westward of the Dead Sea, called “desert”  in the text, prepared himself by self-discipline, and by constant communion with God, for the wonderful office to which he had been divinely called. Here year after year of his stern probation passed by, till the time for the fulfilment of his mission arrived. The very appearance of the holy Baptist was of itself a lesson to his countrymen; his dress was that of the old prophets — a garment woven of camel's hair (2Ki 1:8), attached to the body by a leathern girdle. His food was such as the desert spontaneously afforded — locusts (Lev 11:22) and wild honey (Psa 81:16) from the rock. (See Endemann, De victu Jo. Bapt. Hersfeld, 1752; Thadd. a St. Adamo, De victu Joa. Bapt. in deserto, Bonn, 1785; Müller, Varia de victu Joa. Baptist. Bonn, 1829; Hackett, Illustr. of Script. p. 96.) Desert though the place is designated, the country where he spent these early years — the wild mountainous tract of Judah lying between Jerusalem and the Dead Sea, along which it stretches — was not entirely destitute of means for supporting human existence (Mat 3:1-12; Mar 1:1-8; Luk 3:1-20; Joh 10:28; Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryph. c. 88). Josephus, in his Life (2, 2), gives an account of one of his instructors, Banus, which throws light on John's condition in the desert: “He lived in the desert, and had no other food than what grew of its own accord, and bathed himself in cold water frequently, both by night and by day. I imitated him in these things, and continued with him three years.” Some writers infer that John was an Essene; so says, e.g. Taylor, editor of Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible; comp. Johnson, Monks before Christ (Bost. 1870, 12mo), p. 109 sq. But this is denied by Rénan, Vie de Jesus (13th ed. Paris, 1867), p. 101 sq.

2. At length, in the fifteenth year of the associate reign of the emperor Tiberius (see Jarvis, Chronicles Introd. p. 228 sq., 462 sq.), or A.D. 25, the long-secluded hermit came forth to the discharge of his office. His supernatural birth, his hard ascetic life, his reputation for extraordinary sanctity, and the generally-prevailing expectation that some great one was about to appear — these causes, without the aid of miraculous power, for “John did no miracle” (Joh 10:41), were sufficient to attract to him a great multitude from “every quarter” (Mat 3:5). Brief and startling was his first exhortation to them — ”Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” A few scores of verses contain all that is recorded of John's preaching, and the sum of it all is repentance — not mere legal ablution or expiation, but a change of heart and life. Herein John, though exhibiting a marked contrast to the scribes and Pharisees of his own time, was but  repeating, with the stimulus of a new and powerful motive, the lessons which had been again and again impressed upon them by their ancient prophets (comp. Isa 1:16-17; Isa 55:7, Jer 7:3-7; Eze 18:19-32; Eze 36:25-27, Joe 2:12-13 Mic 6:8; Zec 1:3-4). But, while such was his solemn admonition to the multitude at large, he adopted towards the leading sects of the Jews a severer tone, denouncing Pharisees and Sadducees alike as “a generation of vipers,” and warning them of the folly of trusting to external privileges as descendants of Abraham (Luk 3:8). Now at last, he warns them that “the axe was laid to the root of the tree,” that formal righteousness would be tolerated no longer, and that none would be acknowledged for children of Abraham but such as did the works of Abraham (comp. Joh 8:39). Such alarming declarations produced their effect and many of every class pressed forward to confess their sins and to be baptized.

What, then, was the baptism which John administered? SEE WASHING. (Comp. Olshausen, Comment. ad loc. Job.; Dale, Johannic Baptism, Phila. 1871.) Not altogether a new rite, for it was the custom of the Jews to baptize proselytes to their religion; not an ordinance in itself conveying remission of sins, but rather a token and symbol of that repentance which was an indispensable condition of forgiveness through him whom John pointed out as “the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world.” Still less did the baptism of John impart the grace of regeneration of a new spiritual life (Act 19:3-4). This was to be the mysterious effect of baptism “with the Holy Ghost,” which was to be ordained by that “mightier one” whose coming he proclaimed. The preparatory baptism of John was a visible sign to the people, and a distinct acknowledgment by them that a hearty renunciation of sin and a real amendment of life were necessary for admission into the kingdom of heaven, which the Baptist proclaimed to be at hand. But the fundamental distinction between John's baptism unto repentance and that baptism accompanied with the gift of the Holy Spirit which our Lord afterwards ordained is clearly marked by John himself (Mat 3:11-12). SEE BAPTISM OF JOHN.

As a preacher, John was eminently practical and discriminating. Self love and covetousness were the prevalent sins of the people at large on them, therefore, he enjoined charity and consideration for others. The publicans he cautioned against extortion, the soldiers against violence and plunder. His answers to them are, no doubt, to be regarded as instances of the appropriate warning and advice which he addressed to every class. The first reason assigned by  John for entering on his most weighty and perilous office was announced in these words: “The kingdom of heaven is at hand.” It was his great work to prepare the mind of the nation, so that when Jesus himself came they might be a people made ready for the Lord. What was the exact idea which John intended to convey by the term “kingdom of heaven” it is not easy, at least in the space before us, to determine with satisfaction. (See Richter. De munere sacro Joanni Bapt. divinitus delegato, Lips. 1756.) We feel ourselves, however, justified in protesting against the practice of those who take the vulgar Jewish notion and ascribe it to John, while some go so far as to deny that our Lord himself, at the first, possessed any other. Had we space to develop the moral character of John, we could show that this fine, stern, high-minded teacher possessed many eminent qualities; but his personal and official modesty in keeping, in all circumstances, in the lower rank assigned him by God must not pass without special mention. The doctrine and manner of life of John appear to have roused the entire of the south of Palestine, and people flocked from all parts to the spot where, on the banks of the Jordan, he baptized thousands unto repentance. Such, indeed, was the fame which he had gained, that “people were in expectation, and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he were the Christ or not” (Luk 3:15). Had he chosen, John might without doubt have assumed to himself the higher office, and risen to great worldly power; but he was faithful to his trust, and never failed to declare, in the fullest and clearest manner, that he was not the Christ, but merely his harbinger, and that the sole work he had to do was to usher in the day spring from on high. (See Beecher, Life of Jesus, vol. 1, ch. 5.)

The more than prophetic fame of the Baptist reached the ears of Jesus in his Nazarene dwelling, far distant from the locality of John (Mat 2:9; Mat 2:11). The nature of the report — namely, that his divinely-predicted forerunner had appeared in Judaea — showed our Lord that the time had now come for his being made manifest to Israel. The mission of the baptist — an extraordinary one for an extraordinary purpose — was not limited to those who had openly forsaken the covenant of God, and so forfeited its principles; it was to the whole people alike. This we must infer from the baptism of one who had no confession to make, and no sins to wash away. Jesus himself came from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized of John, on the special ground that it became him “to fulfil all righteousness,” and, as man, to submit to the customs and ordinances which were binding upon the rest of the Jewish people. John, however, naturally at first shrank from offering  the symbols of purity to the sinless Son of God. Immediately on the termination of this symbolical act, a divine attestation was given from the opened vault of heaven, declaring Jesus to be in truth the long looked-for Messiah —”This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased” (Mat 3:17). The events which are found recorded in Joh 1:19 sq. seem to have happened after the baptism of Jesus by John. SEE JESUS CHRIST.

Here a difficult question arises — How is John's acknowledgment of Jesus at the moment of his presenting himself for baptism compatible with his subsequent assertion that he knew him not save by the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him, which took place after his baptism? It is difficult to imagine that the two cousins did not personally recognize each other, from their close relationship, and the account which John could not have failed to receive of the remarkable circumstances attending Jesus' birth; hence his general deference at that time, but his explicit testimony subsequently (see Kuinol, Alford, Comment. on Mat 3:14). The supposition that John was not personally acquainted with Jesus is therefore out of the question (see Lücke, Comment. on Joh 1:31). Yet it must be borne in mind that their places of residence were at the two extremities of the country, with but little means of communication between them. Perhaps, too, John's special destination and mode of life may have kept him from the stated festivals of his countrymen at Jerusalem. It is possible, therefore, that the Savior and the Baptist had not often met. It was certainly of the utmost importance that there should be no suspicion of concert or collusion between them. John, however, must assuredly have been in daily expectation of Christ's manifestation to Israel, and so a word or sign would have sufficed to reveal to him the person and presence of our Lord, though we may well suppose such a fact to be made known by a direct communication from God, as in the case of Simeon (Luk 2:26; comp. Jackson on the Creed, Works. Oxf. ed. 6, 404). At all events, it is wholly inconceivable that John should have been permitted to baptize the Son of God without being enabled to distinguish him from any of the ordinary multitude. Upon the whole, the true meaning of the words κἀγώ οὐκ ῆδειν αὐτόν would seem to be as follows: And I, even I, though standing in so near a relation to him, both personally and ministerially, had no assured knowledge of him as the Messiah. I did not know him, and I had not authority to proclaim him as such till I saw the predicted sign in the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him. It must be borne in mind that John had  no means of knowing by previous announcement whether this wonderful acknowledgment of the divine Son would be vouchsafed to his forerunner at his baptism or at any other time (see Dr. Mill's Hist. Character of St. Luke's Gospel, and the authorities quoted by him). SEE BAPTISM OF JESUS.

With the baptism of Jesus John's more especial office ceased. The king had come to his kingdom. The function of the herald was discharged. It was this that John had with singular humility and self-renunciation announced beforehand: “He must increase, but I must decrease.” It seems but natural to think, therefore, when their hitherto relative position is taken into account, that John would forthwith lay down his office of harbinger, which, now that the Sun of Righteousness himself had appeared, was entirely fulfilled and terminated. Such a step he does not appear to have taken. From incidental notices we learn that John and his disciples continued to baptize some time after our Lord entered upon his ministry (see Joh 3:23; Joh 4:1). We gather also that John instructed his disciples in certain moral and religious duties, as fasting (Mat 9:14; Luk 5:33) and prayer (Luk 11:1). In short, the language of Scripture seems to imply that the Baptist Church continued side by side with the Messianic (Mat 11:3; Luk 7:19; Joh 14:25), and remained long after John's execution (Act 19:3). Indeed, a sect which bears the name of “John's disciples” exists to the present day in the East, whose sacred books are said to be pervaded by a Gnostic leaven. (See Gesenius, in the Allgem. Literaturzeitung, 1817, No. 48, p. 378, and in the Hall. Encyclop., probeheft, p. 95 sq.; Burckhardt, Les Nazoréeans apellés Zaebiens et Chrétiens de St. Jean, secte Gnostique, Strasb. 1810; also Blarkey, in the Bibl. Hag. 4, 355 sq.; Schaff, Apost. Hist. p. 279 sq.). SEE JOHN, ST., CHRISTIANS OF.

They are hostile alike to Judaism and Christianity, and their John and Jesus are altogether different from the characters bearing these names in our evangelists. Still, though it has been generally assumed that John did not lay down his office, we are not satisfied that the New Testament establishes this alleged fact. John may have ceased to execute his own peculiar work as the forerunner, but may justifiably have continued to bear his most important testimony to the Messiahship of Christ; or he may even have altogether given up the duties of active life some time, at least, before his death; and yet his disciples, both before and after that event, may have maintained their individuality as a religious communion. Nor will the student of the New Testament and of ecclesiastical history,  who knows how grossly a teacher far greater than John was, both during his life and after his crucifixion, misunderstood and misrepresented, think it impossible that some misconception or some sinister motive may have had weight in preventing the Baptist Church from dissolving and passing into that of Christ. (See Weber, J. d. Täufer und die Parteien seiner Zeit, Gotha, 1870.) It was, not improbably, with a view to remove some error of this kind that John sent the embassy of his disciples to Jesus which is recorded in Mat 11:3; Luk 7:19. The spiritual course which the teachings of Jesus were more and more taking, and the apparent failure, or at least uneasy postponement of the promised kingdom in the popular sense, especially after their esteemed master lay in prison, and was in imminent danger of losing his life, may well have led John's disciples to doubt if Jesus were in truth the expected Messiah; but no intimation is found in the record that John required evidence to give him satisfaction. (See below.) Be that as it may, it is certain that John still continued to present himself to his countrymen in the capacity of witness to Jesus. Especially did he bear testimony to him at Bethany beyond Jordan (for Bethany, not Bethabara, is the reading of the best MSS.). So confidently, indeed, did he point out the Lamb of God, on whom he had seen the Spirit alighting like a dove, that two of his own disciples, Andrew, and probably John, being convinced by his testimony, followed Jesus as the true Messiah.

3. But shortly after he had given his testimony to the Messiah, John's public ministry was brought to a close. He had, at the beginning of it, condemned the hypocrisy and worldliness of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and he had now occasion to denounce the lust of a king. In daring disregard of the divine laws, Herod Antipas had taken to himself the wife of his brother Philip; and when John reproved him for this, as well as for other sins (Luk 3:19), Herod cast him into prison. Josephus, however, assigns a somewhat different cause for Herod's act from that given in the Gospels: “Now some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and that very justly, as a punishment of what he did against John that was called the Baptist; for Herod slew him, although he was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness one towards another and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism. Now when others came in crowds about him — for they were greatly moved by hearing his words — Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise a rebellion (for they seemed ready to do anything he  should advise), thought it best, by putting him to death, to prevent any mischief he might cause, and not bring himself into difficulties by sparing a man who might make him repent of it when it should be too late. Accordingly he was sent a prisoner, out of Herod's suspicious temper, to Machaerus, the castle I before mentioned, and was there put to death” (Ant. 18, 5, 2). There is no contrariety between this account and that which is given in the New Testament. (See Lamy, Diss. de vinculis Joa. Bapt.; Van Til, De Joa. Bapt. incarceratione fictitia Herodiana vincula antecedente, L.B. 1710.) Both may be true: John was condemned in the mind of Herod on political grounds, as endangering his position, and executed on private and ostensible grounds, in order to gratify a malicious but powerful woman. The scriptural reason was but the pretext for carrying into effect the determination of Herod's cabinet. That the fear of Herod was not without some ground may be seen in the popularity which John had gained (Mar 11:32; see Lardner, Works, 6, 483).

The castle of Machaerus, where John was imprisoned and beheaded, was a fortress lying on the southern extremity of Peraea, at the head of the Lake Asphaltites, between the dominions of Herod and Aretas, king of Arabia Petraea, and at the time of our history appears to have belonged to the former (Lardner, 6, 483). It was here that the above-mentioned reports reached him of the miracles which our Lord was working in Judaea — miracles which, doubtless, were to John's mind but the confirmation of what he expected to hear as to the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom. But if Christ's kingdom were indeed established, it was the duty of John's own disciples, no less than of all others, to acknowledge it. They, however, would naturally cling to their own master, and be slow to transfer their allegiance to another. With a view, therefore, to overcome their scruples, John sent two of them to Jesus himself to ask the question, “Art thou he that should come?” They were answered not by words, but by a series of miracles wrought before their eyes — the very miracles which prophecy had specified as the distinguishing credentials of the Messiah (Isa 35:5; Isa 61:1); and while Jesus bade the two messengers carry back to John as his only answer the report of what they had seen and heard, he took occasion to guard the multitude who surrounded him against supposing that the Baptist himself was shaken in mind, by a direct appeal to their own knowledge of his life and character. Well might they be appealed to as witnesses that the stern prophet of the wilderness was no waverer, bending to every breeze, like the reeds on the banks of Jordan. Proof abundant had  they that John was no worldling, with a heart set upon rich clothing and dainty fare — the luxuries of a king's court — and they must have been ready to acknowledge that one so inured to a life of hardness and privation was not likely to be affected by the ordinary terrors of a prison. But our Lord not only vindicates his forerunner from any suspicion of inconstancy, he goes on to proclaim him a prophet, and more than a prophet; nay, inferior to none born of woman, though in respect to spiritual privileges behind the least of those who were to be born of the Spirit and admitted into the fellowship of Christ's body (Mat 11:11). It should be noted that the expression ὁ δὲ μικρότερος, κ. τ. λ., is understood by Chrysostom, Augustine, Hilary, and some modern commentators to mean Christ himself, but this interpretation is less agreeable to the spirit and tone of our Lord's discourse. Jesus further proceeds to declare that John was, according to the true meaning of the prophecy, the Elijah of the new covenant, foretold by Malachi (Mal 3:4).

The event, indeed, proved that John was to Herod what Elijah had been to Ahab, and a prison was deemed too light a punishment for his boldness in asserting God's law before the face of a king and a queen. Nothing but the death of the Baptist would satisfy the resentment of Herodias. Though foiled once, she continued to watch her opportunity, which at length arrived. A court festival was kept in honor of the king's birthday. After supper the daughter of Herodias, came in and danced before the company, and so charmed was the king by her grace that he promised with an oath to give her whatsoever she should ask. Salome, prompted by her abandoned mother, demanded the head of John the Baptist. The promise had been given in the hearing of his distinguished guests, and so Herod, though loath to be made the instrument of so bloody a work, gave instructions to an officer of his guard, who went and executed John in the prison, and his head was brought to feast the eyes of the adulteress whose sins he had denounced. SEE HERODIAS.

According to the Scripture account, the daughter of Herodias obtained the Baptist's head at the entertainment, without delay. How could this be when Machaerus lay at a distance from Jerusalem? The feast seems to have been made at Machaerus, which, besides being a stronghold, was also a palace, built by Herod the Great, and here Antipas appears to have been spending some time with his paramour Herodias.

4. Thus was John added to that glorious army of martyrs who have suffered for righteousness' sake. His death seems to have occurred just  before the third Passover, in the course of the Lord's ministry, A.D. 28. Herod undoubtedly looked upon him as some extraordinary person, for no sooner did he hear of the miracles of Jesus than, though a Sadducee himself, and, as such, a disbeliever in the resurrection, he ascribed them to John, whom he supposed to have risen from the dead. SEE HEROD ANTIPAS.

Holy Scripture tells us that the body of the Baptist was laid in the tomb by his disciples, and ecclesiastical history records the honors which successive generations paid to his memory. He is mentioned in the Koran, with much honor, under the name of Jahja (see Hottinger, Historia Orientalis, p. 144-149, Tigur. 1660; Herbelot, Biblioth. Or. 2, 283 sq.).

The brief history of John's life is marked throughout with the characteristic graces of self-denial, humility, and holy courage. So great, indeed, was his abstinence that worldly men considered him possessed. “John came neither eating nor drinking, and they said he hath a devil.” His humility was such that he had again and again to disavow the character and decline the honors which an admiring multitude almost forced upon him. To their questions he answered plainly he was not the Christ, nor the Elijah of whom they were thinking, nor one of their old prophets. He was no one — a voice merely — the voice of God calling his people to repentance in preparation for the coming of him whose shoe latchet he was not worthy to unloose. For his boldness in speaking truth, he went a willing victim to prison and to death.

Resembling, though John did, in so many things the Elijah of former days, the exit of the one from his field of labor was remarkable for its humiliating circumstances, as the other for its singular glory — the one dying as a felon by the hand of the executioner, the other, without tasting at all of death, ascending to heaven in a chariot of fire. But in John's case it could not be otherwise; the forerunner, no more than the disciple, could be above his Master; and especially in the treatment of the one must the followers of Jesus be prepared for what was going to be accomplished in the other. After John's death, and growing out of it, a whole series of special actions and discourses were directed to this end by our Lord. The manner of John's death, therefore, is on no account to be regarded as throning a depreciatory reflection on his position and ministry. He was, as Christ himself testified, “a burning and a shining light” (Joh 5:35), and he fulfilled his arduous course in a truly noble and valiant spirit. — Fairbairn.

5. For the literature connected with this subject, see, besides the treatises noticed above, — Hase, Leben Jesu (4th ed. Leipzig, 1854), p. 82, 86,  149; Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 20 sq., 23, 125; Walch, Bibliotheca Theologica, 3, 402; Witsii Exerc. de Joanne Bapt. (in his Miscell. Sacra, 2, 367); Leopold, Johannes der Täufer (Hannov. 1825); Usteri. Nachrichten von Johannes dem Täufer (in the Studien und Kritiken, 1829, 3:439); Von Rohden, Johannes der Täufer (Lübeck, 1838); Neander, Leb. Jesu (Hamb. 1837), p. 49; Keim, Leb. Jesu, 1, 469-523; Hausrath, Leben Jesu, p. 316-340. The ecclesiastical traditions touching John may be found in the Acta Sanct. 4, 687-846; and, in a compendious form, in Tillemont. Mémoires, 1, 82-108, 482-505. Other treatises of a more special character, in addition to those above cited, are: Hottinger, Pentas dissert. Bibl. chronol. (Traj. a. R. 1723) p. 143 sq.; Deyling, Observationes sacr. 3, 251 sq.; Ammon, Pr. de doctrina et morte Jo. Bapt. (Erlangen; 1809); Rau, Pr. de Joan. Bapt. in rem Christ. studiis (Frlang. 1785), 2, 4; Abegg, Orat. de Jo. Bapt. (Heidelb. 1820); Bax, Specim. de Jo. Bapt. (L. B. 1821); Stein, Ueb. Gesch. Lehre u. Schicksale Joh. d. T. (in Keil's Analect. 4, 1, 37 sq.); Wessenberg, Johannes der Vorläufer uns. Herrn (Constanz, 1821); Müller, Pr. de Jo. Bapt. (Helmst. 1733); Asp. Obs. Phil. hist. de Jo. Bapt. (Upsala, 1733) Lisco, Biblische Beitr. über J. d. Täufer (Berlin, 1826); Eckhard, Josephus de Jo. Bapt. testatus (Eisen. 1785); Harenberg, De cibo Jo. Bapt. (in Otia Gand. sacra, Traj. ad R. 1740, p. 1 sq.); Amnele, Amictus et victus J. Bpt. (Upsal. 1755); Stollberg, id. (Vitemb. 1673); Carpzov, De cultu Jo. B. Antiquat. Chr. (Rome, 1755); Huth, Num. Jo. B. Maria et discip. Chr. fuerint baptizati (Erlangen, 1759); Blatt, A Dissert. on John's Message to our Savior (London, 1789); Zeigermann, Comm. de consil. quo Jo. discip. ad Jesum ablegaverit (Nuremb. 1813); Frank, Joh. d. Täufer (Eisleben, 1841); Kromayer, De baptisme Christi (Lips. 1680).

## John The Cappadocian[[@Headword:John The Cappadocian]]

             patriarch of Constantinople (he was the second patriarch of the name of John, Chrysostom being John I) from A.D. 517 or 518, was, before his election to the patriarchate, a presbyter and syncellus of Constantinople. Originally he sided with the opponents of the Council of Chalcedon, but he had either too little firmness or too little principle to follow out steadily the inclination of his own mind, for he appears to have been in a great degree the tool of others. On the death of Anastasius, and the accession of the emperor Justin I, the orthodox party among the inhabitants of Constantinople raised a tumult, and compelled John to anathematize Severus of Antioch, and to insert in the diptychs the names of the fathers of the Council of Chalcedon, and restore to them those of the patriarchs Euphemius and Macedonius. These diptychs were two tables of ecclesiastical dignitaries, one containing those who were living, and the other those who had died in the peace and communion of the Church, so that insertion was a palpable declaration of orthodoxy, and erasure of heresy or schism. These measures, extorted in the first instance by popular violence, were afterwards sanctioned by a synod of forty bishops. In A.D. 519, John, at the expressed desire of Justin, sought a reconciliation with the Western Church, from which, under Anastasius, the Eastern Church had separated, and in this task John displayed considerable cunning. Not only  was he successful in restoring a friendly and union like feeling between the Greek and Roman churches, but Hormisdas even left to him the task of bringing about also the reconciliation of the patriarchs of Antioch and Alexandria to the orthodox Church. SEE HORMISDAS.

In this he failed. John died about the beginning or middle of the year 520, as appears by a letter of Hormisdas to his successor Epiphanius. John wrote several letters or other papers, a few of which are still extant. Two short letters (Ε᾿πιστολαί), one to John, patriarch of Jerusalem, and one to Epiphanius, bishop of Tyre, are printed in Greek, with a Latin version, in the Concilia, among the documents relating to the Council of Constantinople in A.D. 536 (5, col. 185, ed. Labbe; 8, 1065-67, ed. Mansi). Four relationes, or Libelli, are extant only in a Latin version among the Epistolae of pope Hormisdas (in the Concilia, 4, 1472, 1486, 1491, 1521, edit. Labbe; 8, 436, 451, 457, 488, edit. Mansi). It is remarkable that in the two short Greek letters addressed to Eastern prelates John takes the title of οἰκουμενικὸς πατριάρχης, oecumenical, or universal patriarch, SEE PATRIARCH, and is supposed to be the first that assumed this ambitious designation. It is remarkable, however, that in those pieces of his which were addressed to pope Hormisdas, and which are extant only in the Latin version, the title does not appear; and circumstances are not wanting to lead to the suspicion that its presence in the Greek epistles is owing to the mistake of some transcriber, who has confounded this John the Cappadocian with John the Faster. It is certainly remarkable that the title, if assumed, should have incurred no rebuke from the jealousy of the popes, not to speak of the other patriarchs equal in dignity to John; or that, if once assumed, it should have been dropped again, which it must have been, since the employment of it by John the Faster (q.v.), many years after, was violently opposed by pope Gregory I as an unauthorized assumption. We may conjecture, perhaps, that it was assumed by the patriarchs of Constantinople without opposition from their fellow prelates in the East during the schism of the Eastern and Western churches, and quietly dropped on the termination of the schism, that it might not prevent the reestablishment of friendly relations. See Theophanes, Chronog. p. 140- 142, ed. Paris (p. 112, 113, ed. Ven.; p. 253-256, ed. Bonn); Cave, Hist. Litt. 1, 503; Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. 11, 99; Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog.2, 592.

## John The Constant[[@Headword:John The Constant]]

             elector of Saxony. SEE REFORMATION (in Germany).

## John The Faster[[@Headword:John The Faster]]

             (JOHANNES JEJUNATOR Or NESTEUTES), of humble extraction, became patriarch of Constantinople in 582. The was distinguished for his piety, benevolence, strong asceticism, and fasting. He was the first who assumed the title of “ecumenical patriarch,” and thereby involved himself in difficulties with the bishops of Rome, Pelagius II and, Gregory I, the opening of a struggle which resulted finally, in the 11th century (1054), in a complete rupture of the churches of Rome and Constantinople. (See the article GREGORY I, and Ffoulkes, Christendoms's Divisions, vol. 1, § 17.) John died Sept. 2, 595. The Greek Church counts him among its saints. He is reputed the author of Α᾿κολουθία καὶ τάξις τῶν ἐξομολογουμένων; Λόγοςπρὸς τον μέλλοντα ἐξαγορεῦσαι τὸν αὑτοῦ πνευματικὸν υἱόν, which belongs to the earliest penitential works of the Greek Church (pub. by Morinus, Comm. hist. de administratione sacramenti poenitentice, Paris, 1651, Ven. 1792, etc.). See Oudin, De Scr. Eccles. 1, 1473 sq.; Fabricius, Bibl. Grceca, 10, 164 sq.; Le Quien, Oriens Christian.  1, 216 sq.; Schrockh, Kirchengesch. 17, 56 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 748; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3, 556.

## John The Grammarian[[@Headword:John The Grammarian]]

             SEE JOHN THE LABORIOUS.

## John The Italian[[@Headword:John The Italian]]

             (Johannes Italus) (1). a monk of the 10th century. He was at first canon at Rome, but his acquaintance with Odon, abbot of Clugny, led him to France, and he entered a convent there. Some say that he afterwards returned to Italy, and became prior of a Roman convent, while others say that he became abbot of some French Cistercian convent, and that he died in France after 945. Our information regarding his personal history is derived only from his biography in the Life of St. Odon (in Mabillon, Acta Sanct. 7, 152). He published extracts of St. Gregory's Moralia. See Hist. Litt. de la France, 6, 265; Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs Sacres, 12, 825.

## John The Italian (2)[[@Headword:John The Italian (2)]]

             (Italus, Ι᾿ταλός) (2), a Greek philosopher and heretic who flourished in the time of Alexius I Comnenus (1081-1118), escaped to Italy after the revolt of Maniaces against Constantine, and there prosecuted his preparatory studies. He finally returned again to Constantinople, and became a disciple of Michael Psellus the younger. His learning and ability attracted general attention, and the emperor Michael Ducas (1071-1078), finding himself in need of a man acquainted with the Italian provinces to influence them to a return to the Byzantine empire, selected John Italus for this purpose, and dispatched him to Dyrrachium. He, however, proved unfaithful to the trust, and, his intrigues having become public, was obliged to flee to Rome to avoid persecution. He was subsequently allowed to return to Constantinople, and there entered the monastery of Pega. When Psellus was banished in 1077, John was made first professor of philosophy (ὕπατος τών φιλοσόφων), and filled this place with great success.

Yet he was better acquainted with logic and Aristotle's philosophy than with the other branches of science, and was but little versed in grammar and rhetoric. He was very passionate and hasty in argument, and sometimes even resorted to bodily violence, but he was, fortunately, prompt in acknowledging his errors. He expounded to his pupils Proclus, Plato, Jamblichus, Porphyrius, and Aristotle, but often in a manner quite inconsistent with the position of Christian orthodoxy. Alexius, soon after ascending the throne, caused Italus's doctrines to be examined, and summoned him before an ecclesiastical court. Notwithstanding the protection of the patriarch Eustratius, John Italus was obliged publicly to recant and anathematize eleven heretical opinions advanced in his lectures. Among other things, he was accused of “ridiculing image-worship.”  Continuing, however, to teach the same doctrines, he was anathematized by the Church, and, fearing persecution, he forsook the rostrum. It is said that in his later years he publicly renounced his errors. His principal works (all in MSS.) are, ῎Εκδοσις εἰς διάφορα ζητήματα; ῎Εκδοσις εἰς τὰ τοπικά; Περὶ διαλεκτικῆς; Μέθοδος ῥητορικῆς ἐκδοθεῖσα κατὰ σύνοψιν; some discourses, etc. See Anna Comnenus, Alexius, 5, 8, 9; Fabricius, Bibl. Groeca, 3, 213-217; 6, 131; 11, 646-652; Cave, Hist. Litt. 2, 154; Oudin, Comment. de Scriptoribus et Scriptis Ecclesiastes 2, col. 760; Lambece, Commentar. de Biblioth. Coesar. 3, col. 411, edit. Kollar; Le Beau, Hist. du Bas-Empire, 81, 49; Hase, Notices d. Manuscripts, vol. 9. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 26, 557.

## John The Laborious[[@Headword:John The Laborious]]

             (JOHANNES PHILOPONUS, also surnamed ALEXANDRINUS and GRAMMATICUS), an Eastern scholar of great renown, was born at Alexandria towards the close of the 6th century or the beginning of the 7th. Of his personal history but very little seems to be definitely known. He is said to have been present at the capture of that city by the Mohammedans (A.D. 639), and to have temporarily embraced their creed to prevent the burning of the Alexandrian library; but the truth of this story is rather doubtful (comp. Gibbon, Decline and Fall Rom. Emp. ch. 51). The great renown of John Philoponus is due mainly, perhaps, to his speculations on Christian doctrine, more especially his theories on the Trinity, cosmogony, and immortality. He was a passionate admirer of Plato and Aristotle, and hence his persistency in amending Christian dogma by philosophy, and hence much ambiguity in his position on Christian doctrines, and hence also the reason why he has so frequently been the subject of attack as a heretic. It is especially his theory on the Trinity that has classed him among the Tritheists, of which he has even often, though inaccurately, been pointed  out as the founder, while in truth he was only a forerunner of them.

See, however, TRITHEISM. His principal work on dogmatics, Διαιτητὴς ἣ περὶ ἑνώσεως, is lost, yet, from extracts of it still extant, the following has been determined to be his position on the doctrine of the Trinity. Nature and hypostasis he regards as identical; a double nature in Christ is incompatible with one hypostasis; and to the objection that in the Trinity there are confessedly three hypostases and but one nature, he argues that in the Trinity three particular and individual existences or hypostases are comprised under the idea of unity. This unity, however, is merely the generic term, which comprehends the several particulars, the Κοινὸς τοῦ ειναι λόγος. If this be called nature, it is done in an abstract sense, and is inductively derived from particulars; but if φύσις is to convey the sense of independent existence, it must join the particular, individual being, and, therefore, the hypostasis. Applying this argument to Christ, he concludes that to the unity of his hypostasis belongs also the unity of nature. (Comp. again TRITHEISM, and Dorner, Doct. Person of Christ, diss. 2, vol. 1, p. 148, 414.) His works extant are:

(1) De oeternitate mundi, or ἀϊδιότητος κόσμου (Ven. 1535, fol.), in which he attempts to establish the Christian dogma of creation by reason alone, without reference to Biblical authority. The ideas are eternal only when they are regarded as creative thoughts of God; as such they are inherent in Providence, and their realization adds nothing to divine perfection. God, by his ἕξις, was eternally Creator, and his essence required no new characteristics by the ἐνέργεια. The world itself cannot be eternal, for the effect cannot be equal to the cause: —

(2) In his Commentaria in Mosaicam mundi creationem, or Περὶ κοσμοποιϊvας (edited by Corder, Vienna, 1630), he attempts to reconcile the Mosaic account of creation with the facts derived from our own experience: —

(3) In his Περὶ ἀναστάσεως (known to us only from Photius [Cod. 21- 23], Nicephorus [H.E. 18, 47], and Timotheus [De receptu hoeret. in Cotil. Mon. 3, 414 sq.]) he separates the sensual from the spiritual creation, a concession to philosophy made at the expense of Christianity. “The rational soul,” he argues, “is not only an , but an imperishable substance, entirely distinct from all irrational existence, in which matter is always associated with form. In consequence of this inseparable connection of matter and  form, the natural body is destroyed and annihilated by death. The resurrection of the body is the new creation of the body:” —

(4) Περὶτῆς τοῦ ἀστρολάβου χρήσεως (published by Hase, Bonn, 1839): —

(5) Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων against Jamblichus): —

(6) Commentaries on Aristotle (Venice, 1509, 1534, 1535, etc.): —

(7) Grammatical Essays (in Labbe, Glossaria, London, 1816), etc. See J. G. Scharfenberg, De J. Ph. (Leipzig, 1768); Fabricius, Biblioth. Groeca, 10, 639 sq.; Ritter, Gesch. d. Philos. 6, 500 sq., Stud. u. Ku.rit. 1835, p. 95 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 760; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography, 3, 321.

## John The Little[[@Headword:John The Little]]

             or JOHANNES PARVUS (Jean Petit), a French theologian, was born in Normandy in the latter half of the 14th century. He was at one time professor of theology in the University of Paris, but was deposed for having, on the 8th of March, 1408, pronounced a discourse in justification of the murder of the duke of Orleans, brother of the king of France, who was assassinated by the duke of Burgundy. He died at Hesdin, France, in 1411. — Pierer, Unit. Lex.

## John The Monk[[@Headword:John The Monk]]

             (Johannes Monachus), or JOHN OF CRESSY, a French canonist, was born at Cressy, Ponthieu, in the 13th century. He was a Cistercian monk and was created cardinal. He died in 1313. He wrote commentaries on the decretals of Boniface VIII and Benedict IX, and was the first who wrote on the whole Sextus of Boniface VIII. The same work was afterwards done by Guido de Baisio, and still better by Johannes Andreae. The glossaries of Johannes Monachus were annotated and published by Phil. Probus, doctor of the school of Bourges. His MSS., under the title Glossoe in sextum decretalium, are preserved in the public library of Chartres. He is also considered by some as the author of the Defensorium Juris, but this is not proved. See Savigny, Catalogue de la Bibl. de Chartres, 4, 274. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. 26, 559. (J.N.P.)

## John The Presbyter[[@Headword:John The Presbyter]]

             a supposed disciple of Jesus, and instructor of Papias of Hierapolis, is said to have been a contemporary of the apostle John (with whom it is thought he has been confounded by early Church historians), and to have resided at Ephesus. For the assertion that there existed such a person, the testimony advanced is

(1) that of Papias (in Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 3, 39), who, in speaking of the personal efforts he put forth to establish himself in the Christian faith, says: “Whenever any one arrived who had had intercourse with the elders (τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις), I made inquiry concerning the declarations of these; what Andrew, what Peter, or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the disciples of the Lord. said, as also what Aristion and John the Presbyter, disciples of the Lord, say. For I believed that I should not derive so much advantage from books as from living and abiding discourse.”Eusebiuns in reporting this, takes special pains to report that Papias purposely adduces the name John twice, first in connection with Peter; James, and Matthew, where only the apostle can be intended, and again along with Aristion, where he distinguishes him by the title of “the Presbyter.” Eusebius further states that this confirms the report of those who relate that there were two men in Asia Minor who bore that name, and had been closely connected with Christ, and then continues by showing that two tombs had been found in Ephesus being the name of John. Further proof is found in another part of his history (7, 25), where he cites Dionsius, bishop of Alexandria, about the middle of the 3d century, as uttering the same tradition concerning the finding of the two tombs at Ephesus inscribed with the name of John, and as ascribing to John the Presbyter the authorship of the Apocalypse, which Eusebius himself was inclined to do. The existence of a presbyter John is

(2) declared in the Apostolical Constitutions (7, 36), where it is said that the second John was bishop of Ephesus after John the Apostle, and that it was by the latter that he was instituted into office. Further testimony is obtained from Jerome (De Vir. Ill. c. 9), who reports the opinion of some that the second and third epistles of John are the production of John the Presbyter, “cujus et hodie alterum sepulcrum apud Ephesum ostenditur, etsi nonnulli putant duas memorias ejusdem Johannis evangelistae esse.” In defense of the existence of such a person as John the Presbyter appear prominently among modern critics Grotius, Beck, Fritzsche, Bretschneider, Credner, Ebrard, and Steitz (Jahrb. deutscher Theol. 1869, 1, 138 sq.), all of whom ascribe to him the authorship of the last two epistles of John, generally believed to be the productions of John the Apostle; also Liicke, Bleek, De Wette, and Neander, who consider John the Presbyter the author of the Apocalypse. The simple question whether another John existed in Asia Minor contemporary with John the Apostle would, of course, be of little import, but the fact that the apostolical authorship of some of the epistles and of the Apocalypse is doubted has called to critical inquiry most of the leading theological minds of our day. The result is that, while some have conceded the existence of another John, clothed even with episcopal dignity (Dollinger, First Age of the Church, p. 113), others have denied altogether the probability of the existence of such a person contemporary with the apostle John (see Schaff, Church History, Apostolic Age, p. 421, note). Dr.W.L. Alexander, in reviewing the proofs of those who assert the existence of John and his authorship of some of the Johannean writings, thinks that in the way of this assumption stands the following: 1. “The negative evidence arising from the silence of all other ancient authorities, especially the silence of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who, in a list of eminent teachers and bishops in Asia Minor, preserved by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. v, 24), makes no mention of John the Presbyter; and, 2. The positive evidence afforded by the statement of Ireneeus, who not only omits all mention of the Presbyter, but says that Papias was a hearer of John the Apostle along with Polycarp (adv. Hoeres. 5, 33). [Not so thinks Donaldson in his Hist. Christ. Lit. and Doctr. 1, 312 sq.] This counter evidence has appeared to some so strong that they have thought it sufficient to set aside that of Papias, who, they remind us, is described by Eusebius as a man of a very small intellect (σφόδρα σμικρὸς τὸν νοῦν Hist. Eccles. 3, 39). [See Schaff; below.] But this seems going too far. Papias describes himself as a hearer of the presbyter John (Euseb. 5, 24), and in this he could hardly be mistaken, whatever was his deficiency in  intellectual power [this view is advocated by Zahn (in his Hermas) and Riggenbach (Jahrb. deutscher Theol. 13, 319); against it, see Steitz (in Jahrb. 14, 145 sq.)]; whereas it is very possible that Irenaeus may have confounded the presbyter with the apostle, the latter of whom would be to his mind much more familiar than the former. The silence of Polycrates may be held proof sufficient that no John the Presbyter was bishop of Ephesus, or famed as a teacher of Christianity in Asia Minor; but, as Papias does not attest this, his testimony remains unaffected by this conclusion.

On the whole, the existence of a John the Presbyter seems to be proved by the testimony of Papias; but beyond this, and the fact that he was a disciple of the Lord, nothing is certainly known of him. Credner contends that πρεσβύτερος is to be taken in its ordinary sense of ‘older,' and that it was applied to the person mentioned by Papias either because he was the senior of St. John, or because he arrived before him in Asia Minor; but this is improbable in itself; and, had Papias meant to intimate this, he would not have simply called him ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ι᾿ωάννης (see Liddon, p. 514). In his statement πρεσβύτερος is plainly opposed to ἀπόστολος as a distinctive title of office” (Kitto, Cycop. s.v.). We cannot close without permitting Dr. Schaff (Apost. Ch. Hist. p. 421 sq.) to give his view on this important question. He says: “There is room even to inquire whether the very existence of this obscure presbyter and mysterious duplicate of the apostle John rests not upon sheer misunderstanding, as Herder suspected (Offenb. Joh. p. 206, in the 12th vol. of Herder's Werke zur Theol.). We candidly avow that to us, notwithstanding what Liicke (iv, 396 sq.) and Credner (Einileit. in's N.Test. 1, 694 sq.) have said in its favor, this man's existence seems very doubtful. The only proper, original testimony for it is, as is well known, an obscure passage of Papias in Eusebius, 3, 39.” After doubting the-propriety of giving credit to a statement of Papias not reiterated by any other authority of the early Church, he says: “It is very possible that Papias meant in both cases one and the same John, and repeated his name perhaps on account of his peculiarly close contact with him. (See above, Dr. Alexander's view.) So Irenaeus, at least, seems to have understood him, when he calls Papias a disciple of the apostle John (without mentioning any presbyter of that name) and friend of Polycarp (Adv. Hoer. 5, 33). The arguments for this interpretation are the following:

(1) The term ‘presbyter' is here probably not an official title, but denotes age, including the idea of venerableness, as also Credner supposes (p. 697), and as may be inferred from 2Jn 1:1 and 3Jn 1:1, and from the  usage of Irenoeus, who applies the same term to his master Polycarp (Adv. Hoer. 5, 30), and to the Roman bishops before Soter (5, 24). This being so, we cannot conceive how a contemporary of John, bearing the same name, should be distinguished from the apostle by this standing title, since the apostle himself had attained an unusual age, and was probably even sixty when he came to Asia Minor.

(2) Papias, in the same passage, styles the other apostles also ‘presbyters,' the ancients, the fathers; and, on the other hand, calls also Aristion and John (personal) ‘disciples of the Lord.'

(3) The evangelist designates himself as ‘the elder' (2Jn 1:1 and 3Jn 1:1), which leads us to suppose that he was frequently so named by his ‘little children,' as he loves to call his readers in his first epistle. For this reason also it would have been altogether unsuitable, and could only have created confusion, to denote by this title another John, who lived with the apostle and under him in Ephesus. Credner supposes, indeed, that these two epistles came not from the apostle, but, like the Apocalypse, from the ‘presbyter John' in question. But it is evident at first sight that these epistles are far more akin, even in their language, to the first epistle than to the Apocalypse (comp. 2 John 47 with 1Jn 2:7-8; 1Jn 4:2-3; 2Jn 1:9 with 1Jn 2:27; 1Jn 3:9, etc.). This is De Wette's reason for considering them genuine. When Credner supposes that the presbyter afterwards accommodated himself to the apostle's way of. thinking and speaking, he makes an entirely arbitrary assumption which he himself condemns in pronouncing a like change in the apostle ‘altogether unnatural and inadmissible' (p. 733).

(4) The Ephesian bishop Polycrates, of the 2d century, in his letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, on the Paschal controversy (in Euseb. 5, 24), mentions but one John, though he there enumerates the μεγάλα στοιχεῖα of the Asian Church, Philip, with his pious daughters, Polycarp, Thraseas, Sagaris, Papirius, Melito, most of whom were not so important as the presbyter John must have been if he were a personal disciple of the Lord, and the author of the Apocalypse. We can hardly think that in this connection, where it was his object to present as many authorities as possible for the Asiatic usage respecting the feast, Polycrates would have passed over this John if he had known anything about him, and if his tomb could have been really pointed out in Ephesus, as the later Dionysius and Jerome intimate. Jerome, however, in speaking of this, expressly observes,  ‘Nonnulli putant, duas memorias ejusdem Johannis evangelists esse' (De Vir. Ill. c. 9); which, again, makes this whole story doubtful, and destroys its character as a historical testimony in favor of this obscure presbyter.”

Ridiculous, certainly, is the argument which some have advanced, that the different Johannean epistles differ so much in style that they cannot possibly be ascribed to one and the same person. On this argument Ebrard (Einleitung) laid particular stress, but he is ably answered by Dr. Tholuck in his Glaubwurdigkeit der evangel. Geschichte, 2d ed. p. 283. From the rich treasury of his reading the latter draws such analogies as the “varietas dictionis Appulejanae;” the difference between the Dialogus de Oratoribus and the Annales of Tacitus; between the Leges and the earlier dialogues of Plato; the sermons and the satires of Swift, etc. “This catalogue,” says Dr. Schaff, “may easily be increased from the history of modern literature. Think, for example, of the immense distance between Schleiermacher's Roden uber die Religion and his Dialektik; Hegel's Logik and Aesthetikc; the first and second part of Gothe's Faust; Carlyle's Life of Schiller and his Latter-day Pamphlets, etc.” Comp. also Liddon, Divinity of Christ, p. 512 sq. SEE JOHN, SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF.

## John The Recluse[[@Headword:John The Recluse]]

             SEE JOHN NICIOTA.

## John The Scholar (2)[[@Headword:John The Scholar (2)]]

             (JOHANNES SCHOLASTICUS or CLIMACUS). a monk of the latter half of the 6th century, was a zealous partisan of monastic life, and became abbot of a convent on Mount Sinai. He died there about 606. He wrote Κλίμαξ τοῦ παραδείσου, an ascetic mystical work (Latin, Scala paradisi, Ambrosius,  Venice, 1531, etc.), which was greatly celebrated and widely circulated among Greek monks for centuries after his death: — Liber ad religiosum postorem, qui est de offcio coenobiarchoe (publ. by Matth. Rader, 1606). A collection of his works in Greek and Latin has been published by Matth. Rader (Paris, 1633). — Pierer, Univers. Lex. s.v.

## John V[[@Headword:John V]]

             Pope, a native of Syria, elevated to the papal dignity in May or July, 685, hardly ever left the bed during the short time of his insignificant pontificate. The authenticity of the letters assigned to him, and of the book De dignitate pallii, has been contested. He died Aug. 2, 686.

## John VI and VII[[@Headword:John VI and VII]]

             Popes, both Greeks by birth, were quite insignificant occupants of the papal throne. The former was consecrated October 10, 701, and buried January 10, 705. He was defended by Roman soldiers against the exarch Theophylact, who was ordered to drive him from the apostolic see. In a council which he held at Rome he acquitted Wilfred, archbishop of York, of several charges brought against him by the English clergy. The latter (consecrated March 1, 705, buried Oct. 18, 707) is described as weak and spiritless. The happiest illustration of the weakness of the Roman see at this time is afforded us in the action of this pope, who did not dare to venture to express an opinion on the Trullan canon, submitted to his examination by the emperor Justinian II, for fear of giving offence to somebody; and we do not wonder that an able ecclesiastical writer of our day (Butler, in his Ch. History, 1, 359) says that the whole period from Gregory I to Gregory II “may be briefly designated as that in which the popes were under subjection to the emperors of the East and their lieutenants, the exarchs of Ravenna.” See the Vite in Anastasius; Bower, History of the Popes, 3, 159 sq., 167 sq.; Riddle, Papacy, 1, 305 sq.  Pope (styled the ninth by those who believed in the story of pope Joan [q.v.], whom they style John VIII), a native of Rome, succeeded Adrian II Dec. 14, 872. He displayed much tact, and harbored great schemes, but was destitute of noble motives, and the spirit displayed during his administration is in keeping with the ideas of the pseudo-lsidorian collection, to which his predecessor Nicholas I had first ventured to appeal. John's designs, however, found but a tardy response in the little minds with which he had to deal, and the prevalence of general anarchy was not more auspicious to their execution.

The pope, as well as the clergy, in the strife after power, actuated only by worldly ambition, knew no other arms than cunning and intrigue, and with these they were neither able to control the rude powers which sapped the foundations of the Carlovingian monarchy, nor to erect on its ruins the fabric of ecclesiastical dominion. When Louis II died, 875, without an heir to his land and crown, Charles the Bald marched hastily into Italy, and took possession of the Italian dominions. Then he proceeded to Rome, and accepted (Christmas, 875), as a boon of the chair of St. Peter, the imperial crown, to which he had no lawful claim. Some Church annalists claim that the two then entered into a compact by which the emperor ceded to the pope the absolute and independent government of Rome, a confirmation and amplification of Pepin's donation; but documental proof (and that of an ambiguous kind) can be deduced only for the surrender of Capua (compare Mansi, Concil. 17, 10). By this alliance not much was directly gained by either party, for Charles, having once secured his coronation, cared but little for the papal interests; “yet eventually the manner in which Charles had become possessed of the empire and of Italy increased very materially the papal power, especially when, in a moment of fear for his throne, Charles the Bald suffered the pope to declare that to him had been intrusted the imperial diadem by the only power on earth that could claim its disposal the vicar of Rome.' ‘The emperor,' however, failed to protect the papal dominions from the attacks of the Saracens.

It is true he at one time led an army against the infidels (877), but his sudden death cut off all further hope of relief, especially after Athanlsius's (bishop-duke of Naples) double-handed game of pleasing the pope and forming alliances with the Saracens became known at Rome, and we do not wonder that the plundering of Campania and the exactions of John make Milman say of the pope's difficulties from this score that “the whole pontificate of John VIII was a long, if at times interrupted, agony of  apprehension lest Rome should fall into the hands of the unbeliever” (Latin Christianity, 3, 84). Much more precarious became the condition of the Roman pontiff after the death of Charles the Bald, whose son and successor in the West Frank dominion, Louis the Hammerer, engaged in warfare with the Normans, found himself neither in a position to be an aspirant for the imperial crown, nor to afford assistance to the vicar of Christendom. The only one from whom the pope really received any assurances of succor was Carloman, who at this time, with an army in Upper Italy, and just recognised as king at Pavia, was aiming at the imperial throne against the French line. But, finding the pope more favorably inclined towards the French, he suddenly departed, and left to his nobles the disposition of the pope's case. Lambert, duke of Spoleto, and Adelbert, count of Tuscany, immediately made themselves masters of Rome, and, after imprisoning the pope, compelled the clergy and the nobles to swear allegiance to Carloman. But no sooner had Rome been cleared of Carloman's friends than the pope himself set out for France, determined no longer to conceal his desire to create for himself an emperor whom all the world should recognise as absolutely indebted for the crown to the see of Rome only. Arrived in France, the pope made Provence his refuge.

Everywhere he was received with great respect, but especial deference was paid him by one Boso duke of Lombardy, connected with the imperial house by marriage, possessed of greats influence and wealth, and an aspirant for the imperial purple. He succeeded in winning the good graces of the Roman pontiff, and was designated for the vacant throne (comp. the letter in Mansi, 17, 121). Boso was, however, only made king of Burgundy, as Charles the Fat proved too fast for the pope; he had marched with a preponderating force into Italy, and the pope, foreseeing that the prince would not be likely to await his decision as to the rights oft the Carlovingians to the throne, hastened to meet him at Ravenna, and reluctantly (though contriving to avoid the appearance of constraint) placed the crown upon the head of Charles the Fat. But, if John failed in placing upon the throne his own favorite, he certainly succeeded even now in exalting, as he had done under Charles the Bald, the pope above the emperor. To this, as well as to his efforts to make the clergy independent of the temporal princes, may be ascribed his popularity as a pope, and the magnificent reception he enjoyed on his visit to France. “At the Council of Ravenna in 877, and again at another at Troyes, which he convened in the following year, during his stay in France, he propounded several decrees, to the astonishment of the bishops themselves, claiming for them various  rights and privileges which they had not themselves hitherto ventured to demand. This proceeding produced upon their minds the greater impression, inasmuch as they had long been desirous of advancing their social position. Never until now had they been made aware of the points at which they ought to aim in order to secure for themselves the highest rank and influence in the state, and the pontiff who gave them powerful assistance in this weighty affair could not but be highly popular among them. It was perhaps by this measure that John principally contributed to the strengthening of the papacy to such an extent that it remained without any considerable loss during a long succession of unworthy, or impotent and inactive popes, who occupied and disgraced the see during the troubles which shook Italy for more than half a century” (Riddle, Papacy, 2, 31, 32).

The controversy with the Eastern Church on the question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Bulgaria was continued under John. At first he inclined to favor Photits (q.v.), and acknowledged him as patriarch of Constantinople, but he was afterwards obliged to excommunicate him, as the Latin party severely condemned his tourse. Ffoulkes (Christendom's Division, 2, p. 7) says that the fable of pope Joan must have originated with the Latin party of this time, and that it was aimed against John VIII, “not because his theology was defective, or his life immoral, or his rule arbitrary, but solely because he had had the courage, the manliness, to appreciate the abilities and desire to cultivate the friendship of the great patriarch his brother.” But his excommunication of Photius was by no means the only one he pronounced. Indeed, “no pope was more prodigal of excommunion than John VIII. Of his letters, above 300 (found in Mansi, Concilia, vol. 16), it is remarkable how large a proportion threaten. inflict, or at least allude to this last exercise of sacerdotal power” (Milman, Lat. Christianity, 3, 92 sq.). John found his death, as the Annales Fuldenses relate, through a conspiracy of his own curia. The assassins first tried poison; when this did not operate quick enough, they slew him with a hammer, Dec. 15, 882. See Milman, Lat. Christ. bk. 50 ch. 3; Bower, History of the Popes, 5, 36 sq.; Riddle, Papacy, 2, 27 sq.; Reichel, Rom. See in the Middle Ages, p. 109 sq.; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. 2, 347; Giesebrecht, Gesch. der deutschen Kaiserzeit, 1, 139 sq.; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 6, 754; Muratori, Scriptt. 3, pt. 3. (J.H.W.)

## John X[[@Headword:John X]]

             Pope, according to Liutprand (discredited by Milman, Latin Christianity, 3, 163), owed his promotion in ecclesiastical offices to the dissolute Theodora (q.v.), who, attracted by his handsome figure, made him successively archbishop of Bologna, Ravenna, and finally pope (May 15, 914). The profligacy of his times, especially in Rome, surpassed that of the most degenerate period of paganism. The popes were merely the contemptible creatures of the Roman nobility. But, if the archbishop of Ravenna was not a fit example of piety or holiness to be selected for the spiritual head of Christendom, “he appears,” says Milman (Latin Christianity, 3, 161), “to have been highly qualified for the secular part of his office.” He was a man of ability and daring, eminently needed at this juncture to save Rome from becoming the prey of Mohammedan conquest. The Saracens from Africa, who had landed in Italy and fortified themselves near the banks of the Liris, had made frequent irruptions into the Roman territory. At first John contented himself with inciting the neighboring dukes to come to his defense; but, finding the aid of the two emperors necessary to combat successfully the Mohammedans, he crowned Berenger emperor of the West, March 24, 916, and, after having united all forces previously at his command with Berenger and the dukes of Benevento and Naples, he marched in person against them, and completely routed and exterminated them. After a reign of fourteen years, this powerful prelate of Rome came to a miserable end by the legitimate consequences of the same vices that had been instrumental in raising him to his high dignity. Marozia, the daughter of Theodora, anxious to secure for herself and her lover the government of Rome, and finding John too much in their way, surprised him in the Lateran palace, and thrust him into a prison, where, some months after, he died, either of want or by some more summary means  (A.D. 929). Comp. Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 5, 90 sq. Hoier, Die deutschen Pabste, 1, 18; Milman, Lat. Christ. 3, 158 sq. (J.H.W.)

## John XI[[@Headword:John XI]]

             Pope, a natural son of Marozia, and, in all probability, of pope Sergius III, was seated on St. Peter's chair by his mother, in whose hands rested at this time (931) the power to supply any vacancies in the papal chair. Of course spiritual government was by such people not in consideration; in fact, Rome was now by all Christendom detested like a pestiferous swamp. “Marozia, not content with having been the wife of a marquis, the wife of a wealthy and powerful duke of Tuscany, perhaps the mistress of one, certainly the mother of another pope, looked still higher in her lustful ambition; she must wed a monarch. To the king of Italy her hand was offered, and by him accepted. But if the Romans had brooked the rule of a Roman woman, they would not so readily consent for her paramour, a foreigner, to rule over them, and, headed by Marozia's own son Alberic, the nobles put an end to the government of Marozia (and Hugh of Provence) and of pope John XI by expelling the former and imprisoning the latter, who died of poison, as is generally supposed, in January, 936. See Milman, Lat. Christ. 3, 165 sq.; Du Chesne, Hist. des Papes, 2, 460; Aschbach, Kirchen Lex. 3, 518; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 5, 96 sq. start

## John XII[[@Headword:John XII]]

             Pope, a son, of Albeic, and grandson of the profligate and ambitious Marozia, whose vices he seems to have inherited, succeeded to the dignity of Roman patrician upon the death of his father Alberic, and in November, 955, after the death of Agapetus, was elevated to the papal see, though only about sixteen years old. His own name was Octavianus, but as pope he took that of John XII, thus inaugurating the practice which has ever since been followed by the popes of assuming a pontifical name. Ambitious to extend the boundaries of the States of the Church, he soon involved himself in a disastrous war with Berenger II, himself full of ambition, and anxious to become master of Rome. In this most extreme hour of need the pope hesitated not to beseech help from one whom he had formerly declined to receive as worthy of the imperial crown, the emperor Otho I. Daring and indomitable as was the spirit of Otho I, he was no sooner asked by Rome than we find him crossing the Alps with a large army, and, having entered Rome, he secured to the pope not only personal safety, but also  confirmed his title to the States of the Church. The extent of these promises, however, has been subject to controversy, and it is not without a reason that the Vatican record, by which Pepin's donation was confirmed and enlarged, is withheld from critical scrutiny. SEE PAPACY.

At Pavia, already, Otho had been crowned king of Italy here, at the Eternal City, he received from the pope himself the imperial diadem. “Never did a more important event in history take place, making less impression on those who witnessed it, and less commemorated by subsequent historians, than the coronation of Otho I at Rome in the year 962. By the coronation of Charles 162 years earlier the first foundations had been laid for the empire; by the, coronation of Otho that empire itself was founded afresh, and from that time forwards it had an uninterrupted existence” (Reichel. Rosmai See in the Middle Ages, p. 124). For a short period the spiritual and temporal heads of Christendom seemed to be happily united, but the fickle John, influenced either by mistrust or jealousy, soon again interrupted that happy concord by concocting anew intrigues with Alberia, the son of Berenger. Rumors of the treacherous conduct of John reached the ears of Otho I, but the noble German would hardly believe the reports until some trustworthy officers whom he had hastily dispatched to Italy pronounced them true. The profligacy and vices of the pope were also reported to Otho I, and the latter determined to return to Rome and depose the vicar, if found guilty of the charges preferred against him. A council composed of the first ecclesiastics of Germany, France, and Italy was quickly called by Otho I, he himself presiding, and the vicar of Christ, accused of the crimes of murder, adultery, and perjury, was summoned to appear in defense. Failing to comply with the emperor's request, judgment was pronounced, and he was deposed and excommunicated Dec. 4, 963, and Leo VIII (q.v.) declared his successor. Hardly had the emperor left Rome when John, supported by the Roman nobility, returned, convened another synod at St. Peter's, and caused it to rescind the resolutions of the former one. Otho I, informed of these outrages, was preparing for a return to Rome for the third time, when John suddenly died of apoplexy while he was engaged in an adulterous intrigue, May 14, 964. “He was a man of most licentious habits, associating with women of every station, and filling the Lateran with the noisy profanity of a brothel.” Panvinius, in a note to Platina's account of pope Joan, suggests that the licentiousness of John XII, who, among his numerous mistresses, had one called Joan, who exercised the chief influence at Rome during his pontificate, may have given rise to the story of “pope Joan.” Comp. Luitprand, Historia Ottonis, in Monum. Germ.  Script. vol. 3; Milman, Lat. Christ. 3, 175 sq.; Neander, Ch. History; Gieseler, Ch. Hist. 2, 350; Reichel, See of Rone in the Middle Ages, p. 121 sq.; Riddle, Papacy, 2, 39 sq. (J.H.W.)

## John XIII[[@Headword:John XIII]]

             Pope, who was made such A.D. 965, was of noble descent, and held, previous to his election, the bishopric of Narni. Provoking the wrath of the .Roman nobility on account of his severity, and being a favorite of the imperial party, they instigated a riot against him, and finally secured him as prisoner. The pope, however, effected his escape, and returned to the city about a year after when the emperor himself made his appearance, visiting the disorderly factions of the city with unmitigated severity. After the appointment of a prefect as representative of the imperial power, Otho the Great went to Ravenna; followed by the pope. Here a great and influential council was held, Easter, 967, and fresh guarantees offered to the pontifical chair on all the territory to which it had ever been entitled, including Ravenna. In return for these favors, John crowned the younger Otho (afterwards Otho II) as emperor, and associate king of Germany; also his wife Theophania, the daughter of the Greek emperor. He also evinced his gratefulness by establishing, at the emperor's expressed desire, a mission among the northeastern Slavonians. John died in 972. His few letters are found in Mansi, Concil. Suppl. 1, 1142, and Harduin, Concil. 6, pt. 1, 639. See Pagi, Brev. Pontif. R. 2, 233 sq.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3, 520; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 757.

## John XIV[[@Headword:John XIV]]

             Pope, who was, previous to his elevation, Peter, bishop of Pavia, and archchancellor of the emperor, was elected pope through the influence of Otho II in November or December, 983, in place of Boniface VII (q.v.). Unfortunately, however, his patron died at Rome December 7 of the same year, and the ex-pope, encouraged by the anti-empirical party, ventured to return the following spring (April, 984) from Constantinople, whither he had fled, and proving sufficiently strong to overcome John, his person was secured, and he was imprisoned in the Castle del Angelo, where he was either poisoned or starved to death. See Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, 3, 520.

## John XIX (or XX)[[@Headword:John XIX (or XX)]]

             Pope, son of count Gregory of Tuscany, procured the papal throne by violence and bribery after the decease of his brother Benedict VIII, in the year 1024, and died in 1034. He crowned the emperor Conrad, but is especially noted for his imbecility and simoniacal inclinations. The latter so much controlled him that he came very near disposing of the Roman supremacy over the Eastern Church for a pecuniary consideration.

## John XV[[@Headword:John XV]]

             Pope, who began his inglorious reign in September, 985, was in reality only the puppet of Crescentius, the true governor of Rome, for he presided and ruled at the Castle del Angelo as patricius. At one time John fled to Tuscany, but at the intervention of Otho III he was afterwards permitted to return and to live in the Lateran, but he remained destitute of all authority. By way of compensation for his lack of power, he enriched himself and his relatives with the revenues of the Church. Concerning the dispute about the bishopric of Rheims, see Sylvester II. He died in April, 996.

Some believe that another John, son of the Roman Rupertus, was the fifteenth pontiff under the name of John, and that the present John was the sixteenth pope of that name, holding that he was pope four months after the murder of Boniface VIII; but this is a very dubious statement, and is wholly denied by modern critics. Comp. Willman's Jahrbiicher des deutschen Reichs unter Otto III, p. 208, 212; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3, 520; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 757.

## John XVI (or XVII)[[@Headword:John XVI (or XVII)]]

             Pope, a native of Greece, a Calabrian and bishop of Piacenza, was appointed in 997 by Crescentius, in opposition to Gregory V; but when Otho III, in February, 998, brought Gregory V back to Rome, he imprisoned, mutilated, and ill treated John most shamefully, and put to death Crescentius and his partisans. SEE GREGORY V. Though a rival pope, and in office only ten months, John is generally numbered in the series of the popes.

## John XVII (or XVIII)[[@Headword:John XVII (or XVIII)]]

             Pope, succeeded Sylvester II in 1003, and died four months after his election.

## John XVIII[[@Headword:John XVIII]]

             (or XIX, with the surname Fasanus), Pope, succeeded the preceding, and died about 1009. The history of the popes during this period is very obscure, and the chronology confused. He seems to have been on a good footing with the Greek Church, for his name found a place in the great  book of the Constantinopolitan Church. See Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3, 521.

## John XX[[@Headword:John XX]]

             SEE JOHN XXI.

## John XXI[[@Headword:John XXI]]

             (who should really have been counted XX), Pope (whose true name was Petrus Juliani, cardinal bishop of Tusculum, a native of Lisbon), was elected Sept. 13, 1276. He was a man of learning and honest intentions, but weak, and unable to carry out any honest designs. Whether he is identical with Petrus Hispanus, the writer of many medical and philosophical works, is not certain. His efforts to unite the European powers for a crusade were unsuccessful. It is said that he found his death May 16, 1277, at Viterbo, by the falling of a ceiling. See Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 6, 758.

## John XXII[[@Headword:John XXII]]

             Pope, one of the most celebrated of the pontiffs of Avignon, whose family name was James de Cahors, was elected pope in 1316, on the death of Clement V. Attempting to carry out, in very altered circumstances, the vast and comprehensive policy of Gregory VII and Innocent III, John interposed his authority in the contest for the imperial crown in Germany between Louis of Bavaria and Frederick of Austria, by not only espousing the cause of the latter, but even excommunicating his rival. Public opinion, however, and the political relations of the papacy founded upon it, had already begun to change. The people of Germany opposed this policy, and encouraged the Diet of Frankfurt to ignore the papal action, and it was by this body declared that the imperial authority depended upon God alone,  and that the pope had no temporal authority, direct or indirect, within the empire. A long contest ensued, which resulted in his deposition. (See below.) In Italy also he experienced much trouble. The Guelphs or papal party, led by Robert, king of Naples, defeated the Ghibellines, and the pope excommunicated Matteo Visconti, the great leader of that party, and likewise Frederick, king of Sicily. Between Guelphs and Ghibellines, Italy was at that time in a dreadful state of confusion.

The pope preached a crusade against Visconti, Cane della Scala, and the Este, as heretics. Robert, with the assistance of the pope, aspired to the dominion of all Italy, and the pope sent a legate, who, at the head of an army, assisted Robert and the other Guelphs against the Ghibellines of Lombardy. But the Ghibellines had clever leaders; Castruccio Castracani, Cane della Scala, and the Visconti kept the fate of the war in suspense until Louis of Bavaria sent troops to their assistance. In 1327 Louis finally came himself to Italy, and, after being crowned at Milan with the iron crown, proceeded to Rome, where the people roused in his favor, drove away the papal legate, and caused Louis to be crowned emperor in St. Peter's by the bishops of Venice and of Aleria. After the coronation, Louis held an assembly in the square before the church, in. which he summoned John under his original name, James of Cahors, to appear to answer the charges of heresy and high treason against him. After this mock citation, the emperor proceeded to depose the pope, and to appoint in his stead Peter de Corvara, a monk of Abruzzo, who assumed the name of Nicholas V. Louis also proclaimed a law, which was sanctioned by the people of Rome, to the effect that the pope should reside at Rome, and, if absent more than three months, should be considered as deposed. These measures, however, were attended with little result. Louis returned to Germany, and the Guelphic predominance at Rome was restored, the papal representative resuming his authority. But John XXII never personally visited Rome, having died at Avignon in 1334, when he had accumulated in his coffers the enormous sum of 18,000,000 florins of gold. John is renowned in theological history as the author of that portion of the canon law called the Extravagantes, and also for the singular opinion he entertained that the just will not be admitted to the beatific vision until after the general resurrection. This opinion he was obliged formally to retract before his death (see Reichel, Roman See in the Middle Ages, p. 421). Under his pontificate the clergy and people of the towns were deprived of the right of electing their bishops, which right he reserved to himself on payment of certain fees by the person elected. He was especially rapacious in the collection of the Annates, or First Fruits. See  Bower, History of the Popes, 6, 413 sq.; Labbe, 15, 147; English Cyclopoedia, s.v.

## John XXIII[[@Headword:John XXIII]]

             Pope, a native of Naples, and previously to his election known as cardinal Cossa, succeeded Alexander V in 1410. A man of great talents, but worthless in character, his reputation as cardinal under his predecessor is by no means enviable. Indeed, he is accused of having poisoned Alexander V (q.v.). As a pope, he supported the claims of Louis of Anjou against Ladislaus, king of Naples; but Ladislaus, having defeated his rival in battle, advanced to Rome, and obliged John to flee to Florence. He then preached a crusade against Ladislaus, which gave occasion to denunciations and invectives from John Huss. Meantime the great schism continued, and Gregory, styled XII, and Benedict, antipopes, divided with John the homage of the Christian states. In his exile, wishing to secure the favor of the emperor, he proposed to Sigismund the convocation of a general council to restore peace to the Church, and Sigismund fixed on the city of Constance as the place of assembly. On hearing of the death of Ladislaus, by which event Rome became again open to him, John repented of what he had proposed, but was obliged to comply with the general wish by repairing to Constance. By this council (see vol. 2, p. 486) John was forced to drop the papal tiara; but soon after, by the assistance of Frederick of Austria, he resumed his authority by ordering the council to dissolve. This provoked the question whether the pope is the supreme authority in the Church, and the fourth and fifth sessions decided “that the General Council, once assembled, is superior to the pope, and can receive no orders from him.” A formal process was now instituted against John; sixty charges were laid against him, and he was finally deposed on May 29, 1415, and given into the custody of the elector palatine. After the election of Martin V and the termination of the Council of Constance, John, now again Balthazar Cossa, escaped from Germany, and made his submission to the new pope, who treated him kindly, and gave him the first rank among the cardinals. He died soon after, Nov. 22, 1419, at Florence. The name of John, which most of those who bore it disgraced, either by debauchery, simony, or other crimes, has since been avoided by the occupants of the chair of St. Peter. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 759; Eng. Cyclop. s.v.; Muratori, Vitoe, 3, 2, p. 846 sq.; Riddle. Papacy, 2, 353.

## John the Apostle[[@Headword:John the Apostle]]

             (Ι᾿ωάννης) the Apostle, and brother of the apostle James “the greater” (Mat 4:21; Mat 10:2; Mar 1:19; Mar 3:17; Mar 10:35; Luk 5:10; Luk 8:3; etc.).

I. Personal History. —

1. Early Life. — It is probable that he was born at Bethsaida, on the Lake of Galilee. The general impression left on us by the Gospel narrative is that he was younger than the brother whose name commonly precedes his (Mat 4:21; Mat 10:3; Mat 17:1, etc.; but compare Luk 9:28, where the order is inverted in most codices), younger than his friend Peter, possibly also than his Master. The life which was protracted to the time of Trajan (Eusebius, H.E. 3, 23, following Irenaeus) can hardly have begun before the year B.C. 4 of the Dionysian era. The Gospels give us the name of his father Zebedaeus (Mat 4:21) and his mother Salome (comp. Mat 27:56 with Mar 15:40; Mar 16:1). Of the former we know nothing more. SEE ZEBEDEE. The traditions of the fourth century (Epiphan. 3, Hoer. 78) make the latter the daughter of Joseph by his first  wife, and consequently half sister to our Lord. By some recent critics she has been identified with the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, in Joh 19:25 (Wieseler, in Stud. u. Krit. 1840, p. 648). Ewald (Gesch. Israels, v. 171) adopts Wieseler's conjecture, and connects it with his own hypothesis, that the sons of Zebedee, and our Lord, as well as the Baptist, were of the tribe of Levi. On the other hand, more sober critics, like Neander (Pflanz. u. Leit. p. 609 [4th ed.]) and Lücke (Johannes, 1, 9), reject both the tradition and the conjecture. SEE SALOME.

They lived, it may be inferred from Joh 1:44, in or near the same town as those who were afterwards the companions and partners of their children. SEE BETHSAIDA.

There, on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, the apostle and his brother grew up. The mention of the “hired servants” (Mar 1:20), of his mother's “substance” (ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, Luk 8:3), of “his own house” (τὰ ἴδια, Joh 19:27), implies a position removed by at least some steps from absolute poverty. The fact that the apostle was known to the high priest Caiaphas, as that knowledge was hardly likely to have begun after he had avowed himself the disciple of Jesus of Nazareth, suggests the probability of some early intimacy between the two men or their families. The name which the parents gave to their younger child was too common to serve as the ground of any special inference; but it deserves notice (1) that the name appears among the kindred of Caiaphas (Act 4:6); (2) that it was given to a priestly child, the son of Zacharias (Luk 1:13), as the embodiment and symbol of Messianic hopes. The frequent occurrence of the name at this period, unconnected as it was with any of the great deeds of the old heroic days of Israel, is indeed in itself significant as a sign of that yearning and expectation which then characterized not only the more faithful and devout (Luk 2:25; Luk 2:38), but the whole people. The prominence given to it by the wonders connected with the birth of the future Baptist may have imparted a meaning to it for the parents of the future evangelist which it would not otherwise have had. Of the character of Zebedeus we have hardly the slightest trace. He interposes no refusal when his sons are called on to leave him (Mat 4:21). After this he disappears from the scene of the Gospel history, and we are led to infer that he had died before his wife followed her children in their work of ministration. Her character meets us as presenting the same marked features as those which were conspicuous in her son. From her, who followed Jesus and ministered to him of her substance (Luk 8:3), who sought for her two sons that they might sit, one on his right hand, the other on his left, in his kingdom (Mat 20:20), he might well derive  his strong affections, his capacity for giving and receiving love, his eagerness for the speedy manifestation of the Messiah's kingdom. The early years of the apostle we may believe to have passed under this influence. He would be trained in all that constituted the ordinary education of Jewish boyhood. Though not taught in the schools of Jerusalem, and therefore, in later life, liable to the reproach of having no recognized position as a teacher, no Rabbinical education (Act 4:13), he would yet be taught to read the Law and observe its precepts, to feed on the writings of the prophets with the feeling that their accomplishment was not far off.

2. Incidents recorded of him in the New Testament. — The ordinary life of the fisherman of the Sea of Galilee was at last broken in upon by the news that a prophet had once more appeared. The voice of John the Baptist was heard in the wilderness of Judaea, and the publicans, peasants, soldiers, and fishermen of Galilee gathered round him. Among these were the two sons of Zebedaeus and their friends. With them perhaps was One whom as yet they knew not. They heard, it may be, of John's protests against the vices of their own ruler — against the hypocrisy of Pharisees and Scribes. But they heard also, it is clear, words which spoke to them of their own sins — of their own need of a deliverer. The words “Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins” imply that those who heard them would enter into the blessedness of which they spoke. Assuming that the unnamed disciple of Joh 1:37-40 was the evangelist himself, we are led to think of that meeting, of the lengthened interview that followed it as the starting point of the entire devotion of heart and soul which lasted through his whole life. Then Jesus loved him as he loved all earnest seekers after righteousness and truth (comp. Mar 10:21). The words of that evening, though unrecorded, were mighty in their effect. The disciples (John apparently among them) followed their new teacher to Galilee (Joh 1:44), were with him, as such, at the marriage feast of Cana (Joh 2:2), journeyed with him to Capernaum, and thence to Jerusalem (Joh 2:12; Joh 2:22), came back through Samaria (Joh 4:8), and then. for some uncertain interval of time, returned to their former occupations. The uncertainty which hangs over the narratives of Mat 4:18 and Luk 5:1-11 (comp. the arguments for and against their relating to the same events in Lampe, Comment. ad Joann. 1, 20), leaves us in doubt whether they received a special call to become “fishers of men” once only or twice. In either case they gave up the employment of their life and went to do a work like it, and yet unlike, in God's spiritual kingdom. From this time they take their place  among the company of disciples. Only here and there are there traces of individual character, of special turning points in their lives. Soon they find themselves in the number of the Twelve who are chosen, not as disciples only, but as their Lord's delegates — representatives — apostles. In all the lists of the Twelve those four names of the sons of Jonah and Zebedaeus stand foremost. They come within the innermost circle of their Lord's friends, and are as the ἐκλεκτῶν ἐκλεκτότεροι.

The three, Peter, James, and John, are with him when none else are, in the chamber of death (Mar 5:37), in the glory of the transfiguration (Mat 17:1), when he forewarns them of the destruction of the Holy City (Mar 13:3, Andrew, in this instance, with them), in the agony of Gethsemane. Peter is throughout the leader of that band; to John belongs the yet more memorable distinction of being the disciple whom Jesus loved. This love is returned with a more single, undivided heart by him than by any other. If Peter is the φιλόχριστος, John is the φιλιησοῦς (Grotius, Prolegom. in Joann.). Some striking facts indicate why this was so; what the character was which was thus worthy of the love of Jesus of Nazareth.. They hardly sustain the popular notion, fostered by the received types of Christian art, of a nature gentle, yielding, feminine. The name Boanerges (Mar 3:17) implies a vehemence, zeal, intensity, which gave to those who had it the might of Sons of Thunder. That spirit broke out once and again when they joined their mother in asking for the highest places in the kingdom of their Master, and declared that they were ready to face the dark terrors of the cup that he drank, and the baptism that he was baptized with (Mat 20:20-24; Mar 10:35-41) — when they rebuked one who cast out devils in their Lord's name because he was not one of their company (Luk 9:49) — when they sought to call down fire from heaven upon a village of the Samaritans (Luk 9:54). About this time Salome, as if her husband had died, takes her place among the women who followed Jesus in Galilee (Luk 8:3), ministering to him of their substance, and went up with him in his last journey to Jerusalem (Luk 22:55). Through her, we may well believe, John first came to know Mary Magdalene, whose character he depicts with such a life-like touch, and that other Mary, to whom he was afterwards to stand in so close and special a relation. The fullness of his narrative of what the other evangelists omit (John 11) leads to the conclusion that he was united also by some special ties of intimacy to the family of Bethany. It is not necessary to dwell at length on the familiar history of the Last Supper. What is characteristic is that he is there, as ever, the disciple whom Jesus loved; and, as the chosen and a  favored friend, reclines at table with his head upon his Master's breast (Joh 13:23). To him the eager Peter — they had been sent together to prepare the supper (Luk 22:8) — makes signs of impatient questioning that he should ask what was not likely to be answered if it came from any other (Joh 13:24). As they go out to the Mount of Olives the chosen three are nearest to their Master. They only are within sight or hearing of the conflict in Gethsemane (Mat 26:37).

When the betrayal is accomplished, Peter and John, after the first moment of confusion, follow afar off, while the others simply seek safety in a hasty flight (Joh 18:15). The personal acquaintance which existed between John and Caiaphas enabled him to gain access both for himself and Peter, but the latter remains in the porch, with the officers and servants, while John himself apparently is admitted to the council chamber, and follows Jesus thence, even to the praetorium of the Roman procurator. (Joh 18:16; Joh 18:19; Joh 18:28). Thence, as if the desire to see the end, and the love which was stronger than death, sustained him through all the terrors and sorrows of that day, he followed — accompanied probably by his own mother, Mary the mother of Jesus, and Mary Magdalene — to the place of crucifixion. The teacher who had been to him as a brother leaves to him a brother's duty. He is to be as a son to the mother who is left desolate (Joh 19:26-27). The Sabbath that followed was spent, it would appear, in the same company. He receives Peter, in spite of his denial, on the old terms of friendship. It is to them that Mary Magdalene first runs with the tidings of the emptied sepulchre (Joh 20:2); they are the first to go together to see what the strange words meant. Not without some bearing on their respective characters is the fact that John is the most impetuous, running on most eagerly to the rock tomb; Peter, the least restrained by awe, the first to enter in and look (Joh 20:4-6). For at least eight days they continued in Jerusalem (Joh 20:26).

Then, in the interval between the resurrection and the ascension, we find them still together on the Sea of Galilee (Joh 21:1), as though they would calm the eager suspense of that period of expectation by a return to their old calling and their old familiar haunts. Here, too, there is a characteristic difference. John is the first to recognize in the dim form seen in the morning twilight the presence of his risen Lord; Peter the first to plunge, into the water and swim towards the shore where he stood calling to them (Joh 21:7). The last words of the Gospel reveal to us the deep affection which united the two friends. It is not enough for Peter to know his own future. That at once suggests the question — “And what shall this man do?” (Joh 21:21). The history of  the Acts shows the same union. They, are of course together at the ascension and on the day of Pentecost. Together they enter the Temple as worshippers (Act 3:1), and protest against the threats of the Sanhedrim (Act 4:13). They are fellow workers in the first great step of the Church's expansion. The apostle whose wrath had been roused by the unbelief of the Samaritans overcomes his national exclusiveness, and receives them as his brethren (Act 8:14). The persecution which was pushed on by Saul of Tarsus did not drive him or any of the apostles from their post (Act 8:1). When the persecutor came back as the convert, he, it is true, did not see him (Gal 1:19), but this, of course, does not involve the inference that he had left Jerusalem. The sharper though shorter persecution which followed under Herod Agrippa brought a great sorrow to him in the martyrdom of his brother (Act 12:2). His friend was driven to seek safety in flight. Fifteen years after Paul's first visit he was still at Jerusalem, and helped to take part in the great settlement of the controversy between the Jewish and the Gentile Christians (Act 15:6). His position and reputation there were those of one ranking among the chief “pillars” of the Church (Gal 2:9). Of the work of the apostle during this period we have hardly the slightest trace. There may have been special calls to mission work like that which drew him to Samaria. There may have been the work of teaching, organizing, exhorting the churches of Judea. His fulfilment of the solemn charge intrusted to him may have led him to a life of loving and reverent thought rather than to one of conspicuous activity. We may, at all events, feel sure that it was a time in which the natural elements of his character, with all their fiery energy, became purified and mellowed, rising step by step to that high serenity which we find perfected in the closing portion of his life. Here, too, we may, without much hesitation, accept the traditions of the Church as recording a historic fact when they ascribe to him a life of celibacy (Tertull. De Monog. c. 13. The absence of his name from 1Co 9:5 tends to the same conclusion. It harmonizes with all we know of his character to think of his heart as so absorbed in the higher and diviner love that there was no room left for the lower and the human.

3. Sequel of his Career. — The traditions of a later age come in, with more or less show of likelihood, to fill up the great gap which separates the apostle of Jerusalem from the bishop of Ephesus. It was a natural conjecture to suppose that he remained in Judaea till the death of the Virgin released him from his trust. When this took place we can only conjecture.  The hypothesis of Baronius and Tillemont, that the Virgin accompanied him to Ephesus, has not even the authority of tradition (Lampe, 1, 51). There are no signs of his being at Jerusalem at the time of Paul's last visit (Acts 21). The pastoral epistles set aside the notion that he had come to Ephesus before the work of the apostle of the Gentiles was brought to its conclusion. Out of many contradictory statements, fixing his departure under Claudius, or Nero, or as late even as Domitian, we have hardly any data for doing more than rejecting the two extremes. Lampe fixes A.D. 66, when Jerusalem was besieged by the Roman forces under Cestius, as the most probable date. Nor is it certain that his work as an apostle was transferred at once from Jerusalem to Ephesus. A tradition current in the time of Augustine (Quoest. Evang. 2, 19), and embodied in some MSS. of the New Test., represented the 1st Epistle of John as addressed to the Parthians, and so far implied that his apostolic work had brought him into contact with them. In the earlier tradition which made the apostles formally partition out the world known to them, Parthia falls to the lot of Thomas, while John receives Proconsular Asia (Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 3, 1). In one of the legends connected with the Apostles' Creed, Peter contributes the first article, John the second; but the tradition appears with great variations as to time and order (comp. Pseudo-August. Serm. 240, 241). When the form of the aged disciple meets us again in the twilight of the apostolic age, we are still left in great doubt as to the extent of his work and the circumstances of his outward life. Assuming the authorship of the Epistles and the Revelation to be his, the facts which the New Test. writings assert or imply are:

(1) that, having come to Ephesus, some persecution, local or general, drove him to Patmos (Rev 1:9);

(2) that the seven churches, of which Asia was the center, were special objects of his solicitude (Rev 1:11); that in his work he had to encounter men who denied the truth on which his faith rested (1Jn 4:1; 2Jn 1:7), and others who, with a railing and malignant temper, disputed his authority (3Jn 1:9-10). If to this we add that he must have outlived all, or nearly all, of those who had been the friends and companions even of his maturer years that this lingering age gave strength to an old imagination that his Lord had promised him immortality (Joh 21:23) — that, as if remembering the actual words which had been thus perverted, the longing of his soul gathered itself up in the cry, “Even so, come, Lord Jesus” (Rev 22:20) — that from some who spoke  with authority he received a solemn attestation of the confidence they reposed in him (Joh 21:24) — we have stated all that has any claim to the character of historical truth. The picture which tradition fills up for us has the merit of being full and vivid, but it blends together, without much regard to harmony, things probable and improbable. He is shipwrecked off Ephesus (Simeon Metaph. In vita Johann. c. 2; Lampe, 1, 47), and arrives there in time to check the progress of the heresies which sprang up after Paul's departure. Then, or at a later period, he numbers among his disciples men like Polycarp, Papias, Ignatius (Jerome, De vir. Illust. c. 17). In the persecution under Domitian he is taken to Rome, and there, by his boldness, though not by death, gains the crown of martyrdom. The boiling oil into which he is thrown has no power to hurt him (Tertull. De Proescript. c. 36).

The scene of the supposed miracle was outside the Porta Latina, and hence the Western Church commemorates it by the special festival of “St. John Port. Latin.” on May 6th. He is then sent to labor in the mines, and Patmos is the place of his exile (Victorinus, In Revelation 9; Lampe, 1, 66). The accession of Nerva frees him from danger, and he returns to Ephesus. There he settles the canon of the Gospel history by formally attesting the truth of the first three Gospels, and writing his own to supply what they left wanting (Euseb. H.E. 3, 24). The elders of the Church are gathered together, and he, as by a sudden inspiration, begins with the wonderful opening, “In the beginning was the word” (Jerome, De vir. Illust. 29). Heresies continue to show themselves, but he meets them with the strongest possible protest. He refuses to pass under the same roof (that of the public baths of Ephesus) with their foremost leader, lest the house should fall down on them and crush them (Iren. 3, 3; Euseb. H.E. 3, 28; 4, 14). Eusebius and Irenaeus make Cerinthus the heretic. In Epiphanius (Hoer. 30, c. 24) Ebion is the hero of the story. To modern feelings the anecdote may seem at variance with the character of the apostle of love, but it is hardly more than the development in act of the principle of 2Jn 1:10. To the mind of Epiphanius there was a difficulty of another kind: nothing less than a special inspiration could account for such a departure from an ascetic life as going to a bath at all. Through his agency the great temple of Artemis is at last reft of its magnificence, and even (!) leveled with the ground (Cyril. Alex. Orat. de Mar. Virg.; Nicephor. H.E. 2, 42; Lampe, 1, 90). He introduces and perpetuates the Jewish mode of celebrating the Easter feast (Eusebius, H.E. 3, 3) — at Ephesus, if not before, as one who was a true priest of the Lord. bearing on his brow the plate of gold (πέταλον; compare Suicer. Thes. s.v.) with the  sacred name engraved on it, which was the badge of the Jewish pontiff (Polycrates, in Eusebius, H.E. 3, 31; 5, 24).

In strange contrast with this ideal exaltation, a later tradition tells how the old man used to find pleasure in the playfulness and fondness of a favorite bird, and defended himself against the charge of unworthy trifling by the familiar apologue of the bow that must sometimes be unbent (Cassian. Collat. 24, c. 2). More true to the N.T. character of the apostle is the story, told with so much power and beauty by Clement of Alexandria (Quis dives, c. 42), of his special and loving interest in the younger members of his flock — of his eagerness and courage in the attempt to rescue one of them who had fallen into evil courses. The scene of the old and loving man, standing face to face with the outlaw chief whom, in days gone by, he had baptized, and winning him to repentance is one which we could gladly look on as belonging to his actual life — part of a story which is, in Clement's wordsοὐ μῦθος ἀλλὰ λόγος. Not less beautiful is that other scene which comes before us as the last act of his life. When all capacity to work and teach is gone — when there is no strength even to stand — the spirit still retains its power to love, and the lips are still opened to repeat, without change and variation, the command which summed up all his Master's will, “Little children, love one another” (Jerome, in Galatians 6). Other stories, more apocryphal and less interesting, we may pass over rapidly. That he put forth his power to raise the dead to life (Euseb. H.E. 5, 18); that he drank the cup of hemlock which was intended to cause his death, and suffered no harm from it (Pseudo-August. Soliloq.; Isidor. Hispal. De Morte Sanct. c. 73); that when he felt his death approaching he gave orders for the construction of his own sepulchre, and when it was finished calmly laid himself down in it and died (Augustin. Tract. in Joann. 124); that after his interment there were strange movements in the earth that covered him (ib.); that when the tomb was subsequently opened it was found empty (Niceph. H.E. 2, 42); that he was reserved to reappear again in conflict with the personal antichrist in the last days (Suicer, Thes. s.v. Ι᾿ωάννης) these traditions, for the most part, indicate little else than the uncritical spirit of the age in which they passed current. The very time of his death lies within the region of conjecture rather than of history, and the dates that have been assigned for it range from A.D. 89 to A.D. 120 (Lampe, 1, 92).

See Perionii Vitoe Apostol. p. 95 sq.; Edzard De Joanne Cerinthi proesentiam futgiente. (Viteb. 1732); Schwollmann, Comment. de Jo. in Pathimo exilio (Halle, 1757); Hering, Von d. Schule d. Apost. Joh. zu  Ephesus (Bresl. 1774); Bishop, Life, etc., of St. John (London, 1827); Webb, The Beloved Disciple (Lond. 1848); Krummacher (in Life of Cornelius, etc.); Lee, Life of St. John (N.Y. 1854); Macfarlane, The Disciple whom Jesus loved (Lond. 1855); Kienkel, Der Apostel Johannes (Berlin, 1871).

II. The most prominent traits of John's character appear to have been an ardent temperament and a delicacy of sentiment. These combined to produce that devoted attachment to his Master which leads him to detail all his discourses and vindicate his character on all occasions. Yet, with all his mildness and amiability of temper — doubtless, in part, the fruit of divine grace, for we trace also a degree of selfishness in Mar 9:38; Mar 10:35 he was not altogether feminine in disposition, but possessed an energy and force of mind which gave him the title of one of the “sons of thunder” (Mar 3:17), bursting forth in vehement language in his writings and on one occasion calling even for rebuke (Luk 9:54-55). SEE BOANERGES. It was these traits of mind that enabled him to take so profound and comprehensive a view of the nature and office of the incarnate Son of God, evident in all his writings, and especially developed in the introduction to his Gospel.

See Von Melle, Entwurf einer Lebensbeschreibung und Charakteristik d. Apost. Joh. (Heidelb. 1808); Niemeyer, Charakteristik der Bibel, 1, 303 sq.; Wernsdorf, Meletema de Elogio filior. tonitrui (Helmst. 1755); Obbar, De Temperamento Joa. cholerlico (Gött. 1738); F. Trench, Life and Character of John the Evangelist (London, 1850); Stanley, Sermons and Essays on the Apost. Age, serm. 4; W. Grimm, in Ersch and Gruber's Encycl. sect. 2, pt. 22, p. 1 sq.; Ad. Monod, Sermons (La Parole vivante) (Par. 1858); Pressense, Apostolic AEra, p. 415.

## John, A Metropolitan Of Kiew[[@Headword:John, A Metropolitan Of Kiew]]

             was raised to that dignity in 1164 by the patriarch of Constantinople, Lucas Chrysoberges. He is famous for his letter to pope Alexander III, of which a rare book entitled Kirilovoi (Moscow, 1644) gives some extracts. John died May 12, 1166. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## John, Abbot Of St. Arnoul Of Metz[[@Headword:John, Abbot Of St. Arnoul Of Metz]]

             is first mentioned in 960, when he succeeded Anstée in that office. He was reputed to be a learned and very liberal man for the times. He granted a charter of freedom to the inhabitants of Maurville formerly serfs of the abbey, and divided the land among them, retaining only for the abbey the right of levying certain taxes. He died about 977. John wrote a Life of St. Glodosinde (Mabillon, Acta Sanctoe, vol. 2, col. 1087) and the Life of St. John de Vendiére, abbot of Gorze (Bollandii, vol. 3, Feb.). See Gallia Christ. vol. 13, col. 900; Hist. Litt. de la France, 7, 421; Hoefer, Nouveau Biog. Générale, 26, 530. (J.N.P.)

## John, Aegeates[[@Headword:John, Aegeates]]

             (οΑ῾ἰγεάτης), a presbyter of Ægae (Αἰγαί) (probably in Cilicia, between Mopsuestia and Issus). Photius calls him (Cod. 55) a Nestorian, but Fabricius, with reason, supposes that he was a Eutychian. When he flourished is not known; he may perhaps be consigned to the latter half of the 5th century. Vossius places him under Zeno the Isaurian, but Cave thinks he was later. He is the reputed author of

(1) Ε᾿κκλησιαστικὴ ἱστορία (Historia Ecclesiastica) in ten books, of which Photius had read five, containing the history of the Church from the deposition of Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus (the third general  council, A. D. 431) to the deposition of Petrus Fullo (A.D. 477), who had usurped the see of Antioch in the reign of the emperor Zeno. As the Council of Ephesus is the point at which the ecclesiastical history of Socrates leaves off, it is probable that the history of John of Ægae commenced, like that of Evagrius, at that point, and consequently that these five books were the first five of his history. Photius describes his style as perspicuous and florid, and says that he was a great admirer of Dioscorus of Alexandria, the successor of Cyril, and extolled the Synod of Ephesus (A.D. 449), generally branded with the epithet ἡ ληστρική, “the synod of robbers,” while he attacked the Council of Chalcedon. How late a period the history came down to cannot be determined: —

(2) A work which Photius describes as Κατὰ τῆς ἁγίας τετάρτης συνόδου (Adversus Quartam Sanctam Synodum). This must be Photius' description, not the original title of the work; for, opposed as we infer John to have been to the authority of the Council of Chalcedon, he would hardly have described it as “the fourth sacred council.” Photius commends the style in which the work was written. Fabricius identifies John of Ægae with the Joannes ὁ διακρινόμενος, i.e. “the dissenter,” cited by the anonymous writer of the Διαστάσεις σύντομοι χρονικαί (Breves Demonstrationes Chronographicoe), given by Combefis (in his Origenum C. Politinarum Manipulus, p. 24, 33), but Combefis himself (ibid. p. 59) identifies this John with John Malalas. Whether John of Ægae is the John ὁ Ρήτωρ, “the Rhetorician,” cited by Evagrius Scholasticus (Hist. Eccl. 1, 16; 2, 12; 3, 10, etc.) is doubtful. Le Quien (Opera S. Joannis Damasceni, 1, 368, note) identifies them, but Fabricius thinks they were different persons. See Photius, Bibl. Cod. 41, 55; Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. 7, 419; Cave, Hist. Lit. 1, 456, ed. Oxford, 1740-43; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography, 2, 585.

## John, Archbishop Of Thessalonica[[@Headword:John, Archbishop Of Thessalonica]]

             who flourished in the 7th century, is noted as a stout defender of the orthodox faith against the Monothelites. He attended as papal legate the third Constantinopolitan (sixth ecumenical) Council (A.D. 680), and in that character subscribed the Acta of the council (Concilia, vol. 6, col. 1058, ed. Labbe; vol. 3, col. 1425, ed. Hardouin; vol. 11 col. 639, ed. Iansi,). The time of his death is altogether uncertain. He wrote

(1) Εἰς τὰς μυροφόρους γυναῖκας, In mulieres ferentes unguenta, a discourse or treatise in which he argues that there is no contradiction in the several accounts of the resurrection of Christ given by the four evangelists. This piece appears to have been regarded by some as a work of Chrysostom, and was first published (but from a mutilated and corrupt text) by Savile in his edition of Chrysostom (5, 740, Eton. 1610, fol.), though with an expression of doubt as to its genuineness. It was subsequently printed more correctly in the Novum Auctarium of Combefis (vol. 1, Paris, 1648, folio), and by him assigned to the right author. It is  given in a mutilated form in Montfaucon's edition of Chrysostom among the Spuria, 8, 159 (Paris, 1718, ol.), or in 8, 816 of the 8vo reprint (Paris, 1839). It is also given in the Bibliotheca Patrum of Gallandius, 13, 185, etc. A Latin version is given in the Bibliotheca Patrum, vol 12 (Lyons, 1677): —

(2) Λόγος, Oratio, of which a considerable extract was read by Nicolaus, bishop of Cyzicus, at the second Nicene (seventh, ecumenical) Council, and is printed in the Concilia, vol. 7, col. 353, ed. Labbe: vol. 4, col. 292, ed. Hardouin; vol. 13, col. 163, ed. Mansi; and by Gallandius in his Bibliotheca Patrum, 13, 196. See Give, Hist. Litt. 1; 597; Fabricius. Bibl. Graec. 10, 250. — Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2, 603.

## John, First Epistle Of[[@Headword:John, First Epistle Of]]

             the most important of the so called catholic or “general” Epistles, of which it is the fourth in order. SEE BIBLE, vol. 1, p. 800, Colossians 2.  I. Its Authenticity. — That this is the production of the same author as wrote the fourth Gospel is so manifest that it has universally been admitted (comp. Hauff, Die Authentie u. der hohe Werth des Evang. Johan. p. 137 sq.). The establishment of the genuineness of the one, therefore, involves the admission of that of the other. The evidence, however, in favor of the Epistle is sufficient to establish its claims, apart from its relation to the Gospel. See § 7, below.

1. External. — Eusebius informs us that Papias knew and made use of it (H.E. 3, 39); Polycarp quotes a passage (4, 3) from it in his Epistle to the Philippians, ch. 7; Irenaeus uses it (comp. Adv. Hoer. 3, 15; 5, 8, with 1Jn 2:18; 1Jn 4:1; 1Jn 4:3; 1 John 5, 1); it is quoted or referred to by Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 2, 389) and Tertullian (Scorpiac. c. 22; Adv. Prax. c. 15); and Eusebius assures us that it was universally and always acknowledged in the Church (H.E. 3, 25, 26). It is found in the Peshito and in all the ancient versions and is included in every catalog of the canonical books which has come down to us (Lardner, Works, 6, 584). In fact, the only persons who appear not to have recognized this Epistle are the ancient heretics, the Alogi and the Marcionites, the latter of whom were acquainted with none of the writings of John, and the former rejected them all, ascribing them to Cerinthus, not upon critical, but purely arbitrary and dogmatical grounds.

2. With this the internal evidence fully accords. The work is anonymous, but the apostle John is plainly indicated throughout as the writer. The author asserts that he had been an immediate disciple of Jesus, and that he testifies what he himself had seen and heard (1 John 1, 1-4; 1Jn 4:14), and this assumption is sustained throughout in a way so natural and unaffected that it would be doing violence to all probability to suppose that it could have been attained by one who felt that he was practicing in this a deliberate imposition. The circumstances also of the writer to which he alludes, the themes on which he chiefly dwells, and the spirit which his writing breathes, are all such as fall in with what we know of the apostle John and suggest him as the writer. If this be the work of a pretender, he has, as De Wette remarks (Exeget. Hdb.), “shown incredible subtlety in concealing the name of the apostle, while he has indirectly, and in a most simple natural way, indicated him as the writer.”

A few German theologians in our own times (Lange, Schriften des Johan. 3, 4 sq.; Cludius, Uransichten des Christenth. p. 52 sq.; Bretschneider,  Probabilia, p. 166 sq.; Zeller, in the Theol. Jahrb. 1845) have been the first critics to throw doubts on the genuineness of any of John's writings, and this altogether on internal grounds, but they have met with complete refutations from the pens of Bertholdt (6), Harmsen (Authent. d. Schr. d. Evangel. Johan.), and Lücke (Commentar, 3). See above. The only serious objections to the Epistles are those of Bretschneider, who has equally attacked the genuineness of the Gospel.

(1.) He maintains that the doctrine concerning the Logos, and the anti- docetic tendency of John's 1st Epistle, betray an author of the second century, whom he assumes to be John the Presbyter. But it is beyond all question, says Lücke (1. c.), that the Logos doctrine of John, substantially, although not fully developed, existed in the Jewish theological notions respecting the Son of God, and that we find it distinctly expressed, although in different words, in the Pauline representation of Christ's exalted dignity (compare Colossians 1 with Hebrews 1); that the rudiments of it appear in the literature of the Jews, canonical and apocryphal, Chaldaic and Alexandrians; that in the time of Christ it was considerably developed in the writings of Philo, and still more strongly in the fathers of the second century, who were so far from retaining the simple, Hebraizing, and canonical mode of expression peculiar to John that in them it had assumed a gnostically erudite form, although essentially identical. John intends by the Word (Logos) to express the divine nature of Christ, but the patristic logology attempts to determine the relation between the Logos and the invisible God on one side and the world on the other. The earliest fathers, as Justin Martyr and Tatian, while they make use of John's phraseology, further support their doctrines by ecclesiastical tradition, which, as Lücke observes, must have its root in doctrines that were known in the first century. But, from Theophilus of Antioch downwards, the fathers, mentioning John by name, expressly connect their elucidations with the canonical foundation in the Gospel of John, without the granting of which the language of Justin would be inexplicable (Olshausen, On the Genuineness of the Four Gospels, p. 306 sq.). Accordingly, adds Lücke, on this side, the authenticity of the Gospel and Epistle remains unassailable. SEE LOGOS.

(2.) On similar grounds may be refuted Bretschneider's arguments derived from the anti-docetic character of John's Epistle. It is true, docetism, or the idealistic philosophy, was not fully developed before the second century, but its germ existed before the time of Christ, as has been shown by  Mosheim, Walch, and Niemeyer. Traces of Jewish theology and Oriental theosophy having been applied to the Christian doctrine in the apostolic age are to be found in the Epistles of Paul, and it would be unaccountable to suppose that the fully developed docetism should have first made its appearance in the Epistles of Irenseus and Polycarp. We have the authority of the former of these for the fact that Cerinthus taught the docetic heresy in the lifetime of John in the simple form in which it seems to be attacked in 1Jn 4:1-3; 1Jn 2:22; 2Jn 1:7. SEE DOCETAE.

II. Integrity. — The genuineness of only two small portions of this writing have been called in question, viz., the words ὁ ὁμολογῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει (1 John 2; 23), and the words ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὁ Πατήρ ὁ Λᾠγος καὶ τὸ ἃγιον Πνεῦα καὶ ουτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσι. Καὶτρεῖς εἰσιν οἱ μαπτυποῦντες ἐν τῇ γῇ (1 John 5, 7, 8). The former of these is omitted in the Text. Rec., and is printed in italics in the A.V. It is, however, supported by sufficient authority, and is inserted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Scholz, etc. The latter of these passages has given rise to a world-famous controversy, which can hardly be said to have yet ended (Orme, Memoir of the Controversy respecting the Heavenly Witnesses [Lond. 1830]). The prevailing judgment, however, of all critics and interpreters is that the passage is spurious (see Griesbach, Append. ad N.T. 2, 1-25; Tischendorf on the passage; Lücke, Comment. on the Epistles of John, in Bib. Casbinet, No. 15, etc.). SEE WITNESSES, THE THREE HEAVENLY.

III. Time and Place of writing the First Epistle. — On these points nothing certain can be determined.

1. It has been conjectured by many interpreters, ancient and modern, that it was written at the same place as the Gospel. The more ancient tradition places the writing of the Gospel at Ephesus and a less authentic report refers it to the island of Patmos. Hug (Introd.) infers, from the absence of writing materials (3Jn 1:13), that all John's Epistles were composed at Patmos. The most probable opinion is that it was written somewhere in Asia Minor, in which was the ordinary residence of the apostle (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 3, 23); perhaps, according to the tradition of the Greek Church, at Ephesus, but for this we have no historical warrant (Lücke, Commentary).

2. It is equally difficult to determine the time of the writing of this Epistle, although it was most probably posterior to the Gospel, which seems to be referred to in 1Jn 1:4. Some are of opinion that the Epistle was an envelope or accompaniment to the Gospel, and that they were consequently written nearly simultaneously (Hug, Introd.). As, however, the period when the Gospel was written, according to the evidence of tradition and criticism, “fluctuates between the sixth and ninth decennium of the first century” (Lücke, Commentary), we are at a loss for data on which to found any probable hypothesis respecting the exact time of the writing of the Epistle; but that it was posterior to the Gospel is further rendered probable from the fact that it is formed on such a view of the person of Jesus as is found only in John's Gospel and that it abounds in allusions to the speeches of Jesus as there recorded. Lücke concludes, from its resembling the Gospel in its apologetical and polemical allusions, that it indicates such a state of the Christian community as proves that it must be posterior even to the last Epistles of Paul and consequently that the ancient Church was justified in classing it among the catholic Epistles, which all bear this chronological character.

It has been argued by several, from 1Jn 2:18 (ἐσχάτη ὤραἐστίν), that the Epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, while others, founding their conjecture on the same passage, maintain the very reverse. Among the former are to be found the names of Hammond, Grotius, Calovius, Lange, and Hänlein, and among the latter those of Baronius, Basnage, Mill, and Le Clerc.

Equally unsatisfactory is the argument, in respect to the time when this Epistle was written, derived from its supposed senile tone; for, although the style is somewhat more tautological than the Gospel, this can be accounted for by its epistolary character, without ascribing it to the effects of senile forgetfulness. In fact, this character is altogether denied by some of the ablest critics. Still, from the patriarchal tone assumed in the Epistle, and the frequent use of the appellation “little children,” we may reasonably conclude that it was written in advanced age, perhaps not long after the Gospel, or about A.D. 92.

IV. For whom written. — The writer evidently had in his eye a circle of readers with whom he stood in close personal relation — Christians, apparently, who were living in the midst of idolaters (1 John 5, 21), and who were exposed to danger from false speculation and wrong methods of  presenting the truths of Christianity (1Jn 2:22-26; 1Jn 4:1-3; 1Jn 5:1-6, etc.). If the Epistle was written by John at Ephesus, we may, from these circumstances, with much probability conclude that the Christians in that region were the parties for whose behoof it was first designed. Augustine (Quoest. Evangel. 2, 39) says it was addressed “ad Parthos,” and this inscription appears in several MSS. of the Vulgate, and has been defended by Grotius, Paulus, and others, as giving the real destination of the Epistle. John, however, had no relations with the Parthians that we know of, nor does a single ancient testimony confirm the statement of Augustine, except on the part of later writers of the Latin Church, who probably simply followed him. It has been suggested that, as the 2d Epistle is by some of the ancients described as παρθένους (Clem. Alex. Frag., edit. Potter, p. 1011), this may have been changed into ,πρὸς Πάρθους and by mistake applied to the 1st Epistle (Whiston, Comment. on the Cath. Epistles; Hug, Introd. p. 464, Fosdick's transl.). This is possible, but not very probable. The suggestion of Wegscheider, that “ad Parthos” is an error for “ad Sparsos,” an inscription which actually is found in several MSS. (Scholz, Bibl. Krit. Reise, p. 67), is ingenious and may be correct. If we are to understand the term catholic, as applied to this Epistle, in the sense of circular, we may naturally infer, from the absence of the epistolary form, that this was an encyclical letter addressed to several of John's congregations and in all probability to the churches of the Apocalypse. See § 8, below. Lardner is clearly right when he says that it was primarily meant for the churches in Asia under John's inspection, to whom he had already orally delivered his doctrine (1Jn 1:3; 1Jn 2:7). SEE REVELATION.

V. Character. — Though ranked among the catholic Epistles, this writing has not the form of an epistle in this respect it more resembles a free homily; still, in fact, it undoubtedly was sent as a letter to the persons for whose instruction it was designed. The general strain is admonitory and the author seems to have written as he would have spoken had those whom he addresses been present before him. One great thought pervades the book — the reality of Christ's appearance in the flesh, and the all sufficiency of his doctrine for salvation — a salvation which manifests itself in holiness and love. But the author does not discuss these topics in any systematic or logical form; he rather allows his thoughts to flow out in succession as one suggests another and clothes them in simple and earnest words as they arise in his mind. Some have imputed a character of senility to the work on this  account, but without reason. Under a simple and inartificial exterior there lies deep thought and the book is pervaded by a suppressed intensity of feeling that recalls the youthful Boanerges in the aged apostle. The mighty power that is in it has drawn to it in all ages the reverence and love of the noblest minds, “especially of those who more particularly take up Christianity as a religion of love — a religion of the heart” (Lücke, Int. p. 55).

VI. Contents. — A strict analysis of this Epistle, therefore, seems hardly possible, as the writer does not appear to have been systematic in its plan, but rather to have written out of a full and loving heart. “He asserts the pre-existent glory and the real humanity of our Lord, in opposition to false teachers, and for the comfort of the Church (1Jn 1:1-7). Then follows a statement of the sinfulness of man, and the propitiation of Christ, this propitiation being intended to stir us up to holiness and love (1Jn 1:8; 1Jn 2:17); Jesus and the Christ are asserted to be one, in opposition to the false teachers (1 John 1:18-29). The next chapter seems devoted to the singular love of God in adopting us to be his sons, with the happiness and the duties arising out of it, especially the duty of brotherly love (ch. 3). The following chapter is principally occupied with marks by which to distinguish the teaching of the Spirit of God from that of false teachers and of Antichrist, with repeated exhortations to ‘love as brethren' (ch. 4). The apostle then shows the connection between faith, renewal, love to God and to the brethren, obedience, and victory over the world, and concludes with a brief summary of what had been already said (ch. 5)” (Fairbairn). See § 8, below.

VII. Relation to the Fourth Gospel. — The close affinity between this Epistle and John's Gospel has already been alluded to. In style, in prevailing formula of expression, in spirit, and in thought, the two are identical. “It is evident that the writer of each had a similar class of opponents in his mind — those who, like the Docetae, denied the true humanity of Christ; those, again, who denied that the man Jesus was the Christ and Son of God; and those who, under pretence of being his disciples, were habitually living in violation of his commands. In both books is the same deeply loving and contemplative nature; in both, a heart completely imbued with the teaching of the Savior; in both, also, the same tendency to abhorrence of those who opposed his Lord. Remarkable, too (to use the words of Ebrard), is the similarity of the circle of ideas in both  writings. The notions, light, life, darkness, truth, lie, meet us in the Epistle with the same broad and deep meaning which they bear in the Gospel; so, also, the notions of propitiation (ἱλασμός), of doing righteousness, sin, or iniquity (ἁμαρτίαν, ἀνομίαν), and the sharply-presented antitheses of light and darkness, truth and lie, life and death, of loving and hating, the love of the Father and of the world, children of God and of the devil, spirit of truth and of error” (Fairbairn). Macknight, and, still more fully, De Wette, have drawn out a copious comparison of expressions common to the Gospel and Epistle.

This similarity has led to the suggestion that both, in a sense, form one whole, the Epistle being, according to some, a prolegomenon to the Gospel; according to others, its practical conclusion; and according to others, its commendatory accompaniment. The probability is that both were written at the same period of the author's life, and that they both contain in writing what he had been accustomed to testify and teach during his apostolic ministry; but whether any closer relation than this exists between them must remain matter entirely of conjecture.

VIII. Design. — That the apostle sought to confirm the believers for whom he wrote in their attachment to Christianity as it had been delivered to them by the ambassadors of Christ is evident on the surface of the Epistle. It is clear, also, that he had in view certain false teachers by whose arts the Christians were in danger of being seduced from the faith of Jesus as the incarnate Son of God, and from that holy and loving course of conduct to which true faith in Jesus leads; but who these false teachers were, or to what school they belonged, is doubtful. It is an old opinion that they were Docetae (Tertullian, De carne Christi, 1, 24; Dionys. Al. ap. Eusebius, H.E. 7, 25), and to this many recent inquirers have given in their adherence. Lücke, who strenuously defends this view, attempts to show that Docetism was in vogue as early as the time of John by an appeal to the case of Cerinthus and to the references to Docetism in three of the epistles of Ignatius (Ad Smyrn. 2 sq.; Ad Trall. 10; Ad Eph. 7); but the doctrine of Cerinthus respecting the person of Jesus Christ was not Docetic in the proper sense, and the passages cited from Ignatius are all subject to the suspicion of being interpolations, as none of them are found in the Syriac recension. Lücke lays stress also on the words ἐν σαρκί ἐληλυθότα (4, 2; comp. 2Jn 1:7) as indicating an express antithesis to the doctrine of the Docetics that Christ had come only in appearance. It may be doubted, however, whether this means anything more than that Christ had  really come, the phrase ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλθεῖν being probably a familiar technicality for this among the Christians. It may be questioned, also, whether the passage should not be translated thus, “Every spirit which confesseth Jesus Christ having [who has] come in the flesh is of God,” rather than thus, “Every spirit which confesseth that Jesus Christ is come,” etc. (for ὁμολογεῖν with the accusative, see Joh 9:22; Act 23:8; Rom 10:9; 1Ti 6:12), and in this case even the appearance of allusion to a contrary doctrine vanishes (see Bleek, Einleit. p. 593). It may be added that, had John intended to express a direct antithesis to Docetism, he would hardly have contented himself with merely using the words ἐν σαρκὶ ἐλθεῖν, for there is a sense in which even the Docetae would have admitted this.

The main object of the Epistle, therefore, does not appear to be simply that of opposing the errors of the Docetae (Schmidt, Bertholdt, Niemeyer), or of the Gnostics (Kleuker), or of the Nicolaitans (Macknight), or of the Cerinthians (Michaelis), or of all of them together (Townsend), or of the Sabians (Barkey, Storr, Keil), or of Judaizers (Löffler, Semler), or of apostates to Judaism (Lange, Eichhorn, Hänlein): the leading purpose of the apostle appears to be rather constructive than polemical. John is remarkable both in his history and in his writings for his abhorrence of false doctrine, but he does not attack error as a controversialist. He states the deep truth and lays down the deep moral teaching of Christianity, and in this way, rather than directly, condemns heresy. In the introduction (1Jn 1:1-4) the apostle states the purpose of his Epistle. It is to declare the Word of life to those whom he is addressing, in order that he and they might be united in true communion with each other and with God the Father and his Son Jesus Christ. He at once begins to explain the nature and conditions of communion with God, and, being led on from this point into other topics, he twice brings himself back to the same subject. The first part of the Epistle may be considered to end at 1Jn 2:28. The apostle begins afresh with the doctrine of sonship of communion at 1Jn 2:29 and returns to the same theme at 1Jn 4:7. His lesson throughout is, that the means of union with God are, on the part of Christ, his atoning blood (1Jn 1:7; 1Jn 2:2; 1Jn 3:5; 1Jn 4:10; 1Jn 4:14; 1Jn 5:6) and advocacy (1Jn 2:1) — on the part of man, holiness (1Jn 1:6), obedience (1Jn 2:3), purity (1Jn 3:3), faith (1Jn 3:23; 1Jn 4:3; 1Jn 5:5), and, above all, love (1Jn 2:7; 1Jn 3:14; 1Jn 4:7; 1Jn 5:1). John is designated as the Apostle of Love and rightly; but it  should be even remembered that his “love” does not exclude or ignore but embraces both faith and obedience as constituent parts of itself. Indeed, Paul's “faith that worketh by love,” and James' “works that are the fruit of faith,” and John's “love which springs from faith and produces obedience,” are all one and the same state of mind described according to the first, third, or second stage into which we are able to analyze the complex whole.

IX. Commentaries. — The special exegetical helps on the whole of the three epistles of John, besides those mentioned under the Gospel above, are the following, of which we designate the most important by prefixing an asterisk: Didymus, In Ep. Jo. (in Bibl. Max. Patr. 5; also in Bibl. Patr. Gall. 6); Bede, Expositio (in Opp. 5); Althamer, Commentarius (Argent. 1521, 1528, 8vo); Hemming, Commentarius (Vitemb. 1569, 8vo) ; Selnecker, Homilioe (Franc. 1580, 1597, 8vo); Danaeus, Commentarius (Genev. 1585, 8vo); Horne, Expositio [including Jude] (Brunsw. 1654, to); Rappolt, Commentatio (ed. Carpzov, Lips. 1687, and later, 4to); Creyghton, Ontleeding (Franec. 1704, 4to); J. Lange, Exegesis (Hal. 1713, 4to; including Pet., ib. 1724, fol.); Rusmeyer, Erklärung (Hamb. 1717, 4to); Whiston, Commentary (Lond. 1719, 8vo); Tgilde, Verklaaring (Delph. 1736, 4to); Ruhlius, Notoe (Amst. 1739, 12mo); Benson, Notes (London, 1749, 4to; includ. other cath. ep., ib. 1756, 4to); Schirmer, Erklärung (Breslau. 1780, 8vo); Morus, Proelectiones (edit. Hempel, Lips. 1797, 8vo); Hawkins, Commentary (Halifax. 1808, 8vo); Jaspis, Adnotatio [includ. Rev.] (Lips. 1816, 1821, 8vo); Paulus, Erklärung (Heidelberg, 1829, 8vo); Bickersteth, Exposition [includ. Jude] (London, 1846, 12mo); Braune, Auslegung (Grim. 1847, 8vo); Mayer, Commentar (Wien, 1851, 8vo); Sander. Commentar (Elberf. 1851, 8vo); Besser, Auslegung (Halle, 1851, 1856, 1862, 12mo); \*Düsterdieck, Commentar (Götting. 1852-56, 2 vols. 8vo);. \*Huther, in Meyer's Handbuch (Getting. 1853, 1861, 8vo); \*Maurice, Lectures (Cambr. 1857, 1867, 8vo).

On the First Epistle alone there are the following: Augustine, Tractsatus (in Opp. 4, 1091; tr. into French. Par. 1670, 12mo); Luther, Commentarius (ed. Neumann, Lips. 1708; ed. Bruns, Lub. 1797, 8vo; also in German, in Werke, Lpz. 11, 572; Halle, 9, 906); Œcolampadius, Homilioe (Basil. 1525, 8vo); Zwingle, Annotationes (in Opp. 4, 585); Tyndale, Expositions (London, 1531, 8vo reprinted, in Expositions, ib. 1829, p. 145); Megander Adnotationes [includ. Hebrews] (Tigur. 1539, 8vo); Foleng, Commentaria (Venice, 1546, 8vo); Beurlinus, Commentarius (Ttibing. 1571, 8vo);  Hunnius, Enarratio (F. ad M. 1586, 1592, 8vo); Hessels, Commentarius (Duaci, 1599, 8vo); Eckhard, Disputationes (Gies. 1609, 8vo); Socinus, Commentarius (Racov. 1614, 8vo; also in Opp. 1, 157); Egard, Erklärung (Gosl. 1628, 8vo); Cundisius, Quoestiones (Jena, 1648,1698, 4to); Roberts, Evidences, etc. (Lond. 1649, 8vo); Mestrezat, Exposition (Fr., Genève, 1651, 2 vols. 12mo); Cotton, Commentary (Lond. 1656, fol.); Hardy, Unfolding [on 1-3] (Lond. 1656-9, 2 vols. 4to); \*S. Schmid, Commentarius (F. et Lipsiae, 1687, 1707, 1736, 4to); Dorsche, Disputationes (Rostock, 1697, 4to); Spener, Erklärung (Halle, 1699, 1711, 4to); Zeller, Predigten (Lpz. 1709, 8vo); Marperger, Auslegang (Nürnb. 1710, 4to); Oporinus, Liberatio (Gitting. 1741, 4to); Freylinghausen, Erklärung (Halle, 1741, 8vo); Steinhofer, Erklärung (Tübing. 1762, Hamb. 1848, 8vo); Carpzov, Scholia (Helmstadt, 1773, 4to); Semler, Paraphrasis (Riga, 1792, 12mo); Hesselgren, Prolegomena (Upsala, 1800, 8vo); Weber, De authentia, etc. (Halle 1823, 4to); Rickli, Erklärung (Luz. 1828, 8vo); Pierce, Sermons (Lond. 1835, 2 vols. 8vo); Johannsen, Predigten (Alton. 1838, 8vo); Paterson, Commentary (Lond. 1842, 18mo); Thomas, Etudes, etc. (Genesis 1849, 8vno); \*Neander, Erläuterung (Berl. 1851, 8vo; tr. into Engl. by Mrs. Conant, N.Y. 1852, 12mo); Erdmann, Argumentum. etc. (Berol. 1855, 8vo); Graham, Commentary (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Myrberg, Commentarius (Upsala, 1859, 8vo); Handcock, Exposition (Edinburgh, 1861, 8vo); Candlish, Lectures (Edinburgh, 1866, 8vo); Haupt, Einleitung, etc. (Colb. 1869, 8vo). SEE EPISTLES (CATHOLIC).

## John, Frederick[[@Headword:John, Frederick]]

             (surnamed the Magnanimous), elector of Saxony, son of John the Constant (q.v.), was born at 'Torgau, June 30, 1503. Brought up in the Church of the Reformation, he became its unwavering advocate, and, like his father, he was on terms of most intimate friendship with Luther, with whom he carried on an uninterrupted correspondence. He increased the endowment of Wittenberg University from the sequestrated revenues of convents, and in 1548 founded the University of Jena. His relations to the emperor were unpleasant. In 1536 he entered into a reaffirmation of the Smalcald league, by which the Protestant princes bound themselves to mutual protection for ten years. In 1544 the emperor Charles V was left free to give his whole  attention to the affairs in Germany. A war broke out. Frederick was finally defeated, and taken prisoner at Miihlberg, April 24, 1547. He remained in prison till 1552, and died at Weimar, March 3, 1554. John Frederick remained true to the cause of the Evangelical Church in spite of his many misfortunes. See Muller, Geschichte Johann Friedrich des Grossmuthigen (Jena, 1765); Ranke, Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation, 4:190 sq.; Burkhardt, Die Gefangenschaft Joh. Fr. d. Grossmuthigen (1863); Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. , Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## John, Gospel Of[[@Headword:John, Gospel Of]]

             The fourth in order of the evangelical narratives in nearly all editions, though a few MSS. place it immediately after Matthew. SEE GOSPELS.

I. Genuineness. — There is no reason to doubt that the fourth Gospel was from the beginning received in the Church as the production of the apostle whose name it bears. We may decline to accept as a testimony for this the statement at the close of the Gospel itself (Joh 21:24), for this can have the force of an independent testimony only on the supposition that the passage was added by another hand; and though there is an evident allusion  in 2Pe 1:14 to what is recorded in Joh 21:18-19, yet, as that saying of the Lord was one which tradition would be sure to send forth among the brethren (compare Joh 21:23), it cannot be inferred from Peter's allusion to it that it was then put on record as we have it in the Gospel. We may also admit that the passages in the writings of the apostolic fathers which have been adduced as evincing, on their part, acquaintance with this Gospel are not decisive. The passages usually cited for this purpose are Barnab. Ep. 5, 6, 12 (comp. Joh 3:14); Herm. Past. Sim. 9, 12 (compare Joh 10:7; Joh 10:9; Joh 14:6); Ignat, Ad Magnes. 7 (comp. Joh 12:49; Joh 10:30; Joh 14:11). See Lardner, Works, vol. 2. All of them may owe their accordance with John's statements to the influence of true tradition, or to the necessary resemblance of the just utterance of Christian thought and feeling by different men; though in three other passages cited from Ignatius (Ad Romans 7; Ad Trall. 8; and Ad Philad. 7) the coincidence of the first two with Joh 6:32 sq., and of the last with Joh 3:8, is almost too close to be accounted for in this way (Ebrard, Evang. Joh. p, 102; Rothe, Anfänge der Christl. Kirche, p. 715). But Eusebius attests that this Gospel was among the books universally received in the Church (Hist. Eccles. 3, 25); and it cannot be doubted that it formed part of the canon of the churches, both of the East and West, before the end of the 2d century. SEE CANON.

It is in the Peshito, and in the Muratori Fragment. It is quoted or referred to by Justin Martyr (Apol. 1, 52, 61; 2, 6; c. Tryph. 105, etc.; compare Olshausen, Echtheit der Kan. Evv. p. 304 sq.), by Tatian (Orat. ad Groecos, 4, 13, 19), who, indeed, composed a Diatessaron (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 4, 29; Theod. Hoeret. Fab. 1, 20), in preparing which he must have had this gospel before him; in the Epistle of the Church at Vienne and Lyons (Euseb. 5, 1); by Melito of Sardes (see Pitra; Spicileg. Solmense, 1, Prolegom. p. 5, Paris, 1852); by Athenagoras (Leg. pro Christ. 10); by Apollinaris (Frag. Chronicles Pasch. p. 14, ed. Dindorf); by Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 5, 24); and in the Clementine Homilies (19, 22, ed. Dressel, 1853), in such a way that not only is its existence proved, but evidence is afforded of the esteem in which it was held as canonical from the middle of the 2d century. Still more precise is the testimony of Theophilus, bishop of Antioch, who not only composed a Harmony of the four evangelists (Jerome, De viris Illust. 25; Ep. 151, ad Algasiam), but in an extant work (ad Autol. 2, 22) expressly quotes Joh 1:1 as part of holy Scripture, and as the production of the apostle, whom he ranks among the πνευματοφόροι.

More important still is the testimony of Irenaeus (Hoer. 3, 11, 3, p. 218, ed. Grabe), both  because of his acquaintance in early youth with Polycarp, and because of the distinctness and confidence with which he asserts the Johannean origin of this Gospel. SEE IRENAEUS.

To these testimonies may be added that of Celsus, the enemy of the Christians, who, in preparing his attack upon them, evidently had the four canonical Gospels before him, and of whose citations from them some are undoubtedly from that of John (compare Olshausen, ut sup. p. 349, 355; Lücke, Comment. 1, 68 sq., 3d edit.); which shows that, at the time when he wrote, this Gospel must have been in general acceptance by the Christians as canonical. The heretic Marcion, also, in rejecting this Gospel on dogmatical grounds, is a witness to the fact that its canonical authority was generally held by the Christians (Tertull. c. Marcion, 4, 5; De Carne Christi). That the Gospel was recognized as canonical by the Valentinians, one of the most important sects of the 2d century, is placed beyond doubt by the statement of Irenaeus (Hoer. 3, 11), and by the fact that it is quoted by Ptolemaeus, a disciple of Valentinus (Epiphan. Hoer. 33, 3), and was commented on by Heracleon, another of his disciples, both of whom lived about the middle of the 2d century. That Valentinus himself knew and used the book is rendered probable by this, and by the statement of Tertullian (De Proescr. Hoeret. 38), that Valentinus accepted the Biblical canon entire, though he perverted its meaning; and this probability is raised to certainty by the fact that, in the recently discovered work of Hippolytus, Valentinus is found twice (Philosoph. 6, 33, 34, ed. Miller) citing the phrase ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, as applied to the devil, which occurs only in John's Gospel, and repeatedly there (12, 31; 14:30; 16:11); and also quoting the saying, Joh 10:8, as the word of Christ. From the same source also (7, 22, 27, p. 232, 242) we learn that Basilides was acquainted with John's Gospel, and cited it; and this brings us up to the beginning of the 2d century, within a short time of the apostle's death.

This concurrence of external testimony is the more noticeable as there are certain peculiarities in the fourth Gospel which would have thrown suspicion on its genuineness had not that been placed beyond doubt by the knowledge which the Christians had of its having proceeded from the pen of John. Such pre the prominence given to the extra-Galilean ministry of our Lord the record of remarkable miracles, such as the healing of the impotent man (ch. 5), of the blind man (ch. 9), the raising from the dead of Lazarus, and others, omitted by the other evangelists; the insertion of so many discourses of Jesus, of which no hint is found in the other  Gospels, as well as the omission of remarkable facts in the evangelic history, especially the institution of the supper and the agony in the garden; and certain important apparent discrepancies between this and the synoptical Gospels. In perfect keeping with this assumption, also, is the entire tone, spirit, and character of the Gospel; it is emphatically, as Clement of Alexandria calls it, the πνευματικὸν εὐαγγέλιον, and breathes throughout the spirit which was characteristic of “the disciple whom Jesus loved.” The work is evidently the production of one who was, as the writer professes to be (Joh 1:14 [comp. 1Jn 1:1; 1Jn 4:14]; Joh 19:35; Joh 21:24), an eyewitness of what he narrates; and there is a simplicity, a naturalness, and a vividness in the whole narrative, which no forger of a later age could have attained — which the very consciousness of composing what was intended to be an imposition would have precluded.

The remarkable manner also in which the writer avoids introducing John by name (Joh 13:23; Joh 19:16; Joh 20:2-4; Joh 21:7; Joh 21:24) affords additional evidence that John himself was the writer. It has been urged also by some (Bleek, Ebrard, Credner) that the use of the simple Ι᾿ωάννης, without in any case the addition of the usual ὁ Βαπτιστής, to designate the Baptist, in this Gospel, is an evidence of its being the production of John the apostle, on the ground that, “supposing the apostle not to be the writer, one would expect that he should, like the Synoptists, discriminate the Baptist from the apostle by this epithet, whereas, supposing the apostle himself to be the writer, he would feel less prompted to do so” (Bleek, Einleit. in das N.T. p. 148); but to this much weight cannot be attached; for, though it is probable that a writer, taking his materials from the other evangelists, would have designated John as they do, and though, as Meyer suggests (Krit. Exeget. Comm., Einleitung in das Ev. des Johannes, p. 23), it is probable that John, who had been a disciple of the Baptist, might prefer speaking of him by the name by which he had been accustomed to designate him during their personal intercourse rather than by his historical name, yet, as we cannot tell what considerations might have occurred to a forger writing in the apostle's name to induce him to drop the distinctive epithet, it is hardly competent for us to accept this omission as a proof that the work is not the production of a forger. It is needless to press every minute particular into the service of the argument for the genuineness of this Gospel; it is impossible to read it without feeling that it is Johannean in all its parts, and that, had it been the production of any other than the apostle, that other must in mind, spirit, affection, circumstances, and character, have been a second John.  Attempts to impugn the genuineness of this Gospel have been comparatively recent (Guerike, Einleitung, p. 303).

The work of Bretschneider, entitled Probabilia de Evangelii et Epp. Johannis apost. indole et origine (Lips. 1820), is the earliest formal attack of any importance made upon it; and this, the author has himself assured us, was made by him with a view to exciting anew and extending inquiry into the genuineness of the Johannean writings, an end which, he adds, has been gained, so that the doubts he suggested may be regarded as discharged (Dogmatik, 1, 268, 3d ed.). Since that work appeared, the claims of the Gospel have been opposed by Strauss in his Leben Jesu; by Weisse in his Evangelische Geschichte; by Lützelberger (Die Kirchliche Tradition ub. d. Apost. Joh. Lpz. 1848, and in many other forms since); by Baur (Krit. Untersuch. über die Kanonischen Evang.); by Hilgenfeld (Des Evang. und die Briefe Joh. nach ihrem Lehrbegr. dargestellt, Halle, 1849), and by others. But the reasons advanced by these writers have so little force, and have been so thoroughly replied to, that even in Germany the general opinion has reverted to the ancient and catholic belief in respect of the authorship of the fourth Gospel. See Tholuck, Glaubwürdigkeit der Evangel. Gesch.; Ebrard. Kritik d. Evangel. Geschichte (Zür. 1850, 2d ed.); Ewald, Jahrbuch, 3, 146; 5, 178; Meyer, Kritik. Exeg. Comm. 2, Th. 2 Abt. (Gött. 1856, 3d edit.); Bleek, Einl. in das N.T. (Berlin, 1862); Davidson, Introduction to the New Test. 1, 233 sq.; Schaff, Church History (Apostolic Age), § 105. The importance of the fourth Gospel as a proof of the divine character of Jesus Christ led to this special assault on its genuineness by the Rationalists of the Tübingen school and their imitators elsewhere, but without shaking the convictions of the Church at large. SEE JESUS CHRIST.

For further details of the controversy, see Fisher, Supernat. Origin of Christianity (new edit. N.Y. 1870); Pressense, Apostol. Age (N.Y. 1871), p. 509 sq. SEE RATIONALISM. The most important other express treatises in opposition to the authenticity of John's Gospel are those of Bruno Bauer (Brem. 1840, Berl. 1850), Zeller (Jahrb. 1845 sq.), Köstlin (ib. 1853), Volkmar (in several works and arts. in Germ. journals). Scholten (Leid. 1864, etc.), Matthes (ib. 1867), Tayler (Lond. 1867); in favor, Stein (Brandenb. 1822), Crome (Lpzg. 1824), Hauff (Nürnb. 1831, and in the Stud. und Krit. 1846, 1849), Weitzel (ib. 1849), Mayer (Schaffh. 1854), Schneider (Berl. 1854), Tischendorf (Lpzg. 1865 and since), Riggenbach (Basel, 1866), Witticher (Elberf. 1869), Pfeiffer (St. Gall. 1870), Row (in the Journal of Sacred Lit. 1865, 1866, etc.),  Clarke (in the Christian Examiner, 1868); see also the Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. July, 1861, p. 553; Westminster Rev. Ap. 1865, p. 192.

III. Integrity. — Certain portions of this Gospel have been regarded as interpolations or later additions, even by those who accept the Gospel as a whole as the work of John. One of these is the closing part of Joh 1:2, from ἐκδεχομένων, and the whole of Joh 1:4, in regard to which the critical authorities fluctuate, and which contain statements that give a legendary aspect to the narrative, such as belongs to no other of the miracles related in the Gospels. Both are rejected by Tischendorf, but retained by Lachmann; and the same diversity of judgment appears among interpreters, some rejecting both passages (Lücke, Tholuck, Olshausen), others retaining both (Buckner), others rejecting Joh 1:4, but retaining Joh 1:2 (Ewald), while some leave the whole in doubt (De Wette).

Another doubtful portion is the section relating to the woman taken in adultery (Joh 7:53 to Joh 8:11). This is regarded as an interpolation because of the deficiency of critical evidence in its favor (see Tischendorf or Alford, ad loc.), and because of reasons founded on the passage itself, viz. the apparently forced way in which it is connected with what precedes by means of Joh 7:53; the interruption caused by it to the course of the narrative, the words in Joh 8:12 being evidently in continuation of what precedes this section; the alleged going of Jesus to the Mount of Olives and return to Jerusalem, which would place this occurrence in the last residence of our Lord in Jerusalem (Luk 21:37); the absence of the characteristic usage of the ουν, which John so constantly introduces into his narratives, and for which we have in this section δέ, used as John generally uses οàν; and the presence of the expressions ὄρθρον, πᾶς ὁ λαός καθίσας ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς, οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι, ἐπιμένειν, ἀναμάρτητος, καταλείπεσθαι and κατακρίνειν, which are foreign to John's style. On the other side, it is urged that the section contains, as Calvin says, “Nihil apostolico spiritu indignum,” that it has no appearance of a later legend, but bears every trace of an original account-of a very probable fact, and that it has a considerable amount of diplomatic evidence in its favor. The question is one which hardly admits of a decided answer. The preponderance of evidence is, undoubtedly against the Johannean origin of the section, and it has consequently been regarded as an interpolation by the great majority of critics and interpreters, including among the latter Calvin, Beza, Tittmann, Tholuck, Olshausen, Lücke, and Luthardt, as well as Grotius, De Wette, Paulus, and Ewald. At the same time, if it did not  form part of the original Gospel, it is difficult to account for its being at so early a period inserted in it. From a passage in Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 3, 39) some have concluded that Papias inserted it from the Gospel according to the Hebrews; but it is not certain that it is to this section that the words of Eusebius refer, nor is it certain that he meant to say that Papias inserted the story he refers to in the Gospel. SEE ADULTERY, vol. 1, p. 87.

More important than either of these portions is chap. 21, which is by many regarded as the addition of a later hand after the apostle's death. This opinion rests wholly on internal grounds, for there is no evidence that the Gospel was ever known in the Church without this chapter. At first sight it certainly appears as if the original work ended with ch. 20 and that ch. 21 was a later addition, but whether by the apostle himself or by some other is open to question. The absence of any trace of the Gospel having ever existed without it must be allowed to afford strong prima facie evidence of its having been added by the author himself; still this is not conclusive, for the addition may have been made by one of his friends or disciples before the work was in circulation. Grotius, who thinks it was made by the elders at Ephesus, argues against its genuineness, especially from Joh 21:24; but, though the language there has certainly the appearance of being rather that of others than that of the party himself to whom it refers, still it is not impossible that John may have referred to himself in the third person, as he does, for instance, in Joh 19:35; and as for the use of the pl. οἴδαμεν, that may be accounted for by his tacitly joining his readers with himself, just as he assumes their presence in Joh 19:35. There is more difficulty in accepting Joh 19:25 as genuine, for such a hyperbolical mode of expression does not seem to comport with the simplicity and sincerity of John; but there seems to be no valid reason for calling into doubt any other part of the chapter.

IV. Design. — At the close of the Gospel the apostle has himself stated his design in writing it thus: “These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and that, believing, ye might have life through his name” (20:31). Taken in the general, this may be said to be the design of all the evangelical narratives, for all of them are intended to produce the conviction that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah promised to the fathers, and so to exhibit him in his saving power that men believing on him might enjoy that life which he had come to bestow. We must seek, therefore, John's specific design either in some special occasion which he sought to meet, or in some peculiarity in his mode of presenting the claims of Jesus, by which not merely his Messiahship should be evinced, but the  higher aspect of his person, and the spiritual effects of his working, should be prominently exhibited. Probably both of these concurred in the apostle's design; and we shall best conceive his purpose by neither, on the one hand, ascribing to him a merely historical, nor, on the other, a purely dogmatical design. It is an old and still prevalent opinion that John wrote his Gospel to supply the omissions of the other three; but no such impression is conveyed by the Gospel itself, which is as far as possible from having the appearance of a mere series of supplemental notes to previously existing writings; indeed, if this had been the apostle's purpose, it cannot be said that he has in any adequate way fulfilled it. Nor is there any ground for believing that it was a polemical object which chiefly prompted him to write this Gospel, though such a suggestion has often been made. Thus Irenaeus (Hoer. 3, 11, 1) says that the Gospel was written against the errors of Cerinthus. Jerome (De vir. Illust. 9) adds the Ebionites, and later writers have maintained that the Gnostics or the Docetae are the parties against whom the polemic of the apostle is here directed. All this, however, is mere supposition. Doubtless in what John has written there is that which furnishes a full refutation of all Ebionitish, Gnostic, and Docetic heresy; but that to confute these was the design of the apostle, as these writers affirm, cannot be proved. SEE GNOSTICS.

At the same time, though he may have had no intention of formally confuting any existing heresy, it is more than probable that he was stimulated to seek by means of this record to counteract certain tendencies which he saw rising in the Church, and by which the followers of Christ might be seduced from that simple faith in him by which alone the true life could be enjoyed. Still this must be regarded, at the utmost, as furnishing only the occasion, not the design, of his writing. The latter is to be sought in the effect which this Gospel is fitted to produce on the mind of the reader in regard to the claims of Jesus as the divine Redeemer, the source of light and life to darkened and perishing humanity. With this view John presents him to us as he tabernacled among men, and especially as he taught when occasion called forth the deeper revelations which he, as the Word who had come forth from the invisible God to reveal unto men the Father, had to communicate. John's main design is a theological one; a conviction of which doubtless led to his receiving in the primitive Church the title κατ᾿ ἐξοχήν of Θεόλογος. But the historical character of his writing must also be acknowledged. As one who had been privileged to “company” with Jesus, he seeks to present him to us as he really appeared among men, in very deed a partaker of their nature, yet, under that nature, veiling a higher, which ever and anon broke forth in manifestation, so that  those around him “beheld his glory as the glory of the Only Begotten of the Father” (Joh 1:14). “There is here no history of Jesus and his teaching after the manner of the other evangelists; but there is, in historical form, a representation of the Christian faith, in relation to the person of Christ, as its central point, and in this representation there is a picture, on the one hand, of the antagonism of the world to the truth revealed in him, and on the other of the spiritual blessedness of the few who yield themselves to him as the Light of Life” (Reuss, Gesch. der Heil. Sch. d. N.T. p. 204). As John doubtless had the other Gospels before him, without formally designing to supplement them, he would naturally enlarge more particularly upon those portions which they had left untouched, or passed over more briefly.

IV. Contents. — The Gospel begins with a prologue, in which the author presents the great theme of which his subsequent narrative is to furnish the detailed illustration — “the theological program of his history,” as one has called it, and which another has compared to the overture of a musical composition in which the leading idea of the piece is expressed (Joh 1:1-5). The historical exposition begins with Joh 1:6, and the rest of the book may be divided into two parts. Of these the former (Joh 1:6-7) contains the account of our Lord's public ministry from his introduction to it by John the Baptist and his solemn consecration to it by God, to its close in the Passion Week. In this portion we have the Savior presented to us chiefly in his manifestation to the world as a teacher sent from God, whose mission is authenticated by signs and wonders, and whose doctrines, truly divine, transcend in their spiritual import the narrow limits of human speculation, and can be comprehended only by a spiritual discernment. The second portion (ch. 13-21) may be divided into two parts, the one of which is introductory to the other. The former (ch. 13-17) presents to us our Lord in the retirement of private life, in his intercourse with his immediate followers, to whom he pours out his soul in loving counsel, warning, and promise, in the prospect of his departure from them; and in communion with his heavenly Father, with whom, as one who had finished the work he had received to do, he intercedes for those whose redemption from sin and evil is the coveted recompense of his obedience. To this succeeds the account of the Passion, and the appearances of Christ to his disciples after his resurrection (ch. 18-21), which forms the other part of the second portion of the book. See the minute analysis of Lampe in his  Comment., and a briefer one in Westcott, Introd. to Study of the Gospels, p. 281 sq.

The greater part of the book is occupied with the discourses of our Lord, the plan of the evangelist being obviously to bring the reader as much as possible into personal contact with Jesus, and to make the latter his own expositor. Regarding the discourses thus reported, the question has arisen, How far are they to be accepted as an exact report of what Jesus uttered? and in reply to this, three opinions have been advanced:

1. That both in substance and in form we have them as they came from the lips of Christ;

2. That in substance they present what Christ uttered, but that the form in which they appear is due to the evangelist; and,

3. That they are not the discourses of Christ in any proper sense, but only speeches put in his mouth by the evangelist to express what the latter conceived to be a just representation of his doctrine. Of these views the last has found adherents only among a few of the skeptical school; it is without the slightest authority from the book itself, is irreconcilable with the simplicity and earnestness of the writer, is foreign to the habits and notions of the class to which the evangelist belongs, and is contradicted by the frequent explanations which he introduces of the sense in which he understood what he reports (comp. Joh 2:19; Joh 2:21; Joh 7:38-39; Joh 12:32-33, etc.), by the brief notices, which evince an actual reminiscence of the scenes and circumstances amid which the discourse was delivered (e.g. Joh 14:31), and by the prophetic announcements of his impending sufferings and death ascribed to the Savior, which are couched in language such as he might naturally use, such as accounts for those to whom he spoke, even his disciples, not understanding his meaning, but such as it is utterly incredible that one not desirous of reporting his very words should, writing after the fulfilment of these predictions, impute to him (comp. Joh 7:33-36; Joh 8:21-22; Joh 10:17-20; Joh 12:23-36; Joh 14:1-4; Joh 14:18; Joh 14:28; Joh 16:16; Joh 16:19, etc.). Some of these considerations are of weight also as against the second of the opinions above stated; for, if John sought merely to give the substance of the Savior's teaching in his own words, why clothe predictions, the meaning of which at the time of his writing he perfectly understood, in obscure and difficult phraseology? Why especially impute to the speaker language of which he feels it necessary to give an explanation, instead of at once putting the intelligible statement in his discourse?  Undoubtedly the impression which one gets from the narrative is that John means the discourses he ascribes to Jesus to be received as faithful reports of what he actually uttered; and this is confirmed when one compares his report of John the Baptist's sayings with those of our Lord, the character of the one being totally different from that of the other.

To this view it has been objected that there is such an identity of style in the discourses which John ascribes to Christ with his own style, both in this Gospel and in his Epistles, as betrays in the former the hand, not of a faithful reporter, but of one who gives in the manner natural to himself the substance of what his Master taught. In this there is some force, which is but partially met by the suggestion that John was so imbued with the very mind and soul of Christ, so informed by his doctrine, and so filled by his spirit, that his own manner of thought and utterance became the same as that of Christ, and he insensibly wrote and spoke in the style of his Lord. Reuss objects to this that on this supposition the style of Jesus “must have been a very uniform and sharply defined one, and such as excludes the very different style ascribed to him by the synoptists” (Gesch. der H.S. des N.T. p. 203). But the facts here are overstated; the style of our Lord's discourses in John is by no means perfectly uniform, nor is it much further removed from that ascribed to him by the synoptists than the difference of subject and circumstance will suffice to account for. As for the objection that it is inconceivable that the evangelist could have retained for so many years a faithful recollection of discourses heard by him only once, we need not, in order to meet it, resort to the foolish suggestion of Bertholdt that he had taken notes of them at the time for his own behoof; nor need we to lay stress on the assurance of Christ which John records that the Holy Ghost whom the Father should send to them would teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever he had said unto them (Joh 14:26), though to the believer this is a fact of the utmost importance. It will suffice to meet the objection if we suggest that, as the apostle went forth to the world as a witness for Christ, he did not wait till he sat down to write his Gospel to give forth his recollections of his Master's words and deeds. What he narrates here in writing is only what he must have been repeating constantly during his whole apostolic career. Still, after due allowance has been made for all these considerations, it must yet be admitted that the decided Johannean cast of all these discourses, as compared with our Lord's sayings reported in the synoptical Gospels, shows that while the evangelist gives the substance and essential form of Christ's public utterances, he nevertheless, to a large degree, molds them  into his own style of phraseology and coherence. This is especially true of Joh 12:44-50, which is evidently a summary of statements made on perhaps more than one occasion not definitely given. Indeed, it is doubtful if any of the evangelists give us the exact words of our Lord, as they certainly do not tally in this particular any more than they do in the order and connection in which these are narrated. (See Tholuck, Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte [2d edit.], p. 314 sq.). SEE HARMONIES.

V. Characteristics. —

1. As to matter, the peculiarities of John's Gospel more especially consist in the four following doctrines:

(1.) The mystical relation of the Son to the Father.

(2.) That of the Redeemer to believers.

(3.) The announcement of the Holy Ghost as the Comforter.

(4.) The peculiar importance ascribed to love.

Yet these peculiarities are not confined to this Gospel. Although there can be shown in the writings of the other evangelists some isolated dicta of the Lord which seem to bear the impress of John, it can also be shown that they contain thoughts not originating with that disciple, but with the Lord himself. Matthew (Mat 11:27) speaks of the relation of the Son to the Father so entirely in the style of John that persons not sufficiently versed in Holy Writ are apt to search for this passage in the Gospel of John. The mystical union of the Son with believers is expressed in Mat 28:20. The promise of the effusion of the Holy Ghost in order to perfect the disciples is found in Luk 24:49. The doctrine of Paul with respect to love, in 1 Corinthians 13 entirely resembles what, according to John, Christ taught on the same subject. Paul here deserves our particular attention. In the writings of Paul. are found Christian truths which have their points of coalescence only in John, viz., that Christ is the image of the invisible God, by whom all things are created (Col 1:15-16). Paul considers the Spirit of God in the Church the spiritual Christ, as Jesus himself does (Joh 14:16), frequently using the words ειναι ἐν Χριστῷ.

2. As to form, there is something peculiar in the evangelist's manner of writing. His language betrays traces of that Hebraistic character which belongs generally to the N.T. writers, and the author shows his Jewish descent by various incidental indications; but he writes purer Greek than most of the others, and his freedom from Judaic narrowness is so marked that some have founded on this an argument against the genuineness of the book, forgetting that the experiences of the apostle in his more advanced years would materially tend to correct the prejudices and party leanings of his earlier career. The apostle's style is marked by ease, simplicity, and vividness; his sentences are linked together rather by inner affinity in the thoughts than by outward forms of composition or dialectic concatenation they move on one after the other, generally with the help of an ουι, sometimes of a καί, and occasionally of a δέ, and favorite terms or phrases are repeated without regard to rhetorical art. The author wrote evidently for Hellenistic readers, but he makes no attempt at Greek elegance, or that wisdom of words which with many in his day constituted the perfection of Greek art. One of the peculiarities of John is that, in speaking of the adversaries of Jesus, he always calls them οιΙ῾᾿ουδαῖοι. The simplicity of John's character is also evinced by the repetition of certain leading thoughts, reproduced in the same words both in the Gospel and in the Epistles, such as μαρτυπία, testimony; δόξα, glory; ἀλήθεια, truth; φῶς, light; σκότος, darkness; ζωὴ αίωνιος, eternal life; μένειν, to abide. — Kitto. See Kaiser, De speciali Joan. Grammatica, etc. (Erlang. 1842); Westcott, Introd. to Study of the Gospels, ch. 5.

VI. Place of Writing. — Ephesus and Patmos are the two places mentioned by early writers, and the weight of evidence seems to preponderate in favor of Ephesus. Irenaeus (3:1; also apud Euseb. H.E. 5, 8) states that John published his Gospel whilst he dwelt in Ephesus of Asia. Jerome (Prol. in Matthew) states that John was in Asia when he complied with the request of the bishops of Asia and others to write more profoundly concerning the divinity of Christ. Theodore of Mopsuestia (Prol. in Joannem) relates that John was living at Ephesus when he was moved by his disciples to write his Gospel.

The evidence in favor of Patmos comes from two anonymous writers. The author of the Synopsis of Scripture, printed in the works of Athanasius, states that the Gospel was dictated by John in Patmos, and published afterwards in Ephesus. The author of the work De XII Apostolis, printed in the Appendix to Fabricius' Hippolytus (p. 952 [ed. Migne]), states that  John was banished by Domitian to Patmos, where he wrote his Gospel. The later date of these unknown writers, and the seeming inconsistency of their testimony with John's declaration (Rev 1:2) in Patmos, that he had previously borne record of the Word of God, render their testimony of little weight.

After the destruction of Jerusalem, A.D. 70, Ephesus probably became the center of the active life of Eastern Christendom. Even Antioch, the original source of missions to the Gentiles, and the future metropolis of the Christian patriarch, appears, for a time, less conspicuous in the obscurity of early Church history than Ephesus, to which Paul inscribed his Epistle, and in which John found a dwelling place and a tomb. This half Greek, half Oriental city, “visited by ships from all parts of the Mediterranean, and united by great roads with the markets of the interior, was the common meeting place of various characters and classes of men” (Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, ch. 14). It contained a large church of faithful Christians, a multitude of zealous Jews, an indigenous population devoted to the worship of a strange idol, whose image (Jerome, Proef. in Ephes.) was borrowed from the East, its name from the West — in the Xystus of Ephesus free thinking philosophers of all nations disputed over their favorite tenets (Justin, Trypho, 1, 7). It was the place to which Cerinthus chose to bring the doctrines which he devised or learned at Alexandria (Neander, Church History, 1, 396 [Torrey's trans.]). In this city, and among the lawless heathens in its neighborhood (Clem. Alexan. Quis dives salv. § 42), John was engaged in extending the Christian Church when, for the greater edification of that Church, his Gospel was written. It was obviously addressed primarily to Christians, not to heathens. SEE EPHESUS.

VII. Date of Writing. — Attempts have been made to elicit from the language of the Gospel itself some argument which should decide the question whether it was written before or after the destruction of Jerusalem; but, considering that the present tense “is” is used in Joh 5:2, and the past tense “was” in Joh 11:18; Joh 18:1; Joh 19:41, it would seem reasonable to conclude that these passages throw no light upon the question.

Clement of Alexandria (apud Eusebius, H.E. 6, 14) speaks of John as the latest of the evangelists. The apostle's sojourn at Ephesus probably began after Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians was written, i.e. after A.D. 56.  Eusebius (H.E. 3, 20) specifies the fourteenth year of Domitian, i.e. A.D. 95, as the year of his banishment to Patmos. Probably the date of the Gospel may lie between these two, about A.D. 90. The references to it in the 1st Epistle and the Revelation lead to the supposition that it was written somewhat before those two books, and the tradition of its supplementary character would lead us to place it some considerable time after the apostle had fixed his abode at Ephesus.
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## John, Jacobite Bishop Of Dara[[@Headword:John, Jacobite Bishop Of Dara]]

             (a city in Mesopotamia, near Nisibis) in the first half of the 9th century (not in the 6th or 7th, as says Cave in his Hist. Litt. 2, 131, nor in the 4th, as is maintained by Abraham Ecchelensis, nor in the 8th, as it is said by Assemani in his Bibliotheca Orientalis, 2, 118; see also 2, 219 and 347). He was a contemporary of Dionys. of Telmahar, who dedicated his chronicle to him (see Assemani, Bibl. Orient. 2, 247). A manuscript of the Vatican, used by Abraham Ecchelensis, contains three works in Syriac by John:

1. De resurrectione coporum, in four books: —

2. De hierarchia celesti et ecclesiastica, two books, ascribed to the pseudo-Dionysius on account of the similarity of names: —

3. De sacerdotio, four books (Assemani, 2, 118 sq.). He is also considered as the author of the book De Anima (Assemani, 2, 219), which he probably composed after the work of Gregory of Nyssa, whose writings he also used otherwise (Assemani, 3, 22); and also an Anaphora (according to the Catalogus liturgiarum. by Schulting, pt. 3, p. 106, No. 29). — Herzog. Real-Encyk 6, 746. (J.N.P.)

## John, Monophysite (Missionary) Bishop Of Ephesus[[@Headword:John, Monophysite (Missionary) Bishop Of Ephesus]]

             generally called Episcopus Asioe, as Ephesus is the most important see of Asia Minor (see Assemani, Bibl. Orient. t. 2, Diss. de Monophysit. § 9, s.v. Asia), was a native of Amid (?), Syria, and lived in the 6th century (about 591). He resided chiefly in Constantinople, and was highly esteemed at court, especially during the reign of Justinian. The latter appointed him to inquire into the state of the heathen, of whom there was yet a large number in the empire, even in Constantinople and to secure their conversion.

Quite  successful in his efforts at home, the emperor authorized John to take a missionary tour through the whole empire, and we are told that this time he converted 70,000 people, and founded 96 churches (comp. Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ch. 43). He seems not to have had any direct spiritual jurisdiction over the metropolis of Asia Minor, but to have been honored with the title simply on account of his great success as a missionary, and we are inclined to believe that in reality he was simply a “missionary bishop,” for he is often styled “he who is sat over the heathen” (Syr. דצל חנפא), and also “the destroyer of idols” (Syr. מחבר פתכרא). How long John remained a favorite with Justinian we do not know, but have reason to suppose that his fate depended upon the success of his Monophysite brethren. In the reign of Justin II he shared largely in the sufferings which befell the Monophysites at the instigation of John of Sirimis. The period, circumstances, and place of his death are uncertain. He is probably the John Rhetor mentioned by Evagrius and Theodorus Lector, and whom the former calls (lib. 5, c. 24) his compatriot and his relative. Assemani (Bibl. Orient. 2, 84) opposes this identity, but without good reasons. John wrote a historical work, in three parts, in Syriac, which is of great importance for the Church history of the East.

The first part appears to be totally lost, and of the second only a few fragments, quoted by Assemani, are preserved to us. It is indeed the third part alone that has come down to us, and that only in a somewhat mutilated form. Dionysius of Telmahar, in his chronicle (from Theodosius the younger to Justin II), used this part freely; and Assemani obtained his passages (Biblioth. Orient. 1, 359-363, 409, 411-414; 2, 48 sq., 51, 52, 87-90, 312, 328, 329) from this source and from Bar-Hebraeus (Chron. Syr. ed. Bruns and Kirsch, p. 2, 83, 84). These were the only sources through which the work of John was known to us until the third part of it (somewhat incomplete) was discovered by William Cureton among the Syrian MSS. brought to England from the Syrian monasteries of Egypt by Dr. Tattam and A. Pacho, in 1843, 1847, and 1850. This third part was published under the title The Third Part of the Ecclesiastical History of John, Bishop of Ephesus. Now first edited by William Cureton (Oxf. 1855, 4to, pp. 420). The first two parts, forming twelve books, contained, as the author himself says (p. 2), the history of the Church from the beginning of the Roman Empire to the sixth year of the reign of Justinus II, nephew of Justinian, and consequently to the year 571. The third part forms six chapters, of which we have only the second and fifth in full; the others are all more or less incomplete (see Bernstein, Zeitsch. der D. Morgenl. Gesellschaf, 8, 397).

It continues the  history to the third year after the death of Justinus II (581) (see bk. 6, ch. 25, p. 402), and mentions even later dates down to 583. We find in it accounts of many facts of ecclesiastical history not to be discovered in other sources. It is the more important from the fact that the author, although a partisan of the Monophysite doctrine, and occasionally somewhat over credulous, was a contemporary, and often an eyewitness of the facts he relates. Cureton promised an English translation of the work, but to our knowledge it has not yet appeared. The German scholar Schonfelder (Die Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus. Aus dem Syrischen übersetzt. Mit einer Abhandlung u. d. Treiheiten [Munch. 1862, 8vo]) has, however, furnished a German translation, of which those who do not read the Oriental languages can avail themselves in their studies of the Eastern Church. In 1856 a young Dutch scholar, Dr. Land, published a treatise on John, Bishop of Ephesus, the first Syriac Church historian (for the full title, see below), in which he discussed the general relations of Syriac literature, and the productions of the Syriac Church historians in particular, the person and history of bishop John, his style and treatment of Church history, and the contents of his work. Since then, Dr. Land has continued his studies of the Syriac writers, and in vol. 2 of his Anecdota Syriaca (also under the special title Joannis, Episcopi Monophysitoe Scripta Historica [Leyd. 1868, 8vo]), has published all the inedited works of John of Ephesus. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 747; Kitto, Journ. Sac. Lit. 16, 207 sq. (J.H.W.)

## John, Patriarch Of Constantinople[[@Headword:John, Patriarch Of Constantinople]]

             known for his connection with the measures of the emperor Michael Palaeologus, looking to the union of Christendom. He at first refused his aid, and declared the Latins heretics, for which he was imprisoned. While in prison he found leisure to examine the older Greek literature concerning the dissensions of the Eastern and Western churches, and these investigations changed his mind. He was released and made patriarch, but after the death of the emperor retired to a monastery, in 1283. He was again restored, and again exiled, dying in 1298 in Bithynia. The Greek Church excludes his name from the number of the orthodox, but not the Latin Church; hence his writings are found in Leo Allatius's Grcecia Orthodoxa, tom. 1, 2. See Gass, in Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## John, Prester[[@Headword:John, Prester]]

             (Priest John), a supposed Christian king and priest of a medieval kingdom in the interior of Asia, the locality of which is vague and undefined. In the 11th and 12th centuries the Nestorian missionaries penetrated into Eastern Asia, and made conversions among the Keraeit or Krit Tartars, which, according to the earliest reports, are said to have included the khan or sovereign of the tribe. Ung (or Ungh) Khan, who resided at Karakorum, and to whom the afterwards celebrated Genghis Khan was tributary. This name the Syrian missionaries translated by analogy with their own language. converting Ung into “Jachanan” or “John,” and rendering Khan by “priest.” In their reports to the Christians of the West, accordingly, their royal convert figured as at once a priest and the sovereign of a rich and magnificent kingdom. Genghis Khan having thrown off his allegiance, a war ensued, which ended in the defeat and death of Ung Khan in 1202; but the tales of his piety and magnificence long survived, and not only furnished the material of numberless medieval legends (which may be read in Assemani's Bibliotheca Orientalis, 3, 2, 484), but supplied the occasion of several of those missionary expeditions from Western Christendom to which we owe almost all our knowledge of medieval Eastern geography.

The reports regarding Ung Khan, carried to Europe by two Armenian legates in 1145 to Eugene III, created a most profound impression; and the letters addressed in his name, but drawn up by the Nestorian missionaries, to the pope, to the kings of France and Portugal, and to the Greek emperor, impressed all with a lively hope of the speedy extension of the Gospel in a region hitherto regarded as hopelessly lost to Christianity. They are printed in Assemani's Bibliotheca Orientalis. The earliest mention of Prester John is in the narrative of the Franciscan father John Carpini, who was sent by pope Innocent IV to the court of Batu Khan of Kiptchak, the grandson of Genghis Khan. Father Carpini supposed that Prester John's kingdom lay still further to the east, but he did not prosecute the search. This was reserved for a member of the same order, father Rubruquis, who was sent as a missionary into Tartary by St. Louis, and, having reached the camp of Batu Khan, was by him sent forward to Karakorum, the seat of the supposed Prester John. He failed, however, of his hope of finding such a personage, the Khagan of Karakorum, Mangu, being still an unbeliever; and his intercourse with the Nestorian missionaries whom he found established there satisfied him that the accounts were grievously exaggerated. His narrative, which is printed in Purchas's Collection, is one of the most interesting among those of medieval travellers. Under the same vague notion of the existence of a Christian prince and a Christian kingdom in the East, the Portuguese sought for traces of Prester John in their newly- acquired Indian territory in the 15th century. A similar notion prevailed as to the Christian kingdom of Abyssinia, which, in the hope of finding Prester John, was visited so late as the reign of John II of Portugal (1481-95) by Pedro Covilham and Alfonzo di Palva, the former of whom married and settled in the country. See Gieseler's Kirchengeschichte, 3, 3, 43; Ritter's Erdkelndle von Asien, 1, 283 sq.; Schmidt, Forschungqen im Gebiete d. alteren Bildungsgesch. d. Mongolen und Tubeter (Petersb. 1824), p. 162.

## John, Revelation Of[[@Headword:John, Revelation Of]]

             SEE REVELATION.

## John, Second And Third Epistles Of[[@Headword:John, Second And Third Epistles Of]]

             The title catholic does not properly belong to the 2d and 3d Epistles. It became attached to them, although addressed to individuals, because they were of too little importance to be classed by themselves, and, so far as doctrine went, were regarded as appendices to the 1st Epistle.

I. Authorship. —

1. The external evidence for the genuineness of these two Epistles is less copious and decisive than that for the 1st Epistle. They are not in the Peshito version, which shows that at the time it was executed they were not recognized by the Syrian churches; and Eusebius places them among the ἀντιλεγόμενα (H.E. 3, 25). SEE ANTILEGOMENA. The 11th verse of the 2d Epistle, however, is quoted by Irenaeus (Hoer. 1, 16, 3) as a  saying of John, the disciple of the Lord, meaning thereby, without doubt, the apostle. Clement of Alexandria (Strom. 2), in referring to John's 1st Epistle, uses the wordsΙ᾿ωάννης ἐν τῇ μείζουι ἐπιστολῇ, which shows that he was acquainted with at least two Epistles of John; there is extant, in a Latin translation, a commentary by him on the 2d Epistle; and, as Eusebius and Photius both attest that he wrote commentaries on all the seven catholic Epistles, it would appear that he must have known and acknowledged the 3d also. If the Adumsbrationes are Clement's, he bears direct testimony to the 2d Epistle (Adambr. p. 1011, edit. Potter). Origen speaks of the apostle John having left a 2d and 3d Epistle, which, however, he adds, all did not accept as genuine (In Joan. ap. Eusebius, 6, 25). Dionysius of Alexandria (ibid. 7, 25) recognizes them as productions of the same John who wrote the Gospel and the 1st Epistle and so do all the later Alexandrian writers. Eusebius himself elsewhere refers to them (Dem. Evang. 3, 5) without hesitation as John's; and in the synod held at Carthage (A.D. 256), Aurelius, bishop of Chullabi, confirmed his vote by citing 2Jn 1:10 sq. as the language of the apostle John (Cyprian, Opp. 2, 120, ed. Oberthür). Ephrem Syrus speaks of them in the same way in the fourth century. In the fifth century they are almost universally received. A homily, wrongly attributed to St. Chrysostom, declares them uncanonical. In the Muratori Fragment, which, however, in the part relating to the Epistles of John, is somewhat confused or apparently vitiated, there are at least two Epistles of John recognized, for the author uses the plural in mentioning John's Epistles. In all the later catalogs, with the exception of the Iambics ad Seleucum, they are inserted with the other canonical books of the N.T. There is thus a solid body of evidence in favor of the genuineness of these epistles. That they were not universally known and received is probably to be accounted for by their character as private letters to individuals, which would naturally be longer in coming under general recognition than such as were addressed to churches or the Christians of a district.

The only antagonistic testimony which has reached us from antiquity is that of Jerome, who says (De vir. Illust. 9, 18) that both epistles were commonly reputed to be the production, not of John the apostle, but of John the presbyter, confirmed by the statement of Eusebius (3, 25) that it was doubtful whether they were the production of the evangelist or of another John. On this it may be observed,  1. That the statement of Jerome is certainly not true in its full extent, for there is evidence enough that both in his own time and before, as well as after it, the general belief, both in the Latin and the Greek churches, was that they were written by John the apostle.

2. Both Jerome and Eusebius concur in attesting that all ascribed these Epistles either to John the apostle or John the presbyter as their author, which may be accepted as convincing evidence that they are not forgeries of an age later than that of the apostle.

3. The question being between John the apostle and John the presbyter, we may, without laying stress on the fact that the existence of the latter is, to say the least, involved in doubt, SEE JOHN THE PRESBYTER, call attention to the consideration that, while the use of the expressionὁ πρεσβύτερος by the writer of the 2d Epistle may have given rise to the report which Jerome and Eusebius attest, there lies in this a strong evidence that the writer was John the apostle, and not John the presbyter; for it is quite credible that the former, writing in his old age, should employ the termπρεσβύτερος to express this fact just as Paul does (Phm 1:9), and as Peter does (1Pe 5:1), whereas it is incredible that the latter, with whom presbyter was a title of office, should in writing a letter to an individual, designate himself thus, inasmuch as, the office being common to him with many others, the title, in the absence of his name, was no designation at all, to say nothing of the fact that there is no evidence that the members of the πρεσβυτήριον in the primitive churches ever received πρεσβυτερος as a title, any more than the members of the Church, though collectively οἱ ἃγιοι received individually ἃγιος or ἀδελφός as a title (see below). On these grounds there seems to be no reason for attaching much importance to the opinion or tradition reported by Jerome, though it has been adopted by Erasmus, Grotius, Credner, Jachmann (Comm. üb. d. Kathol. Br.), and more recently by Ebrard (Olshausen, Comment. 6, 4, E.T. vol. 10. and in Herzog, Encyc. 6, 736). A late writer (Willichen, Der geschichtliche Charakter; des Ev. Joh. Elberf. 1869) holds that the 2d and 3d Epistles are the production of disciples of John the apostle.

2. If the external testimony is not as decisive as we might wish, the internal evidence is peculiarly strong. Mill has pointed out that of the thirteen verses which compose the 2d Epistle, eight are to be found in the 1st Epistle. Either, then, the 2d Epistle proceeded from the same author as the 1st, or from a conscious fabricator who desired to pass off something of his  own as the production of the apostle; but, if the latter alternative had been true the fabricator in question would assuredly have assumed the title of John the apostle instead of merely designating himself as John the elder, and he would have introduced some doctrine which it would have been his object to make popular. The title and contents of the Epistle are strong arguments against a fabricator, whereas they would account for its nonuniversal reception in early times; and if not the work of a fabricator, it must, from style, diction, and tone of thought, be the work of the author of the 1st Epistle, and, we may add, of the Gospel. The private nature of their contents removes also the suspicion that they could have been forged, since it would be difficult to discover any purpose which could have led to such a forgery.

The reason why John designates himself as πρεσβύτερος rather than ἀπόστολος (2Jn 1:1; 3Jn 1:1) is no doubt the same as that which made Peter designate himself by the same title (1Pe 5:1), and which caused James and Jude to give themselves no other title than “the servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ” (Jam 1:1), “the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James” (Jud 1:1). Paul had a special object in declaring himself an apostle. Those who belonged to the original Twelve had no such necessity imposed upon them. With them it was a matter of indifference whether they employed the name of apostle, like Peter (1Pe 1:1; 2Pe 1:1), or adopted an appellation which they shared with others, like John, and James, and Jude. SEE ELDER.

II. The second Epistle is addressed to one whom the writer calls ἐκλεκτὴ κυρία. This has been differently understood. By some it has been regarded as designating the Church collectively, by others as designating a particular congregation, and by others as denoting an individual. This expression cannot mean the Church (Jerome), nor a particular church (Cassiodorus), nor the elect Church which comes together on Sundays (Michaelis), nor the Church of Philadelphia (Whiston), nor the Church of Jerusalem (Whitby). These opinions are rendered improbable partly by the reference in 2Pe 1:11 to the children, and in 2Pe 1:13 to the sister of the party addressed, partly by the want of any authority for such a usage of the termκυρία as would thus be imputed to the apostle. By those who understand this of an individual there are three renderings: according to one interpretation she is “the lady Electa;” to another, “the elect Kyria;” to a third, “the elect lady.” The first interpretation is that of Clement of Alexandria (if the passage above referred to in the Adunbrationes be his), Wetstein, Grotius,  Middleton; the second is that of Benson, Carpzov, Schleusner, Heumann, Bengel, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Lücke, Neander, Davidson; the third is the rendering of the English version, Mill, Wall, Wolf; Le Clerc, Lardner, Beza, Eichhorn, Newcome, Wakefield, Macknight. For the rendering “the lady Electa” to be right, the word κυρία must have preceded (as in modern Greek) the word ἐκλεκτῇ, not followed it; and, further, the last verse of the Epistle, in which her sister is also spoken of as ἐκλεκτή, is fatal to the hypothesis. The rendering “the elect lady” is probably wrong, because there is no article before the adjective ἐκλεκτῇ. It remains that the rendering “the elect Kyria” is probably right, though here too we should have expected the article — as, indeed, we should under any of the three renderings (though the rendering “an elect lady” is not demanded; see Alford, Gr. Test. vol. 5, prolegg.). The choice, therefore, being between the last two of these renderings, two circumstances seem to be decisive in favor of the former: Kyria occurs elsewhere as a proper name, SEE CYRIA; and that ἐκλεκτή is to be taken in its usual signification is rendered probable by its being applied in 2Pe 1:13 to the sister of the party addressed. SEE ELECTA.

At the time of writing this Epistle the apostle was with the sister of the lady addressed, but expresses a hope ere long to see the latter, and converse with her on matters of which he could not then write. From this we may infer either that the apostle was at the time on a journey from which he expected ere long to return, or that the lady in question resided not very far from his usual residence, and that he intended soon to pay her a visit. Adopting the latter hypothesis as the more probable, and viewing it in connection with the apostle's styling himself πρεσβύτερος, we may infer that the Epistle was written at a late period of the apostle's life.

The object of the apostle in writing the 2d Epistle was to warn the lady to whom he wrote against abetting the teaching known as that of Basilides and his followers, by perhaps an undue kindness displayed by her towards the preachers of the false doctrine. After the introductory salutation, the apostle at once urges on his correspondent the great principle of love, which with him (as we have before seen) means right affection springing from right faith and issuing in right conduct. The immediate consequence of the possession of this love is the abhorrence of heretical misbelief, because the latter, being incompatible with right faith, is destructive of the producing cause of love and therefore of love itself. This is the secret of John's strong denunciation of the “deceiver,” whom he designates as  “Antichrist.” Love is with him the essence of Christianity, but love can spring only from right faith. Wrong belief, therefore, destroys love, and with it Christianity. Therefore says he, “If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds” (2Jn 1:10-11).

III. The third Epistle is addressed to Caius, a Christian brother noted for his hospitality to the saints. Whether this be one of those mentioned elsewhere in the N.T. by this name is uncertain; he may have been the same mentioned Act 19:28. SEE GAIUS.

The apostle writes for the purpose of commending to the kindness and hospitality of Caius some Christians who were strangers in the place where he lived. It is probable that these Christians carried this letter with them to Caius as their introduction. It would appear that the object of the travellers was to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles without money and without price (3Jn 1:7). The apostle had already written to the ecclesiastical authorities of the place (ἐγραψα 3Jn 1:9, not “scripsissem,” as the Vulg.), but they, at the instigation of Diotrephes, had refused to receive the missionary brethren, and therefore the apostle now commends them to the care of a layman. It is probable that Diotrephes was a leading presbyter who held Judaizing views, and would not give assistance to men who were going about with the purpose of preaching solely to the Gentiles. The apostle intimates the probability of his soon personally visiting the church, when he would deal with Diotrephes for his misconduct, and would communicate to Caius many things of which he could not then write. In the mean time he exhorts him to follow that which is good, commends one Demetrius, and concludes with benediction and salutation. Whether this Demetrius (3Jn 1:12) was a tolerant presbyter of the same community, whose example John holds up as worthy of commendation in contradistinction to that of Diotrephes, or whether he was one of the strangers who bore the letter, we are now unable to determine.

From their general similarity, we may conjecture that the two epistles were written shortly after the 1st Epistle from Ephesus. They both apply to individual cases of conduct the principles which had been laid down in their fulness in the 1st Epistle.

IV. Commentaries. — The following are the exegetical helps on the whole of both the latter epistles exclusively, in addition to those noticed above:  Jones, Commentary [including Philem. etc.] (Lond. 1635, fol.); Smith, Exposition [on 2d Epistle] (Lond. 1663, 4to); Sonntag, Hypomnemata (Altorf, 1697, 8vo); Feustking, Commentarius (Vitemb. 1707, fol.); Verpoorten, Exercitationes (Gedan. 1741, 4to); Heumann, Commentar [on 3d Epist.] (Helmst. 1778, 8vo); Müller, Commentarius [on 2d Epist.] (Schleiz, 1783, 4to); Sommel, Isogoge (Lond. 1798, 4to); Rambonnet, Specimen, etc. [on 2d Epistle] (Tr. ad Rh. 1818, 8vo); Gachon, Authenticité, etc. (Montaub. 1851, 8vo); Cox, Private Letters of Sts. Paul and John (Lond. 1867, 8vo). SEE COMMENTARY.

## John, Surnamed The Teuton[[@Headword:John, Surnamed The Teuton]]

             from his nationality, abbot of St. Victor, was a native of the diocese of Treves. He studied at Paris, joined the canon regulars of St. Victor, and became their abbot in 1203. He was one of the ablest of the glossatores (q.v.) on canon law, and appears to have exerted great influence in general over the ecclesiastical affairs of his time, and to have been in great favor both with the pope and with the king of France. He died at Paris Nov. 28, 1229. He left thirty-seven sermons, which are preserved among the MSS. of the Imperial Library at Paris. (Two Dominican Monks of like name flourished in the latter half of the 13th and the first half of the 14th century.) See (esaire d'Heisterbah, Illustr. Mirac. et Histoire Memor. lib 6, c., 12;. Jacques de Vitry, Hist. Occidental. c. 24; Hist. Litt. de la France, 18, 67; Gallia Christ. vol. 10, col. 673; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 26, 547.

## John, The Deacon[[@Headword:John, The Deacon]]

             and orator (Διάχονος καὶ Ρήτωρ) of Constantinople, was a deacon of the great church (St. Sophia) in that city about the end of the 9th century. He wrote Λόγος εἰς τὸν βίον τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ι᾿ωσήφ, τοῦ ὑμνγράφου (Vita S. Josephi Hymnographi), published in the Acta Sanctorum (April 3), vol. 1, a Latin version being given in the body of the work, with a learned Commentarius Proevius at p. 266, etc., and the original in the Appendix, p. 34. Allatius (De Psellis, c. 30) cites another work of this writer, entitled Τίς ὁ σκοπὸς τῷ θεῷ τῆς πρώτης τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πλάσεως. κ. τ. λ. (Quid est Consilium Dei in prima Hominis formatione, etc.). The designation JOANNES DIACONUS is common to several medieval writers, as John Galenus or Pediasmus; John Hypatius John, deacon of Rome; and, John Diaconus, a contemporary and correspondent of George of Trebizond. See Acta Sanctorum, 1. c.; Fabricius, Biblica Groeca, 10, 264, 11, 654; Cave, Hist. Lit. 2, Dissertatio  1, 11; Oudin, De Scriptoribus et Scriptis Ecclesiasticis, 2, 335. — Smith, Dict. Greek and Roman Biog. 2, 594.

## Johnes, Timothy, D.D[[@Headword:Johnes, Timothy, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister of Welsh extraction, was born at Southampton, L.I., May 24, 1717. He graduated from Yale College in 1737, was ordained by the New York Presbytery, February 9, 1743, pastor at Morristown, N.J., and had great success in his ministry there, which closed with his death, September 17, 1794. In 1777 general Washington, on one occasion, communed with his congregation while in the vicinity. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3: 16. (W.P.S.)

## Johns (St.) Day[[@Headword:Johns (St.) Day]]

             a festival to commemorate the nativity of John the Baptist. It was observed as early as the 4th century. The birth of John is known to have preceded that of Jesus Christ six months, and June 24 is therefore the day fixed upon for this festival. Augustine had commented upon the peculiarity of observing his birthday rather than his martyrdom, and the Church of Rome seems to have acted on this suggestion: for it set aside also a day, namely, August 29, in commemoration of his beheading; but both his birth and martyrdom are celebrated on the same day in the service of the Church of England, the chief passages relating to his life and death being included in the lessons. SEE JOHNS, EVE OF ST.

## Johns, Eve of St[[@Headword:Johns, Eve of St]]

             one of the most joyous festivals of Christendom during the Middle Ages, was celebrated on the eve of the birthday of John the Baptist (q.v.). From the account given of it by Jakob Grimm (Deutsche Mythologie, 1, 578, 581, 583 sq.), it would appear to have been observed with similar rites in every country of Europe. Fires were kindled chiefly in the streets and market places of the towns, as at Paris, Metz, etc.; sometimes, as at Gernsheim, in the district of Mainz, they were blessed by. the parish priest, and prayer and praise offered until they had burned out; but, as a rule, they were secular in their character, and conducted by the laity themselves. The young people leaped over the flames, or threw flowers and garlands into them, with merry shoutings; songs and dances were also a frequent accompaniment. At a comparatively late period the very highest personages took part in these festivities. In England, we are told (see R. Chambers's Book of Days, June 24), the people on the Eve of St. John's were  accustomed to go into the woods and break down branches of trees, which they brought to their homes and planted over their doors, amid great demonstrations of joy, to make good the prophecy respecting the Baptist, that many should rejoice in his birth. This custom was universal in England till the recent change in manners. Some of the superstitious notions connected with St. John's Eve are of a highly fanciful nature. The Irish believe that the souls of all people on this night leave their bodies, and wander to the place, by land or sea, where death shall finally separate them from the tenement of clay. It is not improbable that this notion was originally universal, and was the cause of the widespread custom of watching or sitting up awake on St. John's night, for we may well believe that there would be a general wish to prevent the soul from going upon that somewhat dismal ramble. In England, and perhaps in other countries also, it was believed that if any one sat up fasting all night in the church porch he would see the spirits of those who were to die in the parish during the ensuing twelve months come and knock at the church door in the order and succession in which they were to die. We can easily perceive a possible connection between this dreary fancy and that of the soul's midnight ramble. The kindling of the fire, the leaping over or through the flames, and the flower garlands, clearly show that these rites are essentially of heathen origin, and of a sacrificial character. They are obviously connected with the sun and fire worship of the ancient heathen nations, particularly the Arians (comp. Agni, of the Hindus [q.v.]; Mittera, of the Persians; the vestal virgins, and the Roman festival of Palila), and the Celts, Germans, and Slavi. In old heathen. times, Midsummer and Yule (q.v.), the summer and winter solstices, were the two greatest and most widespread festivals in Europe. The Church of Rome, in its accommodating spirit, instead of abolishing the custom, yielded to popular feeling, and retained this heathen practice under the garb of a Christian name. See Khautz, De ritu ignis in natali S. Johannis accensi (Vienna, 1759); Paciandi, De cults S. Joannis Bapt. antiq. Chrt. (Rom. 1758); Ersch und Gruber, All. Encyklop. 2, 22, p. 265; F. Nork, Fest-Kalender (Stuttgard, 1847), p. 406. — Chambers, Cyclop. a.v.

## Johns, Henry Van Dyke, D.D[[@Headword:Johns, Henry Van Dyke, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at New Castle, Delaware, in 1803, being the youngest son of the Hon. Kensey Johns, chief-justice of Delaware and United States senator. He graduated from Princeton College, afterwards studied at the General Theological Seminary, N.Y., and continued his theological studies under the direction of his brother, bishop Johns of Virginia. His ministry began at Wilmington, Delaware; he was for some time rector of the Church at Frederick, Maryland; thence he was called to Trinity Church, Washington, D.C.; subsequently to Cincinnati, Ohio; then to the rectorship of Christ Church, Baltimore, Maryland, where he continued until 1853, when Emanuel Church was built by a portion of his congregation, and he became its rector, a position which he occupied until his death, April 22, 1859. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1859, page 352.

## Johns, John, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Johns, John, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at New Castle, Delaware, July 10, 1796. He graduated from the College of New Jersey in 1815; studied bwo years at Princeton Theological Seminary; in his eighteenth year joined  the Protestant Episcopal Church, and, June 10, 1819, was ordained deacon, and in 1820 presbyter. His first parish was All-Saints' Church, Frederick, Maryland, and in 1829 he became rector of old Christ's Church, in Baltimore. In 1837 a new church was erected, called the Church of the Messiah, of which he was rector until he became assistant bishop of the diocese of Virginia, May 21, 1842. In 1849 he was elected president of William and Mary College, where he remained until 1854. He died at Alexandria, Virginia, April 5, 1876. He was a leader of the evangelical side of his Church, and commanded admiration from men of all shades of opinion by the purity of his life and the sincerity of his convictions. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sen. 1877, page 12.

## Johns, Richard[[@Headword:Johns, Richard]]

             a celebrated member of the Society of “Friends,” was born at Bristol, England, in 1645, and, coming to this country in early manhood, settled in Maryland. He was won over to the Quakers by George Fox, and preached  for many years. He died Oct. 16, 1717. For further details, see Janney, Hist. of Friends, 3, 190.

## Johns, W. G[[@Headword:Johns, W. G]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Pulaski County, Ky., October 24, 1823, joined the Church at thirteen years of age, was licensed to preach in 1845, and continued in the work for twenty-one years, with interruptions for want of health. Indeed, it is said that so great was his devotion to the Christian ministry that he often preached when barely able to leave his room. He died October 23, 1866. Conf. Min. Meth. Episc. Church South, 3, 157.

## Johnson, Albert Osborne[[@Headword:Johnson, Albert Osborne]]

             an American missionary of the Presbyterian Church to India, was born in Cadiz, Ohio, June 22, 1833. He was educated at Jefferson College, Pa., where he was converted, and, on graduation (1852), went to the Theological Seminary at Alleghany, where he graduated in 1855, and was ordained by the presbytery of Ohio June 12, in the same year. He at once entered the missionary work, which was shared by his wife, whom he had married the day he left the Theological Seminary. But both did not long endure the toils of a missionary life; during the Sepoy rebellion in 1857 they suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Indian rebels. For details, see Walsh, Memorial of the Futtehgurh Misission and her Martyred Missionaries (Philada. 1859, 12mo), p. 241 sq. Mr. Johnson is spoken of by Walsh as “a man of very genial influences and of fine social qualities. As a Christian he was zealous and devoted, a man of prayer, and faithful in all his duties; as a missionary he bade fair to excel in every department of labor. His qualifications were of a high order.”

## Johnson, Edwin A., D.D[[@Headword:Johnson, Edwin A., D.D]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Gowanda, N.Y., October 30, 1829. He joined the Church when eleven years of age, and in 1852 entered the Erie Conference, in which he labored. with efficiency as a pastor until his appointment (1868-72) as assistant editor of the Pittsburgh Christian Advocate. He died at Allegheny, Pennsylvania, June 30, 1885. He wrote  several popular volumes. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1885, page 330; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Johnson, Enoch[[@Headword:Johnson, Enoch]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in North Carolina; he was early converted; joined the itinerancy in 1819, and died November 25, 1824. He was a man of deep piety and useful talents. His labors were abundantly successful, and his character greatly beloved. — Minutes of Conferences, 1, 432.

## Johnson, Evan M., D.D[[@Headword:Johnson, Evan M., D.D]]

             a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Rhode Island, June 10, 1792. He was ordained to the ministry in Trinity Church, Newport, by bishop Griswold, July 8, 1813; removed to New York City in 1814, and became assistant rector of Grace Church, but the year following he exchanged this position for the rectorate of St. James's Church, Newtown, L.I. In 1824 he settled in Brooklyn, and built St. John's Church. During his ministry he united nearly 4000 couples in marriage, and baptized nearly 10,000 children. He was, at the time of his decease, March 19, 1865, the oldest settled Episcopal clergyman in the State of New York.

## Johnson, George Henry Sacheverell[[@Headword:Johnson, George Henry Sacheverell]]

             an eminent Anglican clergyman and mathematician, was born at Keswick, Northumberland, about 1808. He graduated from Queen's College, Oxford, in 1828, obtained several scholarships and a tutorship therein, became professor of astronomy in 1839, of moral philosophy from 1842 to 1845, preacher at Whitehall in 1852, dean of Wells in 1854, and died November 6, 1881. He published a Treatise on Optics (1836): — Sermons (1857): — and wrote the annotations on the Psalms in the Speaker's Commentary.

## Johnson, Haynes[[@Headword:Johnson, Haynes]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Newbury, Vermont, in 1801; converted in 1829; entered the New Hampshire Conference in 1831, and died at Newbury, April 9,1856. He was “a faithful and laborious preacher,” and during the ten months previous to his death he made nine hundred pastoral visits. He was very successful in winning souls to Christ. — Minutes of Conferences, 6, 75.

## Johnson, Herman Merrill, S.T.D., LL.D.[[@Headword:Johnson, Herman Merrill, S.T.D., LL.D.]]

             a prominent minister and educator of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Oswego County, N.Y., Nov. 25, 1815. After preparation at Cazenovia Seminar, he entered, in 1837, the junior class of Wesleyan University, graduating with distinction in 1839. The same year he was elected professor of ancient languages in St. Charles's College, Missouri, where he remained for three years. Thence he was called to occupy the chair of ancient languages in Augusta College, Kentucky, which he held for two years, when he was elected professor of ancient languages and literature in the Ohio Wesleyan University at Delaware, Ohio. Here he performed for a while the duties of acting president of the institution organizing its curriculum, and was especially interested in introducing therein a Biblical course of study as a method of ministerial education. In 1850 he was elected professor of philosophy and English literature in Dickinson College, a position which he filled for ten years, when he was called to the presidency of this institution, together with the chair of moral science, in 1860. Dr. Johnson died April 5, 1868, just after the memorials in behalf of the Methodist centenary had secured to Dickinson College a fair endowment. He contributed largely to the Church periodicals,  especially the New York Christian Advocate and the Methodist Quarterly Review. Indeed, he was decidedly able both as a writer and an instructor, and his contributions were always read with uncommon interest; for, as a thinker, he was clear, concise, original, and his writings were often eminently distinguished for their simplicity and grace of expression. He had an especial liking for all questions of historical and philological inquiry, and published a learned edition of the Clio of Herodotus (N.Y. 1842, and often). He left. unfinished another large and valuable philological contribution, the translation and revision of Eberhard's great Synonymical Dictionary of German, French, Italian, Spanish, and English. It is especially to be regretted that he did not live to complete his Commentary on the historical Books of the Old Test. “Personally, Dr. Johnson was a man of many and rare excellencies. He was pre-eminently a scholar, extensively learned, and yet distinguished for culture rather than for mere learning. He was especially eminent as a teacher, and as an administrator and disciplinarian he had few superiors. In private he was a model Christian gentleman, affable, refined, and unassuming; able and entertaining in conversation, and as a companion genial, without descending to any thing out of harmony with his elevated character and position. As a preacher he was both forcible and instructive, though too rigidly correct in his tastes to allow him to become extensively popular. In his relations to the Church he belonged to an important but very small class. His Christian character, his learning, and his confessed abilities fitted him for almost any one of the highest and most responsible offices in the Church. Such was the place he occupied, while others of equal dignity and importance were ready to be offered to him” (Christian Advocate, N.Y., April 16, 1868). (J.H.W.)

## Johnson, John (1)[[@Headword:Johnson, John (1)]]

             an eminent and learned divine of the Church of England, was born Dec. 30, 1662. He was educated at King's School, in the city of Canterbury, and at St. Mary Magdalen College, Cambridge. Soon after graduation (1682) he was nominated by the dean and chapter of Canterbury to a scholarship in Corpus Christi College, and there took the degree of master of arts in 1685. Shortly after he entered into deacon's orders, and became curate to Thomas Hardres, at Hardres, near Canterbury. In 1686 he became vicar of Boughton under the Bleam, and in 1687 he held the vicarage of Hermhill, adjoining to Boughton. In 1697 he obtained the living of St. John, in the Isle of Thanet, which he shortly after exchanged for that of Appledon and in 1707 he was inducted to the vicarage of Cranbrook. He died in 1725.  His works display the highest scholarship, a mastery both, of the Greek and Hebrew languages, and a deep research into the Holy Scriptures. His Unbloody Sacrifice (London, 1714, 8vo; latest ed. Oxf. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo) is the most complete work on the Eucharist, considered as a sacrifice, extant, particularly on account of its large collection of authorities from the fathers. which are printed in full. These are cited to prove that the Eucharist is a proper material sacrifice; that it is both eucharistic and propitiatory; that it is to be offered by proper officers; that the oblation is to be made on a proper altar; that it is to be consumed by manducation; together with arguments to prove that what our Savior speaks concerning eating his flesh and drinking his blood in the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel is principally meant of the Eucharist. This publication, having involved him in a bitter controversy on account of its High Church views, induced him to publish, in 1717, The Unbloody Sacrifice, and Altar unveiled and supported, part 2, showing the agreement and disagreement of the Eucharist with the sacrifices of the ancients, and the excellency of the former; the great importance of the Eucharist both as a feast and a sacrifice; the necessity of frequent communion; the unity of the Eucharist; the nature of excommunication; the primitive method of preparation, with devotions for the altar. His other works are, A Collection of all Ecclesiastical Laws, etc., concerning the Government, etc., of the Church of England (Lond. 1720, 2 vols. 8vo; Oxford, 1850-51, 2 vols. 8vo): — A Collection of Discourses, etc. (Lond. 1728 2 vols. 8vo): — .The Psalter, or Holy David and his old English Translators cleared (London, 1707, 8vo). See Life, by Rev. Thos. Brett Hook, Eccles. Dict. s.v.; Allibone. Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth. 2, s.v. (E.deP.)

## Johnson, John (2)[[@Headword:Johnson, John (2)]]

             an able and popular minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, born in Louisa Co., Va., Jan. 7, 1783; joined the Church in 1807, and entered the Conference at Liberty Hill, Tennessee in 1808. Two years after he removed to Kentucky, and was appointed first to the Sandy River Circuit, and in 1811 to Natchez Circuit. His early educational advantages had been few, and when he entered the ministry of his Church he can hardly be said to have possessed a fair English education; but unremitting efforts to gain knowledge at last made him one of the best scholars of his Conference. Thus, while at the Natchez Circuit, he displayed an extensive knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew, of which no one had believed him to have an idea even, and from that time he began to rise rapidly in the estimation of his  colleagues. He now took rank with. Lakin, Sale, Page, Blackman, and Oglesby, and was regarded by many as the most remarkable preacher of the West. In 1812 he was appointed to the Nashville Circuit; then successively to the Livingston, Christian, and Goose Creek, and finally again to the Livingston Circuit; and in 1818 he was sent to the Nashville Station. While here he engaged in a controversy on the question of immersion with the Baptist preacher Vardeman, in which he is generally believed to have come off victor; at least from this event dates his great popularity in the West. “Henceforth,” says Redford (Methodism in Kentucky, 2, 143), “the name of John Johnson was the synonym of success in religious controversies.” From 1820 he filled successively the Red River, Hopkinsville, and Russellville Circuits, and in 1823 he was stationed at Louisville, and in 1824 at Maysville, and, after several years of rest, was in 1831 appointed presiding elder of the Green River, and in 1832 of Hopkinsville District. In 1835 he was finally located, and he now removed to Mt.Vernon, Illinois. Here he died April 9, 1858. “As a Christian,” says the Western Christian Advocate (May 26, 1858), “brother Johnson was consistent, exemplary, and deeply devoted. ‘Holiness to the Lord' appears to have been his motto. He died in great peace, testifying, as his flesh and heart failed, that God was the strength of his heart and his portion forever.” (J.H.W.)

## Johnson, John (3)[[@Headword:Johnson, John (3)]]

             SEE JOHNSONIANS.

## Johnson, John Barent[[@Headword:Johnson, John Barent]]

             a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born in 1769 in Brooklyn, L.I.; graduated at Columbia College, 1792; studied theology under Dr. John H. Livingston, and entered the ministry in 1795. He was copastor of the Reformed Dutch Church, Albany, with Rev. Dr. John Bassett, from 1796 to 1802, and afterwards pastor of the church in Brooklyn, 1802-3. Of prepossessing appearance and engaging manners, he won many friends by his dignified and courteous bearing. He was popular with all classes, especially with the young. As a preacher he was distinguished for a melodious voice, a natural manner, and effective oratory. His eulogy on General Washington produced a great sensation throughout the community. The exordium was spoken of at the time as a rare specimen of eloquence; and the whole performance was certainly of a very high order.” It was published by the Legislature, at whose request it was delivered. He  also published several other discourses, and contributed largely to literary periodicals of his day. In person he was tall, slender, well proportioned, and graceful. His imagination was brilliant and his fervor profound. His intellectual qualities and theological and literary attainments were eminent. He wrote his sermons, but delivered them extemporaneously, with great simplicity, directness, and unction. He died of consumption, Aug. 29, 1803. Of his three children, two became Episcopalian clergymen: one at Jamaica, L.I.; the other a professor in the General Theological Seminary at New York. — Rogers, Historical Discourse (Albany, 1858); Sprague, Annals, 9, 167. (W.J.R.T.).

## Johnson, Joseph[[@Headword:Johnson, Joseph]]

             an Indian preacher, was born at Mohegan, near Norwich, Conn., about 1750. After a brief course of instruction under Mr. Wheelock at Lebanon, he was sent, at the age of fifteen, as a schoolmaster to the Six Nations of Indians in New York, and remained there a couple of years. Afterwards he spent a vagrant life for some time, until, during a fit of sickness occasioned by his irregularities, he became a sincere penitent, and determined to preach the Gospel of Christ. He was soon licensed to preach, and for several years was a missionary in the State of New York. He was well acquainted with theology. The date of his death is not known to us.

## Johnson, Samuel[[@Headword:Johnson, Samuel]]

             a Unitarian writer, was born at Salem, Massachusetts, October 10, 1822. He graduated from Harvard College in 1843, and from Harvard Divinity I School in 1846; became pastor of a "Free Church" at Lynn in 1853; in 1870 removed to Salem, and in 1876 to North Andover, where he died, February 19, 1882. Although not an ordained minister, he was intimately associated with the humanitarian tendencies of modern Unitarianism, and an ardent opponent of slavery, speaking and writing eloquently on kindred subjects of reform. He published A Book of Hymns (1846): — The Worship of Jesus (1868): — and Oriental Religions (his principal work, volume 1, Boston, 1872).

## Johnson, Samuel (1)[[@Headword:Johnson, Samuel (1)]]

             an English divine, and a learned but violent writer against popery in the reign of James II, was born in Warwickshire in 1649. He studied at St. Paul's School and at Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1670 he obtained the living of Corrilgham, Essex, but continued to reside in London, and mingled much in politics. He was a friend of Essex, and chaplain to lord William Russell, and advocated the succession of the duke of York. He was a decided opponent of king James II and of his schemes to introduce popery as the religion of the state, and attacked Dr. Hickes (q.v.), the upholder of passive obedience, in a pamphlet entitled Julian the Apostate. He would have gone further had not the death of his protector, lord Russell, obliged him to become more prudent, and to keep his Julian's Arts to undermine Christianity unpublished. For having written the former work he was summoned before judge Jeffries, and of course condemned to a heavy fine. Unable to pay the fine, he was imprisoned, and during his confinement wrote An humble and hearty Address to all Protestants in the  present Army, intended to provoke a rebellion against king James II. He was now put in the pillory in Palace Yard, at Charing Cross, whipped, and fined, after being degraded from orders. After the Revolution of 1688, William III caused the verdict to be reversed, and gave him an indemnity. He died in 1703. His writings were collected and published under the style Works (2d ed. Lond. 1713, fol.). See Biographia Britannica; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 26, 791: Debary, Hist. Ch. of Engl. from James II to 1717, p. 70; Allibone, Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors, 2, 971. (E de P.)

## Johnson, Samuel (2), D.D.[[@Headword:Johnson, Samuel (2), D.D.]]

             an American divine, was born at Guilford, Conn., Oct. 14, 1696, and passed A.B. in 1714 at Yale College, then situated at Saybrook. On the removal of Yale to New Haven he became one of its tutors, and in 1720 pastor of the Congregational Church, West Haven. Determined to change his ecclesiastical relations, he went to England, and received episcopal ordination in 1723. He then visited Oxford and Cambridge, where he was made A.M., and returned to America. Upon his arrival he entered on the mission of Stratford, Conn., and formed the acquaintance of William Burnet, son of the bishop of Salisbury. His ministerial duties were now considerably increased, and his pen warmly engaged for some years in defense of episcopacy. In 1743 he was made D.D. by the University of Oxford. In 1744 he was appointed president of King's College, New York, in which office he continued till 1754, when he returned to Stratford, where he spent a tranquil and dignified old age, chiefly in literary labor. In 1746 he issued A System of Morality, and in 1752 A Compendium of Logic, Metaphysics, and Ethics, and other theological and miscellaneous treatises after this date. He died Jan. 6, 1772. — Sprague, Annals, 5, 52; Allibone, Dict. Eng. and Am. Auth. 2, 971. (E.deP.)

## Johnson, Samuel (3), LL.D.[[@Headword:Johnson, Samuel (3), LL.D.]]

             one of the most distinguished literary men of the eighteenth century, was born at Lichfield September 18, 1709. His early education was acquired in his native town. In 1728 he was entered at Pembroke College, Oxford, but, in consequence of the want of means, did not remain long enough to obtain his degree. In 1731 his father died insolvent. In the same year he went to Bosworth as usher of a school. He soon became disgusted with the drudgery of teaching, and preferred to support himself by working for booksellers in Birmingham. In 1736 he married Mrs. Porter, the widow of  a mercer, who brought him £800. Failing in an effort to establish an academy, he repaired in 1737 to London, accompanied by his celebrated pupil David Garrick. He now devoted himself entirely to literary labor. His first production which attracted notice was his London, a poem in imitation of the third satire of Juvenal. Having entered into an engagement, with the Gentleman's Magazine, he published the parliamentary debates, which, being then a breach of privilege, came out under the fiction of Debates in the Senate of Lilliput. These obtained great celebrity on account of their extraordinary eloquence, and were almost exclusively the product of his own invention. The works which were now produced were celebrated beyond measure, and will ever be regarded as extraordinary monuments both of vigor and originality in thinking, and of great though ponderous power of expression.

But Dr. Johnson had excellencies far superior to mere literary accomplishments. He was truly a devout man, and he possessed a vigor and independence of mind which enabled him to scorn the ridicule and silence the opposition of wits and worldlings to serious religion. He often recurred in after life to the impression made upon his tender imagination by his mother's example and instruction. While a student at Oxford these impressions were revived and intensified, according to his own account, by the careful study of Law's Serious Call, in consequence of which he was incited to a devout and holy life. Serious and pious meditations and resolutions had been early familiar to his mind. The pious gratitude with which he acknowledged mercies upon every occasion, the humble submission which he breathes when it is the will of his heavenly Father to try him with affliction, show how seriously the mind of Johnson had been impressed with a sense of religion.

Dr. Johnson is generally charged with extreme bigotry, and want of charity towards religionists who differed from him. This charge, however, is very unfair in the face of his repeated declaration to the contrary. “All denominations of Christians,” he is reported to have said, “have really little difference in point of doctrine, though they may differ widely in external forms.” “For my part, I think all Christians, whether papist or Protestant, agree in the essential articles, and that their differences are trivial, and rather political than religious.” He spoke in the highest terms of Wesley from intimate knowledge of his character, having been at the same college with him, and said that “he thought of religion only.” “Whatever might be thought of some Methodist teachers,” he said, “he could scarcely doubt the  sincerity of that man, who travelled 900 miles in a month, and preached twelve times in a week; for no adequate reward, merely temporal, could be given for such indefatigable labor. The established clergy in general did not preach plain enough; polished period and glittering sentences flew over the heads of the common people without impression on their hearts. Something might be necessary to excite the affections of the common people, who were sunk in languor and lethargy, and therefore he supposed that the new concomitant of Methodism might probably produce so desirable an effect. The mind, like the body, delighted in change and novelty, and even in religion itself courted new appearances and modifications.” His views on the great subjects of original sin, in consequence of the fall of man, and of the atonement made by our Savior, as reported by his celebrated biographer, were decided and evangelical. His sentiments on natural and revealed religion were equally explicit. In short, it appears that few men have ever lived in whose thoughts religion had a larger or more practical share. “His habitual piety,” says lord Brougham, “his sense of his own imperfections, his generally blameless conduct in the various relations of life, have already been sufficiently described. He was a good man, as he was a great man; and he had so firm a regard for virtue that he wisely set much greater store by his worth than by his fame.” “Though consciousness of superiority might sometimes induce him to carry it high with man (and even this was much abated in the latter part of his life), his devotions have shown to the whole world how humbly he walked at all times with his God.” “If then, it be asked,” says lord Mahon, “who first in England, at that period, breasted the waves and stemmed the tide of infidelity — who enlisted wit and eloquence, together with argument and learning, on the side of revealed religion, first turned the literary current in its favor, mainly prepared the reaction which succeeded that praise seems most justly to belong to Dr. Samuel Johnson. Religion was with him no mere lip service nor cold formality; he was mindful of it in his social hours as much as in his graver lucubrations; and he brought to it not merely erudition such as few indeed possessed, but the weight of the highest character, and the respect which even his enemies could not deny him. It may be said of him that, though not in orders, he did the Church of England better service than most of those who at that listless sera ate her bread.”

The death of this great man was a beautiful commentary on his life. “When at length,” says lord Macaulay, “the moment dreaded through so many years came close, the dark cloud passed away from Johnson's mind. His  temper became unusually patient and gentle; he ceased to think of death and of that which lies beyond death, and he spoke much of the mercy of God and the propitiation of Christ. Though the tender care which had mitigated his sufferings during months of sickness at Streatham was withdrawn he was not left desolate. In this serene frame of mind he died Dec. 13, 1784; a week later he was laid in Westminster Abbey, among the eminent men of whom he had been the historian — Cowley and Denham, Dryden and Congreve, Gay, Prior, and Addison.” (E.deP.)

It remains for us to append a brief outline of all the literary labors of his life. In addition to his contributions to the Gentleman's Magazine and his poem London, Johnson wrote in 1744 an interesting Life of Richard Savage; in 1749 his best poem, The Vanity of Human Wishes, an imitation of the tenth satire of Juvenal; and in 1750 commenced The Rambler, a periodical which he conducted for two years, and the contents of which were almost wholly his own composition. But perhaps one of his greatest accomplishments is his Dictionary, a noble piece of work, entitling its author to be considered the founder of English lexicography; it appeared in 1755, after eight years of solid labor. The Idler, another periodical, was begun by him in 1758, and carried on for two years also; and in 1759 occurred one of the most touching episodes of his life the writing of Rasselas to pay the expenses of his mother's funeral. It was written, he tells us, “in the evenings of a week.” But, with all these publications before the public, he did not really emerge from obscurity until 1762, when a pension of £300 a year was conferred on him by lord Bute; and in the following year occurred an event, apparently of little moment, but which had a lasting influence upon his fame this was his introduction to James Boswell, whose Life of Dr. Johnson is probably more imperishable than any of the doctor's own writings. In 1764 the famous Literary Club was instituted, and in the following year began his intimacy with the Thrales. In the same year appeared his edition of Shakspeare. In 1773 he visited the Highlands with Boswell, and in 1781 appeared his Lives of the Poets, his last literary work of any importance. See Boswell, Life of Johnson; Wilkes, Christian Essays; Murphy, Life, in preface to Works; Memoir by Walter Scott; Essays by Macaulay and Carlyle; a brief but elaborate character of Dr. Johnson, written by Sir James Mackintosh, in his Life, 2, 166-9; Dr. Johston, his Religious Life and Death (N.Y. 1,850, 8vo); Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; English Cyclop. s.v.; and the excellent and elaborate article in Allibone, Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Johnson, Samuel R., D.D[[@Headword:Johnson, Samuel R., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, graduated from the General Theological Seminary, was for many years a professor of systematic divinity there, and a prominent member and secretary of the standing committee of his diocese. In 1872 he became rector of St. Thomas's Church, Amenia Union,  N.Y., and died August 13, 1873. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1874, page 138.

## Johnson, Thomas[[@Headword:Johnson, Thomas]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Virginia, July 11, 1802; went to Missouri in 1822, and commenced the work of the ministry in 1825. He labored as an itinerant in the bounds of the St. Louis Conference, filling some of the most important stations; but spent his greatest labors, and was most successful, as missionary to the Indians. His name will ever be connected with the history of Indian missions. Wise and earnest, he carried success with him in his responsible and arduous labors. He honorably sustained his character as a Christian minister through all his pilgrimage, and died an approved servant of God. He was shot by unknown parties in the night of Jan. 3, 1865, probably on account of his political principles. Among his colleagues in the Conference Johnson ranked with the first, and was highly esteemed by all. Says one of them: “He was a man of principle; one of the very few among the many thousands who, on all occasions and under all circumstances, acted upon the settled principle of morality and religion.” See Conf. Min. M. E. Ch. S. 3, 168.

## Johnson, William Bullien, D.D.[[@Headword:Johnson, William Bullien, D.D.]]

             a Baptist minister, was born on John's Island, near Charleston; S.C., June 13, 1782. He was intended for the jurist's profession, but after conversion (1804) he decided for the ministry, and was ordained, January, 1806, pastor of a church at Eutaw. S.C. In 1809 he removed to Columbia; later he lived at Savannah, Ga., whence he returned to Columbia in 1816. In 1822 he was placed in charge of the female academy at Greenville, S.C. Eight or nine years later he removed to Edgeville, S.C., as pastor, teaching also at the same time at a female high I school, and subsequently to Andersoen, S.C., where a university for ladies bears his name. He finally returned to Greenville, S.C., where he labored faithfully for the Church of his choice up to the hour of his death, in perfect vigor of mind and soundness of body very unlike an octogenarian. He died there in 1862. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Brown University in 1833. Dr. Johnson was a prominent member of the Bible Revision Society, and one of the presidents of the General Baptist Convention of the United States (formed in 1814). Over the Baptist Convention of his native state he presided for a score and a half of years. He wrote largely for the religious periodicals of his Church, and published Development of the Gospel of Jesus Christ through the Government and Order of the Churches, besides sermons, circulars, and addresses. — Appleton, Cyclop. 10, 36.

## Johnson, William L, D.D[[@Headword:Johnson, William L, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was a graduate of the General Theological Seminary, rector in Jamaica, L.I., for at least eighteen years, and died there, August 4, 1870, aged eighty years. See Prot. Episc. Almanac, 1871, page 118.

## Johnsonians[[@Headword:Johnsonians]]

             followers of John Johnson, a Baptist minister at Liverpool, England, in the last century, of whom there are still several congregations in different parts of England. He denied that faith was a duty, or, even action of the soul, and defined it “an active principle” conferred by grace; and denied also the duty of ministers to exhort the unconverted, or preach any moral duties whatever. Though Mr. Johnson entertained high supralapsarian notions on the divine decrees, he admitted the universality of the death of Christ. On the doctrine of the Trinity, his followers are said to have embraced the indwelling scheme, with Calvinistic views of justification and the atonement. See Johnson's Faith of God's Elect; Brine's Mistakes of Mr. Johnson (1745).

## Johnston, Arthur[[@Headword:Johnston, Arthur]]

             a Scottish writer of great celebrity, a native of Caskieben, near Aberdeen, was born in 1587. He was a physician by profession, but spent most of his time in literary pursuits; especially thorough was his acquaintance with Latin, and it is mainly for his Latin version of the Psalms, one of his last and best works, that we mention his name here. They were published under the title of Psalmorum Davidis Paraphrasis Poetica, et Canticorum Evangelicorum (Anerd. 1637, 12mo, and often since). As another writer of note, George Buchanan, also furnished a Latin version of the Psalms, a comparison was frequently instituted as to the comparative merits of their work. Hallam (Liter. Hist. of Europe, 4th ed. Lond. 1854, 3, 53), in alluding to it, thinks that “Johnston's Psalms, all of which are in elegiac meter, do not fall far short of those of Buchanan either in elegance of style or correctness of Latinity. Johnston spent the earlier part of his life in France and Italy. His medical degree he obtained at Padua. He returned to Scotland in 1625, and about 1628 was appointed physician to the court of Charles I. In 1637 his literary attainments received recognition by his election to the rectorate of King's College. He died in 1641. Besides the Psalms, he translated into Latin the Te Deum, Creed, Decalogue, etc.; also Solomon's Song (Lond. 1633, 8vo). His other publications are Elegiain Obitum R. Jacobi (Lond. 1625, 4to) : — Epigrammata (Aberdeen, 1632, 8vo). See memoirs of him in Benson's ed. of Johnston's version of the Psalms; Allibone, Dict. of Eng. and Amer. Authors, 2, 983; Cyclop. Brit. vol. 12, s.v.

## Johnston, Cyrus, D.D[[@Headword:Johnston, Cyrus, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Mecklenburg County, N.C., December 23, 1797. He graduated from Hampden-Sidney College in 1821; became pastor of Bethesda and adjoining churches, S.C., in 1824; at Providence and Sharon in 1839; principal of a female academy at Charlotte, N. C., in 1845, pastor there in 1846, and died January 25, 1855. See Nevin, Presbyterian Encyclop. s.v.

## Johnston, John[[@Headword:Johnston, John]]

             a Scotch minister, was a native of Aberdeen, and flourished in the latter half of the 16th century. He was, like his relative Arthur Johnston (q.v.), of a poetical turn of mind, but he also served his Church (the Presbyterian) in the capacity of professor of divinity at St. Andrew's College. He died in 1612. He wrote Consolatio Christiana sub Cruce, etc. (1609, 8vo): — Jambi Sacra (1611): — Tertrustich r et Lemnmatae Sacra — Item Cantica Sacra — Item Icones Regum Judeoe et Israelis (Lugd. Bat. 1612, 4to); etc. See Allibone, Dict. of English and American Authors, vol. 2, s.v.

## Johnston, John, D.D[[@Headword:Johnston, John, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Crawford, Orange County, N.Y., January 28, 1778. He graduated from the College of New Jersey in 1801; studied theology privately in Princeton; was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery in October, 1806. In 1807 he accepted a call to the united congregations of Newburgh and New Windsor, N.Y. In 1810 he was released from the congregation of New Windsor, but remained as pastor at Newburgh until his death, August 26, 1855. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:394.

## Johnstone, Bryce[[@Headword:Johnstone, Bryce]]

             an eminent Scottish theologian and writer, was born at Annan, Dumfriesshire, in 1747. He studied at the University of Edinburgh, where he graduated D.D. He entered the Church, and was for a long time pastor of Holyrood (from 1771), and died an 1805. He wrote, Commentary on the Revelation of John (1794,2 vols. 8vo) : — On the Influence of Religion on civil Society and civil Government (1801). All of his Sermons and Life were published by his nephew, the Rev. John Johnstone (1807, 8ro); etc. See Gorton's Biogr. Dictionary, s.v.; Allibone, Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth. s.v.

## Johnstone, William O., D.D[[@Headword:Johnstone, William O., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland, April 17, 1822, but received his education in this country. He was pastor of the Kensington Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, for more than thirty years, and his services in every department of Church work were constant and untiring. He died suddenly, January 16, 1883. See (Phila.) Presbyterian, January 20, 1883. (W.P.S.)

## Joiada[[@Headword:Joiada]]

             (Heb. Yoyadats', יויָדָע, a contraction of JEHOIADA, found only in Nehemiah, who invariably uses it), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿ωειδά v.r. Ι᾿ωιδά, Vulg. Jojada, A. Vers. “Jehoiada.”) Son of Paseah, and apparently one of the chief priests; in conjunction with Meshullam he repaired the Old Gate, SEE JERUSALEM, with its appurtenances, after the captivity (Neh 3:6). B.C. 446.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿ωαδά v.r. Ι᾿ωιαδά, Ι᾿ωδαέ.) Son and successor of Eliashib in the high priesthood, himself succeeded by his son Jonathan (Neh 12:10-11; Neh 12:22); another of his sons having married a daughter of Sanballat, on which account he was banished (Neh 13:28). B.C. post 446. Josephus (Ant. 11, 7, 1) Graecizes the name as Judas (Ι᾿ούδας). SEE HIGH PRIEST.

## Joiakim[[@Headword:Joiakim]]

             (Heb. Yoyakimn', יוֹיָקַים, a contraction of JEHOIAKIM, used exclusively by Nehemiah; Sept. Ι᾿ωακείμ v.r. Ι᾿ωακίμ), son of Jeshua and father of Eliashib, high priests successively (Neh 12:10; Neh 12:12; Neh 12:26). B.C. ante 446. Josephus does not mention him. SEE HIGH PRIEST.

## Joiarib[[@Headword:Joiarib]]

             (Heb. Yoyarib', יוֹיָרַיב, a contraction of JEHOIARIB, occurring exclusively in Ezra and Nehemiah), the name of three or four persons.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿ωαρίβ v.r. Ι᾿ωρίβ.) A priest named (Neh 11:10) in connection with Jachin, and as father of Jedaiah (q.v.), but by some error; compare 1Ch 9:10, where he is called JEHOIARIB SEE JEHOIARIB (q.v.), well known as founder of one of the sacerdotal “courses.” SEE PRIEST.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿ωιαρίβ.) A descendant of Judah, son of Zechariah and father of Adaiah (Neh 11:5), apparently through Shelah. See SHILONI. B.C. considerably ante 536.

3. (Sept. Ι᾿ωιαρείβ, Ι᾿ωαρίβ.) One of the priests who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh 12:6). He was the father of Mattenai, a contemporary with the high priest Joiakim (Neh 12:19). B.C. 536.

4. (Sept. Ι᾿ωαρείμ v.r. Ι᾿ωαρίμ.) A person mentioned in connection with Elnathan as a “man of understanding” (the others being called “chief men”), apparently among the priests, sent for by Ezra at the river of Ahava to devise means for obtaining a company of Levites to return with him to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:16). B.C. 459.

## Joidanus[[@Headword:Joidanus]]

             (Ι᾿ωαδάνος,Vulg. Joadeus), one of the priests, “sons of Jesus, the son of Josedec, and his brethren,” who had married foreign wives after the exile (1Es 9:19); apparently the same as GEDALIAH in the corresponding Hebrew text (Ezr 10:18) by a corruption (see Burrington, Genealogies, 1, 167).

## Joining[[@Headword:Joining]]

             besides its common sense (דָּבִק, to cling or adhere), is technically used of the binders (מְחִבְּרוֹת, mechabberoth'), whether of wood or stone, of the walls of a building (1Ch 22:3). SEE COUPLING.

## Joint[[@Headword:Joint]]

             besides its usual meaning ( דֶּבֶקde'bek, ἁφή, etc.), is, in one passage (Son 7:1), very erroneously employed in the A.V. as a rendering of חִמּוּקים, chammukim' (Sept. vaguely ῥνθμοί, Vulg. juncturoe, occurs nowhere else), the wrappers (of the thighs), i.e. drawers, a part of the female dress; which, in the case of bridal toilette, are represented as being fringed with a worked edging like lace or a skillfully chased jewel. SEE ATTIRE.

## Jokdeim[[@Headword:Jokdeim]]

             (Heb. Yokdedm', יָקְדְעָם, burning of the people; Sept. Ιεκδαάμ,Vulg. Jucadam), a town in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Jezreel and Zanoah (Jos 15:56). The associated names indicate a locality in the district southeast of Hebron, perhaps at the ruined site marked as ed- Dar on Van de Velde's Map, just north of Jebel Ziph.

## Jokim[[@Headword:Jokim]]

             (Heb. Yokim', רוֹקַים, prob. a contraction of JOIAKIM; Sept. Ι᾿ωακείμ v.r. Ι᾿ωακίμ, Vulg. paraphrases qui stare fecit solem), a person mentioned among the descendants of Shelah (his third son, according to Burrington), son of Judah (1Ch 4:22). B.C. prob. ante 588. SEE JASHUBI- LEHEM. "The Targum translates, 'and the prophets and scribes who came forth from the seed of Joshua.' The reading which that and the Vulg. had evidently was יָקַים, applied by some Rabbinical tradition to Joshua, and at the same time identifying Joash and Saraph, mentioned in the same verse, with Mahlon and Chilion. Jerome quotes a Hebrew legend that Jokim was Elimelech, the husband of Naomi, in whose days the sun stood still on account of the transgressors of the law (Quoest. Heb. in Paral.)"

## Jokmeam[[@Headword:Jokmeam]]

             (Heb. Yokmeaim', יָקְמְעָם,.gathering of the people; in 1Ki 4:12, Sept. Ι᾿εγμάαμ v.r. Λουκάμ, Vulg. Jecmaan, Auth. Vers. "Jokneam;" in 1Ch 6:68 [53], Ι᾿εκμαάν, Jecmaam), a place elsewhere called KIBZAIM (Jos 21:22), but better known as JOKNEAM (Jos 12:22, etc.).

Jokneam

(Heb. Yokneam'., יָקְנְעָם, possession of the people; Sept. Ι᾿εκονάμ, Vulg. Jachanan. Jeconam, Jecnam), a royal city of the Canaanites (Jos 12:22), situated on the southwestern boundary of Zebulon (but not within it, SEE TRIBE ), near Dabbasheth, and fronted by a stream [the Kishon] (Jos 19:11); assigned out of the territory of Zebulon to the Levites of the family of Merari (Jos 21:34). From 1Ch 6:68, the name appears to have been in later times written in the nearly synonymous form of JOKMEAM, and it thus appears. (in the original) as the boundary point of one of the purveyorships of Solomon (1Ki 4:12). It also seems to have been identical with the Levitical city KIBZAIM (see Lightfoot, Opp. 2, 233) in Mount Ephraim (Jos 21:22). Dr. Robinson has lately identified it with the modern Tell Kaimon, a commanding position at the foot of Mount Carmel, across the Kishon from the plain of Esdraelon, and in a locality exactly agreeing with the scriptural data, and in name and situation with the CYAMON SEE CYAMON (q.v.) of the Apocrypha (Jdt 7:3), as well as with that of the Cnammona of Eusebius and the Cimana of Jerome, although (in their Onomasticon) they profess ignorance of the site of Jokneam (new ed. of Bibl. Researches, 3, 115). Schwarz (Palest. p. 91) gives a conjecture agreeing with the latter part of this identification. (See also Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 326; Tristram, Land of Israel, p. 119.)

## Jokneam[[@Headword:Jokneam]]

             Of Tell Keimun, the modem representative of this place, a brief account may be found in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (2:48), and of the few remaining antiquities (page 69). A freer description is given by Lieut. Conder (Tent Work, 1:131):

"North of Lejjun the great Wady el-Milh runs down from the white plateau of the 'Breezy Land,' which it separates from the southern end of Carmel. Here at the mouth stands a huge tell or mound called Keimun, on which are remains of a little Byzantine chapel, and of a small fort erected by the famous native chief Dhahr el-  Amr. The Samaritans have a curious legend connected with this site. According to them Joshua was challenged by the giants, and enclosed here with his army in seven walls of iron. A dove carried his message thence to Nabih, king of the tribes east of Jordan, who came to his assistance. The magic walls fell down, and the king of Persia, Shobek, was transfixed by an arrow which nailed him on his horse to the ground.

"The present name is a slight modification of the ancient Jokneam of Carmel, but the Crusaders seem to have been puzzled by it, and transformed Keimfn into Cain Mons, or Mount Cain, whence arose the curious legend that Cain was here slain with an arrow by Lamech, which they supposed to be the murder referred to in the Song of Lamech (Gen 4:23). The chapel no doubt shows the spot once held to be the site of the death of Cain, but the derivation of the name was as fanciful as that of Haifa from Cephas or from Caiaphas the high-priest."

## Jokshan[[@Headword:Jokshan]]

             (Heb. Yokshan', יָקְשָׁן, narer; Sept. Ι᾿εζάν v.r. Ι᾿εξάν or Ι᾿εκσάν), the second son of Abraham and Keturah, whose sons Sheba and Dedan appear to have been the ancestors of the Sabaeans and Dedanites, that peopled a part of Arabia Felix (Gen 25:2-3; 1Ch 1:32-33). B.C. cir. 2020. "If the Keturahites stretched across the desert from the head of the Arabian to that of the Persian Gulf, SEE DEDAN, then we must suppose that Jokshan returned westwards to the trans-Jordanic country, where are placed the settlements of his sons, or at least the chief of their settlements, for a wide spread of these tribes seems to be indicated in the passages in the Bible which make mention of them. The writings of the Arabs are rarely of use in the case of Keturahite tribes, whom they seem to confound with Ishmaelites in one common appellation. They mention a dialect of Jokshan (Yakish, who is Yokshan, as having been formerly spoken near 'Aden and El-Jened, in Southern Arabia: Yakit's Moajam,  cited in the Zeitschrift d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, 8, 600-1; 10, 30-1); but that Midianites penetrated so far into the peninsula we hold to be highly improbable" (Smith). "Knobel (Genes. p. 188) suggests that the name Jokshan may have passed into Kashan (קשׁן), and that his descendants were the Cassanitoe (κασσανῖται) of Ptolemy (6, 7, 6) arid Steph. Byzant. (s.v.), the Casandres (Κασανδρεῖς) of Agatharchides (p. 6, ed. Huds.), the Gasandres (Γασανδρεῖς) of Diod. Sic. (3, 44), and the Casani or Gasani of Pliny (Hist. Nat. 6, 32), who dwelt by the Red Sea, to the south of the Cinaedocolpites, and extended to the most northern of the Joktanites." SEE ARABIA.

## Joktan[[@Headword:Joktan]]

             (Heb. Yoktan', יָקְטיָן, little; Sept. Ι᾿εκτάν, Josephus Ι᾿ούκτας, Ant. 1, 6, 4; Vulg. Jectan), a Shemite, second named of the two sons of Eber; his brother being Peleg (Gen 10:25; 1Ch 1:19). B.C. cir. 2400. He is mentioned as the progenitor of thirteen sons or heady of tribes, supposed to have resided in Southern Arabia (Gen 10:26-30); 1Ch 1:20-23). The Arabians called him Kahtan, and assert that from him the eight original residents of Yemen sprang. His name is still pointed out by them near Keshin (Niebuhr, Beschreib. p. 287), and traces of the same name appear in a city mentioned by Niebuhr (Beschr. p. 275) as lying three days' journey north of Nejeran, perhaps the station Jaktan alluded to by Edrisi as situated in the district of Sanaa. (See A. Schultens, Hist. imp. vetust. Joctanidar. in Ar. Fel. ex Abulfeda, etc., Harderov. 1786; Pococke, Specim. hist. Arab. p. 32 sq.; Assemani, Bibl. Orient. 3, 2, 553 sq.: Bochart's Phaleg, 3, 15.)

The original limits of the Joktanidae are stated in the Bible: "Their dwelling was from Mesha, as thou goest unto Sephar, a mount of the East" (Gen 10:30). The position of Mesha, which is reasonably supposed to be the western boundary, is still uncertain, SEE MESHA; but Sephar is well established as being the same as Zafari, the seaport town on the east of the modern Yemen, and formerly one of the chief centers of the great Indian and African trade. SEE SEPHAR.

1. The native traditions respecting Joktan himself commence with a difficulty. The ancestor of the great southern peoples was called Kahtan, who, say the Arabs, was, the same as Joktan. To this some European critics have objected that there is no good reason to account for the  .change of name, and that the identification of Kahtan with Joktan is evidently a Jewish tradition adopted by Mohammed or his followers, and consequently at or after the promulgation of El-Islam. M. Caussin de Perceval commences his essay on the history of Yemen (Essai, 1, 39) with this assertion, and adds, "Le nom de Cahtan, disent-ils [les Arabes], est le nom de Yectan, legerement altere en passant d'une langue etrangere dans la langue Arabe." In reply to these objectors, we may state:

(1.) The Rabbins hold a tradition that Joktan settled in India (see Joseph. Ant. 1, 6, 4), and the supposition of. a Jewish influence in the Arab traditions respecting him is therefore untenable. In the present case, even were this not so, there is an absence of motive for Mohammed's adopting traditions which alienate from the race of Ishmael many tribes of Arabia: the influence here suspected may rather be found in the contradictory assertion, put forward by a few of the Arabs, and rejected by the great majority and the most judicious of their historians, that Kahtan was descended from Ishmael.

(2.) That the traditions in question are post-Mohammedan cannot be proved; the same may be said of everything which Arab writers tell us dates before the prophet's time; for then oral tradition alone existed, if we except the rock cut inscriptions of the Himyarites, which are too few, and our knowledge of them is too slight to admit of much weight attaching to them.

(3.) In the Mir-at ez-Zeman it is stated, "Ibn El-Kelbi says, Yuktan [the Arabic equivalent of Joktan] is the same as Kahtan, son of 'Abir," i.e. Eber, and so say the generality of the Arabs. El-Beladhiri says, "People differ respecting Kahtan; some say he is the same as Yuktan, who is mentioned in the Pentateuch; but the Arabs arabicized his name and said Kahtan, the son of Had [because they identified their prophet Hud with Eber, whom they call 'Abir]; and some say, son of Es-Semeyfa," or, as is said in one place by the author here quoted, "El-Hemeysa, the son of Nebt [or Nabit, i.e. Nebaioth], the son of Ismail," i.e. Ishmael. He then proceeds, in continuation of the former passage, "Abi-Hanifeh ed-Dinawari says, He is Kahtan, the son of Abir, and was named Kahtan only because of his suffering from drought" [which is termed in Arabic Kaht]. (Mir-at ez- Zeman; account of the sons of Shem.) Of similar changes of names by the Arabs there are numerous instances. (See the remarks occurring in the  Koran, chap. 2, 248, in the Expositions of Ez-Zamakhsheri and El- Beydawi.)

(4.) If the traditions of Kahtan be rejected (and in this rejection we cannot agree), they are, it must be remembered, immaterial to the fact that the peoples called by the Arabs descendants of Kahtan are certainly Joktanites. His sons' colonization of Southern Arabia is proved by indisputable and undisputed identifications, and the great kingdom which there existed for many ages before our era, and in its later days was renowned in the world of classical antiquity, was as surely Joktanitic.

2. The settlements of the sons of Joktan are examined in the separate articles bearing their names, and generally in ARABIA. They colonized the whole of the south of the peninsula, the old "Arabia Felix," or the Yemen (for this appellation had a very wide significance in early times), stretching, according to the Arabs (and there is in this case no ground for doubting their general correctness), to Mekkeh on the northwest, and along nearly the whole of the southern coast eastwards, and far inland. At Mekkeh tradition connects the two great races of Joktan and Ishmael by the marriage of a daughter of Jurhum the Joktanite with Ishmael. It is necessary, in mentioning this Jurhum, who is called a "son" of Joktan (Kahtan), to observe that "son" in these cases must be regarded as signifying "descendant," and that many generations (though how many, or in what order, is not known) are missing from the existing list between Kahtan (embracing the most important time of the Joktanites) and the establishment of the comparatively modern Himyaritic kingdom, from this latter date, stated by Caussin, Essai, 1, 63, at B.C. cir. 100, the succession of the Tubbaas is apparently preserved to us. At Mekkeh the tribe of Jurhum long held the office of guardians of the Kaabeh, or temple, and the sacred inclosure, until they were expelled by the Ishmaelites (Kutb ed-Din, Hist. of Mekkeh, ed. Wüstenfeld, p. 35 and 39 sq.; and Caussin, Essai, 1, 194).

But it was at Seba, the Biblical Sheba, that the kingdom of Joktan attained its greatness. In the southwestern angle of the peninsula, Sana (Uzal), Seba (Sheba), and Hadramaut (Hazarmaveth), all closely neighboring, formed together the principal known settlements of the Joktanites. Here arose the kingdom of Sheba, followed in later times by that of Himyar. The dominant tribe from remote ages seems to have been that of Seba (or Sheba, the Saboei of the Greeks), while the family of Himyar (Homeritoe) held the  first place in the tribe. The kingdom called that of Himyar we believe to have been merely a late phasis of the old Sheba, dating; both in its rise and its name, only shortly before our era.

Next in importance to the tribe of Seba was that of Hadramaut, which, till the fall of the Himyaritic power, maintained a position of independence and a direct line of rulers from Kahtan (Caussin, 1, 135-6). Joktanic tribes also passed northwards to Hireh, in El-Irak, and to Ghassan, near Damascus. The emigration of these and other tribes took place on the occasion of the rupture of a great dike (the dike of El-Arim), above the metropolis of Seba; a catastrophe that appears, from the concurrent testimony of Arabic writers, to have devastated a great extent of country, and destroyed the city Ma-rib or Seba. This event forms the commencement of an era, the dates of which exist in the inscriptions on the dike and elsewhere; but when we should place that commencement is still quite an open question. (See the extracts from El-Mesudi and other authorities, edited by Schultens; Caussin, 1, 84 sq.) See Tuch, Commentary on Genesis (Halle, 1838). chap. 10; Knobel, Völkertafel, p. 178 sq.; Ritter, Halbinsel Arabien, 1, 38 sq.; Dr. Ley, De Templi Meccani origine (Berlin, 1849).

## Joktheel[[@Headword:Joktheel]]

             (Hebrew Yooktheel', יָקְתְאֵלֵ, subdued by God), the name of two cities.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿εχθαήλ v.r. Ι᾿αχαρεήλ.) A town in the plain of Judah, mentioned between Mizpeh and Lachish (Jos 15:38). The associated names indicate a locality in the district southwest or west of Eleutheropolis (Keil's Commentary, ad loc.); possibly at Balin, a small modern village a little south of Tell es-Safieh (Robinson, Researches, 2, 368).

2. (Sept. Ι᾿εκθοήλ v.r. Ι᾿εθοήλ.) The name given by king Amaziah to SELAH, the capital of Idumaea, or Arabia Petrea, and subsequently borne by it (2Ki 14:7); from which circumstance he appears to have improved it after having captured it. SEE PETRA.

## Joktheel Of Judah[[@Headword:Joktheel Of Judah]]

             For this town Tristram proposes (Bible Places, page 40) Khurbet Mesheifrefeh, near Gaza, on the ground that "the word is the Arabic equivalent of the Hebrew;" and a writer in the Quar. Statement of the "Pal. Explor. Fund" (January 1881, page 53) proposes "the large ruin Kutlaneh, south of Gezer, as the words are from similar roots." But both these identifications are very precarious.

## Jol[[@Headword:Jol]]

             SEE YULE.

## Jolly, Alexander[[@Headword:Jolly, Alexander]]

             an English prelate, was born in 1756. He was ordained for the ministry in 1777, and became pastor at Turiff the same year. In 1778 he removed to Frasersburgh, where he resided for forty-nine years. In 1796 he was elevated to the bishopric of Dundee, and later he became bishop of Moray,  a see founded in the 12th century, and which, after, bishop Jolly's decease, was absorbed in other diocesei. He died in 1838. Bishop Jolly's works are, Baptismal: Regeneration (Lond. 1826; new edition, with Life of author by Cheyne, 1840, 12mo): — Sunday Services and Holy Days, etc. (1828; 3d ed., with Memoir of author by Bp. Walker, Edinb. 1840, l2mo): — The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist (1832, 12mo; 2d ed. Aberdeen, 1847, 12mo). See Allibone, Dict. of Engl. and American Authors, 2, 986.

## Jolof Version[[@Headword:Jolof Version]]

             SEE JALLOOF VERSION.

## Jolowicz, Heymann[[@Headword:Jolowicz, Heymann]]

             a Jewish scholar, who died at Konigsberg, Prussia, in 1875, is the author of, Die fortschreitende Entwickelung der Cultur der Juden in Deutschland (Berlin, 1841): — Harfenklange der heiligen Vorzeit (Leipsic, 1846): — Bluthen rabbinischer Weisheit (Thorn, 1845): — Die Himmelfahrt und Vision des Propheten Jesaia (Leipsic, 1854): — Die germanische Welt in  ihrer Beruhrung mit dem Christenthume (ibid. 1854): — Bluthenkranz morgenlandischer Dichtungen (1860): — Geschichte der Juden in Konigsberg (1867). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:100 sq.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:626. (B.P.)

## Jomtob[[@Headword:Jomtob]]

             SEE LIPPMANN.

## Jon, Francis Du[[@Headword:Jon, Francis Du]]

             SEE JUNIUS.

## Jona[[@Headword:Jona]]

             (Joh 1:42). SEE JONAS.

## Jona Ben-Ganach[[@Headword:Jona Ben-Ganach]]

             SEE IBN-GANACH.

## Jona, Sueno[[@Headword:Jona, Sueno]]

             a professor of Oriental languages at Upsala, was born in 1590, and died in 1641. He published, Elementale Theologicum, etc. (Upsala, 1625): — Catechesis Minor (ibid. 1627): — Institutionum Hebraicarum pars Elementaria, etc. (1637): — Institutionum Hebraicarum pars Secunda (1638). See Stiernmann, Bibl. Suio-Gothica, page 347; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Jonadab[[@Headword:Jonadab]]

             a shortened form of the name Jehonadab, for which it is used indifferently in the Hebrew as applied to either of two men in certain passages; but these have not been accurately represented in the A.V. which applies the briefer form indeed to either, but the full form to but one in three of these passages. SEE JEHONADAB.

1. The son of Shimeah and nephew of David (A.V. correctly in 2Sa 13:3 twice, 32, 35; incorrectly in 2Sa 13:5, where the Hebrew has Jehonadab).

2. The Rechabite (Jer 35:6; Jer 35:10; Jer 35:19; incorrectly in Jer 35:8; Jer 35:14; Jer 35:16; Jer 35:18).

## Jonah[[@Headword:Jonah]]

             (Heb. Yonah', יוֹנָה, a dove, as often, but in that sense fem., Sept. Ι᾿ωνά in 2Ki 14:25; elsewhere and in the N.T. Ιωνᾶς: SEE JONAS ), the son of Amittai, the fifth in order of the minor prophets. No aera is assigned to him in the book of his prophecy, yet there is little doubt of his being the same person who is spoken of in 2Ki 14:25 as having uttered a prophecy of the relief of the kingdom of Israel, which was accomplished by  Jeroboam's recapture of the ancient territory of the northern tribes between Coele-Syria and the Ghor (compare 2Ki 14:29). The Jewish doctors; have supposed him to be the son of the widow of Sarepta by a puerile interpretation of 1Ki 17:24 (Jerome, Proefat. in Jonam). His birthplace was Gath-hepher, in the tribe of Zebulon (2Ki 14:25). Jonah flourished in or before the reign of Jeroboam II (B.C. cir. 820), since he predicted the successful conquests, enlarged territory, and brief prosperity of the Israelitish kingdom under that monarch's sway (comp. Josephus, Ant. 9, 10, 1). The oracle itself is not extant, though Hitzig has, by a novel process of criticism, amused himself with a fancied discovery of it in chaps. 15 and 16 of Isaiah (Des Proph. Jonah Orakel. über Moab kritisch vindicirt, etc., Heidelb. 1831).

The personal history of Jonah is, with the exception of this incidental allusion, to be gathered from the account in the book that bears his name. Having already, as it seems (from וin 1:1), prophesied to Israel, he was sent to Nineveh. The time was one of political revival in Israel; but ere long the Assyrians were to be employed by God as a scourge upon them. The Israelites consequently viewed them with repulsiveness; and the prophet, in accordance with his name (יוֹנָה, "a dove"), out of timidity and love for his country, shrunk from a commission which he felt sure would result (Jon 4:2) in the sparing of a hostile city. He attempted, therefore, to escape to Tarshish, either Tartessus in Spain (Bochart, Titcomb, Hengstenberg), or more probably (Drake) Tarsus in Cilicia, a port of commercial intercourse. The providence of God, however watched over him, first in a storm, and then in his being swallowed by a large fish (דָּג גָּדֹול) for the space of three days and three nights (see Hauber, Jonas im Bauche des Wallfisches [Lemg. 1753]; Delitzsch, in Zeitschr. f. Luther. Kirche u. Theol. 11840], 2, 112 sq.; Baumgarten, ibid. [1841], 2, 187; Keil, Bibl. Commentar zu d. Kl. Propheten [Leipz. 1866 ]). After his deliverance Jonah executed his commission; and the king, having heard of his miraculous deliverance (dean Jackson. On the Creed, bk. 9, c. 42), ordered a general fast; and averted the threatened judgment. But the prophet, not from personal, but national feelings, grudged the mercy shown to a heathen nation. He was therefore taught, by the significant lesson of the "gourd," whose growth and decay (a known fact to naturalists: Layard's Nineveh, 1, 123, 124) brought the truth at once home to him, that  he was sent to testify by deed, as other prophets would afterwards testify by word, of the capacity of Gentiles for salvation, and the design of God to make them partakers of it. This was "the sign of the prophet Jonas" (Luk 11:29-32), which was given to a proud and perverse generation of Jews after the ascension of Christ by the preaching of his apostles. (See the monographs on this subject cited by Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 160). But the resurrection of Christ itself was also shadowed forth in the history of the prophets, as is made certain to us by the words of our Savior (see Jackson as above, bk. 9, c. 40). Titcomb (Bible Studies, p. 237, note) sees a correspondence between Jon 1:17 and Hos 6:2. Besides this, the fact and the faith of Jonah's prayer in the belly of the fish betokened to the nation of Israel the intimation of a resurrection and of immortality.

On what portion of the coast Jonah was set down in safety we are not informed. The opinions held as to the peculiar spot by rabbins and other thaumaturgic expositors need not be repeated. According to modern tradition, it was at the spot now marked as Khan Nebi Yunas, near Sidon (Kelly's Syria, p. 302). The particular plant (קיקָיוֹן, kikayon', "gourd") which sheltered Jonah was possibly the Ricinus, whose name Kiki is yet preserved in some of the tongues of the East. It is more likely, however, to have been some climbing plant of the gourd tribe. The Sept. renders it κολοκύνθη. Jerome translates it hedera, but against his better judgment and for fear of giving offense to the critics of his age, as he quietly adds in justification of his less preferable rendering, "Sed timuimus grammaticos." (See an elucidation of the passage in the Beitr. zur Beförd. etc. 19, p. 183.) SEE GOURD.

Various spots have been pointed out as the place of his sepulchre, such as Mosul in the East, and Gath-hepher in Palestine; while the so called Epiphanius speaks of his retreating to Tyre, and being buried there in the tomb of Cenezaeus, judge of Israel. (See Otho, Lexicon Rabb. p. 326 sq.; comp. Ephraem Syrus' Repentance of Nineveh, transl. by Dr. Burgess, Lord. 1853.) Apocryphal prophecies ascribed to Jonah may be found in the pseudo-Epiphanius (De Vitis Prophet. c. 16) and the Chronic. Paschale, p. 149.

## Jonah Ben-Abraham Gerundi[[@Headword:Jonah Ben-Abraham Gerundi]]

             a Jewish savant, and one of the principal leaders of the opposition to the school of Maimonides, was born about 1195. A disciple of the celebrated Salomo of Montpensier, he had espoused the cause of the latter. He was one of the parties that pronounced the ban against all who should dare to read the writings of the celebrated Jewish philosopher, and his opposition had in every way been so bitter against the Maimonidists that it caused no little surprise in the Jewish camp when he, upon the attempt of the inquisitors to destroy all copies of the Rabbinical writings, openly declared his former course a mistake, and pronounced the second Moses a great and good man. He even entered upon a pilgrimage to the grave of the man whose writings and disciples he had formerly opposed; and when, at the solicitation of a Jewish congregation which demanded his services, he halted on the journey, and there died (about 1270), his death was attributed by some of his superstitious brethren as a punishment of heaven for the nonfulfilment of his duty to visit the grave of Maimonides, and there declare the folly of his former course. Jonah was a man of splendid parts, and did much to allay strife among his people. Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7, 46, 117 sq. SEE SALOMO OF MONTPENSIER. (J.H.W.)

## Jonahs Prophecy[[@Headword:Jonahs Prophecy]]

             contains the above account of the prophet's commission to denounce Nineveh, and of his refusal to undertake 6he embassy of the method he  employed to escape the unwelcome task, and the miraculous means which God used to curb his self-willed spirit, and subdue his petulant and querulous disposition (Reindel, Die Sendung d. Proph. Jonas nach Ninive. Bamb. 1826). His attempt to flee from the presence of the Lord seems like a partial insanity, produced by the excitement of distracting motives in an irascible and melancholy heart (J. C. Lange, Diss. de mirabili fuga Jonoe, Hal. 1751).

I. Historical Character of the Book. — The history of Jonah is certainly striking and extraordinary. Its characteristic prodigy does not resemble the other miraculous phenomena recorded in Scripture, yet we must believe in its literal occurrence, as the Bible affords no indication of its being a mythus, allegory, or parable (Piper, Historie Jonoe a recentior. conatibus vindicata, (Tryph. 1786). On the other hand, our Savior's pointed and peculiar allusion to it is a presumption of its reality (Mat 12:40). The historical character of the narrative is held by Hess, Lilienthal, Sack, Reindel, Hävernick, Hengstenberg, Laberenz, Baumgarten, Delitzsch, Welte, Stuart, and Keil, Einleitung, sec. 89. (See Friedrichsen, Krit. Uebersicht der verschied. Ansichten on dem Buch Jonah , 2 d edit. 1841.) The opinion of the earlier Jews (Tob 14:4; Tob 14:8; 3Ma 6:8; Josephus, Ant. 9, 10, 2) is also in favor of the. literality of the adventure (see Buddei Hist. V. Test. 2, 589 sq.). It requires less faith to credit this simple excerpt from Jonah's biography than to believe the numerous hypotheses that have been invented to deprive it of its supernatural character, the great majority of them being clumsy and far fetched, doing violence to the language, and despite to the spirit of revelation; distinguished, too, by tedious adjustments, laborious combinations, historical conjecture, and critical jugglery. In vindication of the reality of this striking narrative, it may be argued that the allusions of Christ to Old Testament events on similar occasions are to actual occurrences (Joh 3:14; Joh 6:48); that the purpose which God had in view justified his miraculous interposition; that this miracle must have had a salutary effect both on the minds of the Ninevites and on the people of Israel. Neither is the character of Jonah improbable. Many reasons might induce him to avoid the discharge of his prophetic duty — fear of being thought a false prophet, scorn of a foreign and hostile race, desire for their utter destruction, a false dignity which might reckon it beneath his prerogative to officiate among uncircumcised idolaters (Verschuir, Opusc. p. 73, etc.; Alber, Institut. Hermen. Vet. Test. 3, 393, 407; Jahn, Introduction to the Old Testament, transl. by Turner, p.  372, 373, translator's notes; Laberenz, De Vera. lib. Jonoe Interp. Fulda, 1836).

Others regard this book as an allegory, such as Bertholdt and Rosenmüller, Gesenius and Winer. Especially have many deemed it a parody upon or even the original of the various heathen fables of Arion and the Dolphin (Herodot. 1, 21), and the wild adventure of Hercules which is referred to in Lycophron (Cassandra, 5, 33; see Forbiger, De Lycophr. Cassandra c. epimetro de. ona, Lips. 1827; comp. Iliad, 20, 145, 21, 442; Diod. Sic. 4, 42, Philostr. Icon. 12; Hygin. Fab. 89; Apollod. 2 ,5, 9) and Perseus (Apollod. 2, 4, 3; Ovid, Metam. 4, 662 sq.; Hygin. 64; Phot. Cod. 186, p. 231), Joppa being even famous as the scene of Andromeda's exposure (Pliny, 5, 14, 34; 9, 4; Strabo, 16, 759). Cyrill Alexand., in his Comment. in Jonah notices this similitude between the incident of Jonah and the fabled enterprise of the son of Alcmena (see Allat. Excerpt. var. p. 274; Eudocia Viol. in Villoison's Anec. Gr. 1, 344; Anton, Comparatio librorum V.T. et scriptor. profan. cet. p. 10, Gorlic. 1831; compare, too, Theophylact, Opp. 4, 169). Bleek justly says (Einleit. p. 576) that there is not the smallest probability of the story of Jonah's temporary sojourn in the belly of the whale having been either mediately or immediately derived from those Greek fables. F. von Baur's hypothesis of the story of the book being a compound of some popular Jewish traditions and the Babylonian myth respecting a sea monster Oannes, and the fast for Adonis, is now universally regarded as exploded. For further discussion of this part of Jonah's history, see Gesenius, in the Hall. Lit.-Zeit. 1813, No. 23; Friedrichsen, Krit. Ueberblick der Ansichten vom Jonas (Leipz. 1841); Delitzsch, in Rudelbach's Zeitschrift, 1840, 2, 112 sq. These legendary parallels may be seen drawn out at length by professor Stowe in the Bibliotheca Sacra for Oct. 1853, p. 744 sq. SEE JOPPA.

Some, who cannot altogether reject the reality of the narrative, suppose it to have had a historical basis, though its present form be fanciful or mythical. Such an opinion is the evident result of a mental struggle between receiving it as a real transaction, or regarding it as wholly a fiction (Goldhorn, Excurs. z. B. Jonah p. 28; Friedrichsen, Krit. Ueberblick der Ansichten B. Jonah p. 219). Grimm, in his Uebersetz. p. 61, regards it as a dream produced in that sleep which fell upon Jonah as he lay in the sides of the ship. The fanciful opinion of the famous Herman von der Hardt, in his Jonas in lace, etc., a full abstract of which is given by Rosenmüller (Prolegom. in Jonam, p. 19), was, that the book is a historical allegory,  descriptive of the fate of Manasseh, and Josiah his grandson, kings of Judah. Tarshish, according to him, represents the kingdom of Lydia; the ship, the Jewish republic, whose captain was Zadok the high priest; while the casting of Jonah into .the sea symbolized the temporary captivity of Manasseh in Babylon. Less (Vom historischen Styl der Urwelt) supposed that all difficulty might be removed by imagining that Jonah, when thrown into the sea, was taken up by a ship having a large fish for a figure head a theory somewhat more pleasing than the rancid hypothesis of Anton, who fancied that the prophet took refuge in the interior of a dead whale, floating near the spot where he was cast overboard (Rosenm. Prolegom. in Jonah p. 328). Not unlike the opinion of Less is that of Charles Taylor, in his Fragments affixed to Calmet's Dictionary, No. 145, that דָּג signifies a life preserver, a notion which, as his manner is, he endeavors to support by mythological metamorphoses founded on the form and names of the famous fish god of Philistia. There are others who allow, as De Wette and Knobel, that Jonah was a real person, but hold that the book is made up, for didactic purposes, of legendary stories which had gathered around him. A slender basis of fact has been allowed by some — by Bunsen, for example, who, strangely enough, fixes upon the very portion which to most of his rationalistic countrymen bears the clearest marks of spuriousness, as the one genuine part of the whole — Jonah's thanksgiving from the perils of shipwreck (as Bunsen judges); and thinks that some one had mistaken the matter, and fabricated out of it the present story — by others, such as Krahmer (Das Buch Jonas, introd.), who suppose that Jonah was known to have uttered a prophecy against Nineveh, and to have been impatient at the delay which appeared in the fulfilment, and was hence, for didactic purposes, made the hero of the story.

But the more common opinion in the present day with this school of divines is, that the story is purely moral, and without any historical foundation; nor can any clue be found or imagined in the known history of the times why Jonah in particular, a prophet of Israel in the latter stages of the kingdom, should have been chosen as the ground of the instruction meant to be conveyed. So Ewald, Bleek, etc., who, however, differ in some respects as to the specific aim of the book, while they agree as to its non-historical character. In short, that the book is the grotesque coinage of a Hebrew imagination seems to be the opinion, variously modified, of Semler, Michaelis, Herder, Stäudlin, Eichhorn, Augusti, Meyer, Pareau, Hitzig, and Maurer.  The plain, literal import of the narrative being set aside with misapplied ingenuity, the supposed design of it has been very variously interpreted. Michaelis (Uebersetz. d. N.T. part 11, p. 101) and Semler (Apparat. ad Lib. Vet. Test. Interpret. p. 271) supposed the narrative to be intended to show the injustice of the arrogance and hatred cherished by the Jews towards other nations. So in substance Bleek. Similarly Eichhorn (Einleit. § 577) and Jahn (Introduct. § 127) think the design was to teach the Jews that other people with less privileges excelled them in pious obedience. Kegel (Bibel d. A. und N. Test. 7, 129 sq.) argues that this episode was meant to solace and excite the prophets under the discharge of difficult and dangerous duties; while Paulus (Memorabilia, 6, 32 sq.) maintains that the object of the author of Jonah is to impress the fact that God remits punishment on repentance and reformation. Similar is the idea of Kimchi and Pareau (Interpretation of Old Testament, Biblical Cabinet, No. 25, p. 263). Krahmer thinks that the theme of the writer is the Jewish colony in its relation to the Samaritans (Das B. Jon. Krit. untersucht, p. 65). Maurer (Comment. in Proph. Min.) adheres to the opinion which lies upon the surface, that it inculcates the sin of not obeying God, even in pronouncing severe threatenings on a heathen people. Ewald would make the design quite general, namely, to show how the true fear of God and repentance bring salvation — first, in the case of the heathen sailors; then in the case of Jonah: finally, in that of the Ninerites. Hitzig (first in a separate treatise, then in his commentary on the minor prophets) supposes the book to have been written by someone in the 4th century before Christ, "in Egypt, that land of wonders," and chiefly for the purpose of vindicating Jehovah for having failed to verify the prophecy in Obadiah respecting the heathen Edomites. Similarly, Köster (Die Prophetens des A. und N. Test., Leipz. 18, 9) favors the malignant insinuation that its chief end was to save the credit of the prophets among the people, though their predictions against foreign nations might not be fulfilled, as Nineveh was preserved after being menaced and doomed.

These hypotheses are all vague and baseless, and do not merit a special refutation. Endeavoring to free us from one difficulty, they plunge us into others vet more intricate and perplexing. We notice the principal external objections that have been brought against the book.

(1.) Much profane wit has been expended on the miraculous means of Jonah's deliverance, very unnecessarily and very absurdly; it is simply said, "The Lord had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah." Now the  species of marine animal is not defined, and the Greek κῆτος is often used to specify, not the genus whale, but any large fish or sea monster. All objections to its being a whale which lodged Jonah in its stomach, from its straitness of throat or rareness of haunt in the Mediterranean, are thus removed. Hesychius explains κῆτος as θαλάσσιος ἰχθὑς παμμεγἐθης. Eustathius explains its correspondent adjective κητώεσσαν by μεγάλην (in the Iliad, 2:581). Diodorus Siculus speaks of terrestrial monsters as κητώδη ζῶα, and describes a huge fish as κῆτος ἄπιστον τὸ μέγεθος. The Scripture thus speaks only of an enormous fish, which under God's direction swallowed the prophet, and does not point out the species to which the voracious prowler belonged. There is little ground for the supposition of bishop Jebb, that the asylum of Jonah was not in the stomach of a whale, but in a cavity of its throat, which, according to naturalists, is a very capacious receptacle, sufficiently large, as captain Scoresby asserts, to contain a merchant ship's jolly boat full of men (bishop Jebb, Sacred Literature, p. 178). Since the days of Bochart it has been a common opinion that the fish was of the shark species, Lamia canis carcharias, or "sea dog" (Bochart, Op. 3, 72; Calmet's Dissertation sur Jonah). Entire human bodies have been found in some fishes of this kind. The stomach, too, has no influence on any living substance admitted into it. Granting all these facts as proof of what is termed the economy of miracles, still must we say, in reference to the supernatural preservation of Jonah, Is anything too hard for the Lord? SEE WHALE.

(2.) What is said about the size of Nineveh, also, is in accordance with fact (see Pict. Bible, note, ad loc.). It was "an exceeding great city of three days' journey." Built in the form of a parallelogram, it made, according to Diodorus (2:7), a circuit of 480 furlongs, or about 60 miles. It has been usual, since the publication of Layard's Nineveh, to say that the great ruins of Koyunjik, Nimrûd, Keremles, and Khorsabad form such a parallelogram, the distances from north to south being about 18 miles, and from east to west about 12; the longer sides thus measuring 36 miles, and the shorter ones 24. But against this view professor Rawlinson has recently urged, with considerable force, that the four great ruins bore distinct local titles; that Nimrûd, identified with Calah, is mentioned in Scripture as a place so far separated from Nineveh that "a great city" Resen lay between them (Gen 10:12); that there are no signs of a continuous town; and that the four sites are fortified "on what would be the inside of the city." Still Nineveh, as represented by the ruins of Koyunjik and Nebbi-Yunus, or  Tomb of Jonah, was of an oblong shape, with a circuit of about eight miles, and was therefore a place of unusual size" an exceeding great city." The phrase, "three days' journey," may mean that it would take that time to traverse the city and proclaim through all its localities the divine message; and the emphatic point then is, that at the end of his first day's journey the preaching of Jonah took effect. The clause, "that cannot discern their right hand from their left hand," probably denotes children, and 120,000 of these might represent a population of more than half a million (Rawlinson's Five Great Monarchies, 1, 310; Sir Henry Rawlinson's Comment. on Cuneif. Inscriptions, p. 17; Captain Jones's Topography of Nineveh, in the Jour. of As. Society, 15, 298). Jonah entered the city "a day's journey," that is, probably went from west to east uttering his incisive and terrible message. The sublime audacity of the stranger the ringing monotony of his sharp, short cry had an immediate effect. The story of his wonderful deliverance had perhaps preceded him (Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 100). The people believed God, and proclaimed a fast, and man and beast fasted alike. The exaggeration ascribed to, this picture adds to its credibility, so prone is Oriental nature to extremes. If the burden of Jonah was to have any effect at all, one might say that it must be profound and immediate. It was a panic we dare not call it a revival, or, with Dr. Pusey, dignify it into conversion. There was plainly no permanent result. After the sensation had passed away, idolatry and rapacity resumed their former sway, as is testified by the prophets Isaiah, Nahum, and Zephaniah; yet the appalled conscience of Nineveh did confess its "evil and its violence" as it groveled in the dust. Various causes may have contributed to deeper this consternation — the superstition of the people, and the sudden and unexplained appearance of the foreigner with his voice of doom. "The king," as Layard says, "might believe him to be a special minister from the supreme deity of the nation," and it was only "' when the gods themselves seemed to interpose that any check was placed on the royal pride and lust." Layard adds, "It was not necessary to the effect of his preaching that Jonah should be of the religion of the people of Nineveh. I have known a Christian priest frighten a whole Mussulman town to tents and repentance by publicly proclaiming that he had received a divine mission to announce a coming earthquake or plague" (Nineveh and Babylon, p. 632). The compulsory mourning of the brute creation has at least one analogy in the lamentation made over the Persian general Masistius: "The horses and beasts of burden were shaved" (Herodotus, 9:24). According to Plutarch, also, Alexander continued the observance of a similar custom on the death of Hephaestion. Therefore, in  the accessories of the narrative there is no violation of probability — all is in accordance with known customs and facts. See Nineveh.

(3.) It has appeared to some, in particular to Bleek (Einleit. p. 571), improbable, and against the historical verity of this book, that on the supposition of all that is here related having actually occurred, there should be in the relation of them such a paucity of circumstantial details — nothing said, for instance, of the place where Jonah was discharged on dry land, or of the particular king who then reigned at Nineveh and not only so, but no apparent reference in the future allusions to Nineveh in Scriptura, to the singular change (if so be it actually took plane) wrought through the preaching of Jonah on the religious and moral state of the people. These are still always regarded as idolaters, and the judgments of God uttered against them, as if they stood in much the same position with the heathen enemies generally of God's cause and people. It may fairly be admitted that there is a certain degree of strangeness in such things, which, if it were not in accordance with the character both of the man and of the mission, and in these found a kind of explanation, might not unnaturally give rise to some doubts of the credibility of what is written. But Jonah's relation to Nineveh was altogether of a special and peculiar nature; it stood apart from the regular calling of a prophet and the ordinary dealings of God; and having for its more specific object the instruction and warning of the covenant people in a very critical period of their affairs, the reserve maintained as to local and historical details may have been designed, as it was certainly fitted, to make them think less of the parties immediately concerned, and more of what through these God was seeking to impress upon themselves. The whole was a kind of parabolical action; and beyond a certain limit circumstantial minuteness would have tended to mar, rather than to promote, the leading aim. Then, as to the change produced upon the Ninevites, we are led from the nature of the case to think chiefly of the more flagrant iniquities as the evils more particularly cried against; and Israel itself afforded many examples of general reformations in respect to these, of which little or no trace was to be found in the course even of a single generation. Much more might such be expected to have happened in the case of Nineveh.

II. Style, Date, etc. — The book of Jonah is a simple narrative, with the exception of the prayer or thanksgiving in chap. 2. Its style and mode of narration are uniform. There are no traces of compilation, as Nachtigall supposed; neither is the prayer, as De Wette (Einleit. § 237) imagines,  improperly borrowed from some other sources. That prayer contains, indeed, not only imagery peculiar to itself, but also such imagery as at once was suggested to the mind of a pious Hebrew preserved in circumstances of extreme jeopardy. On this principle we account for the similarity of some portions of its phraseology to Psalm 59:42, etc. The language in both places had been hallowed by frequent usage, and had become the consecrated idiom of a distressed and succored Israelite.. Perhaps the prayer of Jonah might be uttered by him, not during his mysterious imprisonment, but after it (מַמְּעֵי הִדָּגָה, out, i.e. when out of the fish's belly; comp. Job 19:26; Job 11:15). The hymn seems to have been composed after his deliverance. and the reason why his deliverance is noted after the hymn is recorded may be to show the occasion of its composition. 'The Lord had spoken unto the fish, and it had vomited Jonah on the dry land!" (See further Hauber, in his Bibl. Betrachtungen, Lemgo, 1753; also an article on the subject in the Brit. Theol. Mag. 1, 3., p. 18.) There was little reason either for dating the composition of this book later than the age of Jonah, or for supposing it the production of another than the prophet himself. The Chaldaisms which Jahn and others find may be accounted for by the nearness of the canton of Zebulon, to which Jonah belonged, to the northern territory, whence by national intercourse Aramaic peculiarities might be insensibly borrowed. (Thus we have סְפַינָה — a ship with a deck — not the more common Hebrew term; רִב— a foreign title applied to the captain; מַנָּה, to appoint — found, however, in Psalms 61, a psalm which Hupfeld without any valid grounds places after the Babylonian captivity; אָמִר, to command, as in the later books; טִעִם command, referring to the royal decree, and probably taken from the native Assyrian tongue; חָעִם, to row, a nautical term; and the abbreviated form of the relative, which, however, occurs in other books, etc.) Gesenius and Bertholdt place it before the exile; Jahn and Koster after it. Rosenmüller supposes the author may have been a contemporary of Jeremiah; Hitzig postpones it to the period of the Maccabees. The general opinion is that Jonah was the first of the prophets (Rosenmüller, Bp. Lloyd, Davison, Browne, Drake): Hengstenberg would place him after Amos and Hosea, and, indeed, adheres to the order of the books in the canon for. the chronology. He, as well as Hitzig, would identify the author with that of Obadiah, chiefly on account of the initial "and." The king of Nineveh at this time is supposed (Usher and others) to have been Pul, who is placed by Layard (Nim. and Bab. p. 624) at B.C. 750; but an earlier king,  Adrammelech II, B.C. 840, is regarded as more probable by Drake. The date above assigned to Jonah would seem to indicate the husband of the famous Semiramis. SEE ASSYRIA.

III. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps expressly on the whole book, the most important of which we designate by prefixing an asterisk: Ephraem Syrus, In Jonam (in Opp. 3, 562; transl. from the Syriac by Burgess, Homily, Lond. 1853, 12mo); Basil, In Jonam (in Opp. p. 66); Tertullian, Carmen (in Opp. p. 576); Theophylact, Commentarius (in Opp. 4); Brentius, Commentarius (in Opp. 4); Luther, Auslegung (Wittenb. 1526, 4to and 8vo; Erf. 1526, 1531, 8vo; also in Werke, Wittenb. ed. 5, 310; Jen. 3, 214; Alt. 3, 351; Lpz. 8, 516; Hal. 6, 496; in Latin, by Jonas, in Opp. Vitemb. 4, 404; and separately by Opsoppaeus, Hag. 1526, 8vo; and Loneke, Argent. 1526, 8vo); Artopoeus, Commentarius (Stet. 1545, Basil, 1558, 8vo); Bugenhagen, Expositio (Vitemb. 1550, 1561, 8vo); Hooper, Sermons (London, 1550, 12mo; also in Writings, p. 431); Ferus, Commentarius (Lugd. 1554, Antw. 1557, Ven. 1567, 8vo; also in German, Cöln, 1567, 8vo); Willich, Commentarius [includ. sev. minor proph.] (Basil. 1566, 8vo); Selnecker, Auslegung [including Nahum, etc.]. (Lpz. 1567, 4to); Tuscan, Commentarius (Ven. 1573, 8vo); Calvin, Lectures (trans. by Baxter, Lond. 1578, 4to); Pomarius, Auslegung (Magdeb. 1579, Lpz. 1599, 4to; Stettin, 1664, 8vo); Baron, Prelectiones (ed. Lake, Lond. 1579, folio); Grynaeus, Enarratio (Basil. 1581, 8vo); Schadaeus, Synopsis (Argent. 1588, 4to); Junius, Lectiones (Heidelb. 1594, 4to; also in Opp. 1, 1327); \*King, Lectures (Lond. 1594, 1600, 1611, 1618; Oxf. 1597, 1599, 4to); Feuardent, Commentarius (Colon. 1594, folio; 1595. 8vo); Abbott, Exposition (Lond. 1600, 1613, 4to; 1845, 2 vols. 12mo); Wolderus, Diexodus [includ. Joel] (Vitemb. 1605, 4to) Krackewitz, Commentarius (Hamb. 1610, Giessen, 1611, 8vo); Miley, Erklärung (Heidelb. 1614, 4to); Tarnovius, Commentarius (Rost. 1616, 1626, 4to); Schnepf, Commentarius (Rost. 1619, 4to); Quarles, Poem (Lond. 1620, 4to); Treminius, Commentarii (Oriolse, 1623, 4to); Mylius, Commentarius (Francof. 1624, Regiom. 1640, 4to; also in his Sylloge, Amst. 1701, fol., p. 976 sq.); Urven, Commentarius (Antw. 1640, fol.); Acosta, Commentarius (Lugd. 1641, fol.); Ursinus, Commentaries (Francof. 1642, 8vo); Paciuchelli, Lezzioni (Ven. 1650,1660., 1664, 1701, folio also in Latin, Monach. 1672, fol.; Antw. 1681-3, 3 vols. fol.); De Salinas, Commentarii (Lugd. 1652 sq., 3 vols. fol.); Crocius, Commentarius (Cassel. 1656, 8vo); Leusden,  Paraphrasis [Rabbinical] (Tr. ad Rh. 1656, 8vo); Petraeus, Notes [to a transl. from the AEth.] (L.B. 1660, 4to); \*Scheid, Commentarius (Argent. 1659, 1665, 4to); Gerhard, Annotationes [includ. Amos] (Jen. 1663, 1676, 4to); Pfeiffer, Prelectiones (Vitemb. 1671,1706, Lipsiae, 1686, 4to; also in Opp. 1, 1131 sq.); Moebius, Jonas typicus (Lips. 1678, 4to); Christianus, Illustratio (Lips. 1683, 8vo); Bircherod, Expositio (Hafn. 1686, 4to); Von der Hardt, Enigmata, etc. (Helmstadt, in separate treatises, 1719; together, 1723, fol.); Outhof, Verklaaring (Amst. 1723, 4to); Steuersloot, Ontleeding (Leyden, 1730, 4to); Van der Meer, Verklaaring (Gor. 1742, 4to); Reichenbach, De Rabbins errantibus, etc. (Alt. 1761, 4to); Lessing, Observationes (Chemnitz, 1780, 8vo); Lavater, Predigten (Wintenth. 1782, 2 vols. 8vo); Adam, Sendungsgeschichte, etc. (Bonn, 1786, 4to); Piper, Vindicatio (Gryph. 1786, 4to); Lüderwald, Allegorie, etc. (Helmstadt, 1787, 8vo); Höpfner, Cure in Sept., etc. (Lips. 1787-8, 3 parts 4to); Kordes, Observationes in Sept., etc. (Jena, 1788,4to); Löwe, בַּאוּר (Berl. 1788, 8vo; also in his general commentary, Dessau, 1805); Grimm, Erklärung (Düsseld. 1789, 8vo); Fabricius, Commentarius, etc. [from Jewish sources] (Gott. 1792, 8vo); Grangaard, Uebersetzung (Lpzg. 1792, 8vo); Paulus, Zweck, etc. (in his Memorabilien, Leipzig, 1794, 6, 32 sq.); Griesdorf, Interpretandi ratio, etc. (Vitemb. 1794, 2 dissert. 4to); Benjoin, Notes (Cambr. 1796, 4to); Nachtigall, Aufschrift, etc. (in Eichhorn's Bibliothek, Lips. 1799, 9:221 sq.); Elias of Wilna, פֵּרוּשׁ(Wilna, 1800, 4to); Goldhorn, Excurse (Lpz. 1803, 8vo); Jones, Portrait, etc. (London, 1810, and often since, 12mo); \*Friedrichsen, Ueberblick, etc. (Alt. 1817, Lpz. 1841, 8vo); Young, Lectures (London, 1819, 8vo); Reindel, Versuch, etc. (Bamberg, 1826, 8vo); \*Rosenmüller, Scholia (part 7, vol. 2; Lpzg. 1827, 8vo); Hitzig, Orakel ub. Moab (Heidelb. 1831, 4to); Cunningham, Lectures (Lond. 1833, 12mo); Sibthorp, Lectures (Lond. 1834, 8vo); Krahmer, Untersuchung (Kassel. 1839, 8vo). Preston, Lectures (London, 1840, 8vo); Jäger, Endzweck, etc. (Tüb. 1840, 8vo); Peddie, Lectures (Edinb. 1862, 12mo); Fairbairn, Jonah's Life, etc. (Edinburgh, 1849, 12mo); Macpherson, Lectures (Edinb. 1849, 12mo); Tweedie, Lessors (Edinb. 1850, 12mo); Drake, Notes [including Hosea] (Cambr. 1853, 8vo); Harding, Lectures (Lond. 1856,12mo); Muir, Lessons (Edinb. 1854, 1857, 8vo); Wright, Glossaries, etc. (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Desprez, Illustrations (London, 1857, 12mo); Broad, Lectures (Lond. 1860, 8vo); \*Kaulen, Expositio (Mogunt. 1862, 8vo); \*Martin, Jonah's Mission (Lond. 1866, 8vo). SEE PROPHETS, MINOR.

## Jonan[[@Headword:Jonan]]

             (Ι᾿ωνάν, perh. contr. for JONATHAN or JOHANAN, or i.q. JONAS), the son of Eliakim and father of Joseph among the maternal ancestors of Christ (Luk 3:30). He is not mentioned in the Old Test. B.C. considerably ante 876. SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

## Jonas[[@Headword:Jonas]]

             (Ι᾿ωνᾶς, for the Heb. Jonah), the Graecized form of the name of three men in the Apocrypha and New Testament.

1. The prophet JONAH (2 Esdr. 1, 39; Tob 14:4; Tob 14:8; Mat 12:39-41; Mat 16:4; Luk 11:29-30; Luk 11:32).

2. A person occupying the same position in 1Es 9:23 as ELIEZER in the corresponding list in Ezr 10:23. Perhaps the corruption originated in reading אליעיני for אליעזר, as appears to have been the case in 1Es 9:32 (compare Ezr 10:31). The former would have caught the  compiler's eye from Ezr 10:22, and the original form Elionas, as it appears in the Vulg., could easily have become Jonas.

3. The father of the apostle Peter (Joh 21:15-17). In Joh 1:42 the name is less correctly Anglicized "Jona" (some MSS. have Ι᾿ωάννης). A.D. ante 25. SEE BAR-JONA. Instead of Ι᾿ωνᾶ (genitive) in all the above passages, good codices have Ι᾿ωάννου or Ι᾿ωάνου, which latter Lachmann has introduced into the text. Perhaps Jonas is but a contraction for Joannas (Luk 3:27), which is the same as John.

## Jonas, Bishop Of Orleans[[@Headword:Jonas, Bishop Of Orleans]]

             an eminent prelate in the Latin Church, flourished in the first half of the 9th century. He died in 842. Jonas took an active part in the ecclesiastical affairs of his time, and played no unimportant part in the Iconoclastic controversy, in which he assumed a mediate course. In his De cultu Imaginum (1645, 16mo) he wrote both against Claudius, bishop of Turin, and the Iconoclasts. The work was dedicated to king Charles the Bald, with whom he was in great favor. Although condemning the destroyers of images, he did not approve the worship of them, and the most eminent Catholic writers, such as Bellarmine, therefore disapprove of his work. His other principal works are, Libri tres de institutions laicali (transl. into French by De Mege, 1662, 12mo): — De institutione regia (transl. into French by Desmarets, 1661, 8vo). These two works are to be found in Latin in D'Achery's Spicileg. He is also the author of a treatise on Miracles (in Bibl. Patri.). See Milman, Latin Christ. 4, 421; Schröckh, Kirchengeschichte, 23, 294 sq., 416 sq.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3, 573.

## Jonas, Justus[[@Headword:Jonas, Justus]]

             one of the most eminent reformers in Germany, a contemporary and associate of Luther. was born at Nordhausen, June 5,1493. He studied law at the University of Erfurt. In 1519, however, encouraged by the advice of both Hess and Erasmus, he decided to study theology, and, inclining to the cause of the Reformers, he allied himself to Luther in 1521, and thereafter became closely connected with the great reformer. He went to Worms with him, and was soon after appointed provost of the church at Wittenberg. Here he was made D.D. by the university, in which he became a professor, and ever after worked zealously for the propagation of the principles of the Reformation. His legal knowledge was of especial service to the Reformers. In 1529 he accompanied Luther to Marburg, and his letters on  this occasion are a valuable historical contribution. In 1530 we find him assisting Melancthon in the completion of his Augustana. In 1541 he removed to Halle to assume pastoral duties at St. Mary's Church in that city, but in 1546 duke Maurice ordered him to quit the place, and he returned only after the elector John Frederick had taken possession of the city in 1547. The battle of Mühlberg, which falls in this year, again turned the fate of the Protestants, and he once more quitted Halle. In 1551 he was appointed court preacher at Coburg, and in 1553 superintendent of Eisfeld, where he died Oct. 9, 1555. Jonas was particularly distinguished as a ready speaker and as a writer. He took part in the translation of the Bible by Luther, and wrote Proefatio in Epistolas divi Pauli Apostoli, ad Corinthios, etc. (Erfurt, 1520, 4to): — Epitome Judicii J. Jonoe, proepos. Wittemb., de corrigendis coerimoniis (1523): — Annotationes J. Jonoe in Aeta Apostolorum (Wittenb. 1524, Basle, 1525): — Vom alten u. neuen Gott, Glauben u. Lehre (Wittenb. 1526): — Welch die rechte Kirche, und dagegen welch d. falsche Kirche ist (Wittenb. 1534, 4to): — Oratio Justi Jonoe, doct. theol., de Studiis Theologicis (Wittemb. 1539; Melancthon, Select. Declamat. 1, 23): Des 20 Psalms Auslegung (Wittemberg, 1546): — Kurze Historia v. Luthers biblischen u. geistlichen Anfechtungen (in Luther's Works); etc. He also published a number of translations into German, especially of works of Luther and Melancthon; also translations from German into Latin. See Reinhard, Commentatio hist. theolog. de Vita et Obitu Justi Jonoe, etc. (Weimar, 1731); Knapp, Narratio de Justo Jona, etc. (Halle, 1817; 4to): Ersch u. Gruber, Allgemeine Encyklop.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 7, 1 sq.; Pressel, Leben u. ausgew. Schriften d. Vaters u. Begründers. d. luther. Kirche (1862), vol. 8.

## Jonas, Ludwig[[@Headword:Jonas, Ludwig]]

             one of the ablest German theologians of our day, was born at Neustadt a. O. February 11, 1797. During the Franco-Prussian war of 1812-1815 he fought against the foreign invader, but as soon as peace dawned on his native land he resumed his theological studies under the celebrated Schleiermacher, of whom he was one of the most prominent and faithful followers. After preaching at different places, he removed to Berlin in 1834, and soon secured a place in the foreground among Berlin's large array of theological writers. He published Schleiermacher's MSS.: his philosophical Essays and Dissertations in 1835, the Dialectic in 1839, Morals in 1843, Letters in 1858. He died Sept. 19, 1859. Jonas was one of the founders of the Monatsschrift of the United Church of Prussia  (comprising the Reformed and Lutheran churches at that time. SEE PRUSSIA).

## Jonath-elem-rechokim[[@Headword:Jonath-elem-rechokim]]

             (יוֹנִת אֵלֶםרְחֹקַים, yonath' e'lem rechokim', dove of the dumbness of the distances, i.e. the silent dove in distant places, or among strangers; Septuag. ὑπέρ τοῦ λαοῦ τοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγίων μεμακρυμμένου, Vulg. pro populo qui a Sanctis longe factus est), an enigmatical title of Psalms 56, variously interpreted, but probably descriptive of David's solitary feelings while absent from the worship of the Temple among the Philistines; comp. Psa 38:13; Psa 65:5; Psa 74:19. (See Alexander, Comment. ad loc.) The expression "upon" (עִל), preceding this phrase, would seem to indicate that it was the name or opening clause of some well known air to which the ode was set, a supposition not inconsistent with the above appropriation. Its original application would in that case be unknown, like that of similar superscriptions of other Psalms. "Rashi considers that David employed the phrase to describe his own unhappy condition when, exiled from the land of Israel, he was living with Achish, and was an object of suspicion and hatred to the countrymen of Goliath: thus was he amongst the Philistines as a mute (אלמית) dove.

Kimchi supplies the following commentary: 'The Philistines sought to seize and slay David (1Sa 29:4-11), and he, in his terror, and pretending to have lost his reason, called himself Jonath, even as a dove driven from her cote.' Knapp's explanation 'on the oppression of foreign rulers' assigning to Elem the same meaning which it has in Exo 15:15 is in harmony with the contents of the psalm, and is worthy of consideration. De Wette translates 'dove of the distant terebinths,' or 'of the dove of dumbness (Stummheit) among the strangers' or 'in distant places.' According to the Septuagint, the phrase means 'on the people far removed from the holy places' (probably,אל  =,אוּלָ, the Temple hall; see Orient. Literaturblatt. p. 579, year 1841), a rendering which very nearly accords with the Chaldee paraphrase: 'On the congregation of Israel, compared with a mute dove while exiled from their cities, but who come back again and offer praise to the Lord of the Universe.' Aben-Ezra regards Jonath-elem-rechokim as merely indicating the modulation or the rhythm of the psalm. In the notes to Mendelssohn's version of the Psalms, Jonath-elem-rechokim is mentioned as a musical instrument which produced dull, mournful sounds. 'Some take it for a pipe called in Greek ἕλυμος, יונת, from יון, Greek, which would make the inscription read "the long Grecian pipe," but this does not appear to us admissible' (Preface, p. 26)" SEE PSALMS.

## Jonathan[[@Headword:Jonathan]]

             (Heb. Yonathan, יוֹנָתָן, 1Sa 13:2-3; 1Sa 13:16; 1Sa 13:22; 1Sa 14:1; 1Sa 14:3-4; 1Sa 14:12-14; 1Sa 14:17; 1Sa 14:21; 1Sa 14:27; 1Sa 14:29; 1Sa 14:39-45; 1Sa 14:49; 1Sa 19:1; 1Ki 1:42-43; 1Ch 2:32-33; 1Ch 10:2; 1Ch 11:34; Ezr 8:6; Ezr 10:15; Neh 12:11; Neh 12:14; Neh 12:35; Jer 40:8; Sept. Ι᾿ωνάθαν), a contracted form of JEHONATHAN (יְהוֹנָתָן, q.d. Theodore, 1Ch 27:25; 2Ch 17:8; Neh 12:18; Anglicized "Jonathan" elsewhere, Jdg 18:30 1Sa 14:6; 1Sa 14:8; 1Sa 18:1; 1Sa 18:3-4; 1Sa 19:1-2; 1Sa 19:4; 1Sa 19:6-7; 1Sa 20:1; 1Sa 20:3-5; 1Sa 20:9-13; 1Sa 20:16-18; 1Sa 20:25; 1Sa 20:27-28; 1Sa 20:30; 1Sa 20:32-35; 1Sa 20:37-40; 1Sa 20:42; 1Sa 23:16; 1Sa 23:18; 1Sa 31:2; 2Sa 1:4-5; 2Sa 1:12; 2Sa 1:17; 2Sa 1:22-23; 2Sa 1:25-26; 2Sa 4:4; 2Sa 9:1; 2Sa 9:3; 2Sa 9:6-7; 2Sa 15:27; 2Sa 15:36; 2Sa 17:17-20; 2Sa 21:7; 2Sa 21:12-14; 2Sa 21:21; 2Sa 22:32; 1Ch 8:33-34; 1Ch 9:39-40; 1Ch 20:7; 1Ch 27:32; Jer 37:15; Jer 37:20; Jer 38:26; Sept. Ι᾿ωνάθαν), the name of fifteen or more men in the canonical Scriptures, besides several in the Apocrypha and Josephus.

I. A Levite descended from Gershom, the son of Moses (Jdg 18:30). It is indeed said, in our Masoretic copies, that the Gershom from whom this Jonathan sprang was "the son of Manasseh;" but it is on very good grounds supposed that in the name Moses (משׁה), the single letter n (נ) has been interpolated (and it is usually written suspended, Buxtorf, Tiber. p. 14), changing it into Manasseh (מנשׂה), in order to save the character of the great lawgiver from the stain of having an idolater among his immediate descendants (Baba Bathra, 109, b). The singular name Gershom, and the date of the transaction, go far to establish this view. Accordingly the Vulgate, and some copies of the, Septuagint, actually exhibit the name of Moses instead of Manasseh. (See Clarke's Comment. ad loc.) The history of this Jonathan is involved in the narrative which occupies Judges 17:18, and is one of the two accounts which form a sort of appendix to that book. The events themselves appear to have occurred soon after the death of Joshua, and of the elders who outlived him, when the government was in a most unsettled state. Its proper place in the chronological order would have been between the second and third chapters of the book. B.C. cir. 1590.  Jonathan, who was resident at Bethlehem, lived at a time when the dues of the sanctuary did not afford a livelihood to the numerous Levites who had a claim upon them, and belonged to a tribe destitute of the landed possessions which gave to all others a sufficient maintenance. He therefore went forth to seek his fortune. In Mount Ephraim he came to "a house. of gods," which had been established by one Micah, who wanted nothing but a priest to make his establishment complete. SEE MICAH. This person made Jonathan what was manifestly considered the handsome offer of engaging him as his priest for his victuals, a yearly suit of clothes, and ten shekels (about six dollars) a year in money. Here he lived for some time, till the Danite spies, who were sent by their tribe to explore the north, passed this way and formed his acquaintance. When, not long after, the body of armed Danites passed the same way in going to settle near the sources of the Jordan, the spies mentioned Micah's establishment to them, on which they went and took away not only "the ephod, the teraphim, and the graven image," but the priest, also, that they might set up the same worship in the place of which they were going to take possession. Micah vainly protested against this robbery; but Jonathan himself was glad at the improvement in his prospects, and from that time, even down to the captivity, he and his descendants continued to be priests of the Danites in the town of Laish, the name of which was changed to Dan.

There is not any reason to suppose that this establishment, whether in the hands of Micah or of the Danites, involved an apostasy from Jehovah. It appears rather to have been an attempt to localize or domesticate his presence, under those symbols and forms of service which were common among the neighboring nations, but were forbidden to the Hebrews. The offense here was twofold — the establishment of a sacred ritual different from the only one which the law recognized, and the worship by symbols, naturally leading to idolatry, with the ministration of one who could not legally be a priest, but only a Levite. and under circumstances in which no Aaronic priest could legally have officiated. It is more than likely that this establishment was eventually merged in that of the golden calf, which Jeroboam set up in this place, his choice of which may very possibly have been determined by its being already in possession of "a house of gods."

The Targum of R. Joseph, on 1Ch 23:16, identifies this Jonathan with Shebuel, the son of Gershom, who is there said to have repented (עֲבִד תְּתוּבָא) in his old age, and to have been appointed by David as chief over his treasures. All this arises from a play upon the name  Shebuel, from which this meaning is extracted in accordance with a favorite practice of the Targumist.

II. Second of the two sons of Jada, and grandson of Jerahmeel, of the family of Judah; as his brother Jether died without issue, this branch of the line was continued through the two sons of Jonathan (1Ch 2:32-33). B.C. considerably post 1612.

III. The eldest son of king Saul and the bosom friend of David (Josephus Ι᾿ωνάθη, Ant. 6:6,1). He first appears some time after his father's accession (1Sa 13:2). If his younger brother Ishbosheth was forty at the time of Saul's, death (2Sa 2:8), Jonathan must have been at least thirty when he is first mentioned. Of his own family we know nothing except the birth of one son, five years before his death (2Sa 4:4). He was regarded in his father's lifetime as heir to the throne. Like Saul, he was a man of great strength and activity (2Sa 1:23). of which the exploit at Michmash was a proof. He was also famous for the peculiar martial exercises in which his tribe excelled — archery and slinging (1Ch 12:2). His bow was to him what the spear was to his father: "the bow of Jonathan turned not back" (2Sa 1:22). It was always about him (1Sa 18:4; 1Sa 20:35). It is through his relation with David that he is chiefly known to us, probably as related by his descendants at David's court. But there is a background, not so clearly given, of his relation with his father. From the time that he first appears he is Saul's constant companion. He was always present at his father's meals. As Abner and David seem to have occupied the places afterwards called the captaincies of "the host" and "of the guard," so he seems to have been (as Hushai afterwards) "the friend" (comp. 1Sa 20:25; 2Sa 15:37).

The whole story implies, without expressing, the deep attachment of the father and son. Jonathan can only go on his dangerous expedition (1Sa 14:1) by concealing it from Saul. Saul's vow is confirmed, and its tragic effect deepened, by his feeling for his son, "though it be Jonathan my son" (1Sa 14:39). "Tell me what thou hast done" (1Sa 14:43). Jonathan cannot bear to believe his father's enmity to David: "My father will do nothing, great or small, but that he will show it to me and why should my father hide this thing from me? it is not so" (1Sa 20:2). To him, if to any one, the wild frenzy of the king was amenable — "Saul hearkened unto the voice of Jonathan" (1Sa 19:6). Their mutual affection was indeed interrupted by the growth of  Saul's insanity. Twice the father would have sacrificed the son: once in consequence of his vow (1 Samuel 14); the second time, more deliberately, on the discovery of David's flight; and on this last occasion, a momentary glimpse is given of some darker history. Were the phrases "son of a perverse rebellious woman" — "shame on thy mother's nakedness" (1Sa 20:30-31), mere frantic invectives? or was there something in the story of Ahinoam or Rizpah which we do not know? "In fierce anger" Jonathan left the royal presence (ib. 34). But he cast his lot with his father's decline, not with his friend's rise, and "in death they were not divided" (2Sa 1:23; 1Sa 23:16).

1. The first main part of his career is connected with the war with the Philistines, commonly called, from its locality, "the war of Michmash" (1Sa 13:21, Sept.), as the last years of the Peloponnesian War. were called, for a similar reason, "the war of Decelea." In the previous war with the Ammonites (1Sa 11:4-15) there is no mention of him; and his abrupt appearance, without explanation, in 13:2, may seem to imply that some part of the narrative has been lost. B.C. 1073. He is already of great importance in the state. Of the 3000 men of whom Saul's standing army was formed (13:2; 24:2; 26:1, 2), 1000 were under the command of Jonathan at Gibeah. The Philistines were still in the general command of the country; an officer was stationed at Geba, either the same as Jonathan's position or close to it. In a sudden act of youthful daring, as when Tell rose against Gessler, or as in sacred history Moses rose against the Egyptian, Jonathan slew this officer (Auth. Vers. "garrison," Sept. τὸν Νασίβ, 1Sa 13:3-4. See Ewald, 2, 476), and thus gave the signal for a general revolt. Saul took advantage of it, and the whole population rose. But it was a premature attempt. The Philistines poured in from the plain, and the tyranny became more deeply rooted than ever. SEE SAUL.

Saul and Jonathan (with their immediate attendants) alone had arms, amidst the general weakness and disarming of the people (1Sa 13:22). They were encamped at Gibeah, with a small body of 600 men, and as they looked down from that height on the misfortunes of their country, and of their native tribe especially, they wept aloud (Sept. ἔκλαιον, 1Sa 13:16).

From this oppression, as Jonathan by his former act had been the first to provoke it, so now he was the first to deliver his people. On the former occasion Saul had been equally with himself involved in the responsibility of the deed. Saul "blew the trumpet" Saul had "smitten the officer of the  Philistines" (1Sa 13:3-4). But now it would seem that Jonathan was resolved to undertake the whole risk himself. "The day," the day fixed by him (Sept. γίνεται ἡ ἡμέρα, 1Sa 14:1), approached, and without communicating his project to any one, except the young man, whom, like all the chiefs of that age, he retained as his armor bearer, he sallied forth from Gibeah to attack the garrison of the Philistines stationed on the other side of the steep defile of Michmash (1Sa 14:1). His words are short, but they breathe exactly the ancient and peculiar spirit of the Israelitish warrior: "Come, and let us go over unto the garrison of these uncircumcised; it may be that Jehovah will work for us; for there is no restraint to Jehovah to save by many or by few." The answer is no less characteristic of the close friendship of the two young men, already like that which afterwards sprang up between Jonathan and David. "Do all that is in thine heart; .... behold, I am with thee as thy heart is my heart (Sept., 1Sa 14:7)." After the manner of the time (and the more, probably, from having taken no counsel of the high priest or any prophet before his departure), Jonathan proposed to draw an omen for their course from the conduct of the enemy. If the garrison, on seeing them, gave intimations of descending upon them, they would remain in the valley; if, on the other hand, they raised a challenge to advance, they were to accept it. The latter turned out to be the case. The first appearance of the two warriors from behind the rocks was taken by the Philistines as a furtive apparition of "the Hebrews coming forth out of the holes where they had hid themselves;" and they were welcomed with a scoffing invitation (such as the Jebusites afterwards offered to David), "Come up, and we will show you a thing" (1Sa 14:4-12). Jonathan immediately took them at their word. Strong and active as he was, "strong as a lion, and swift as an eagle" (2Sa 1:23), he was fully equal to the adventure of climbing on his hands and feet up the face of the cliff. When he came directly in view of them, with his armor bearer behind him, they both, after the manner of their tribe (1Ch 12:2), discharged a flight of arrows, stones, and pebbles from their bows, crossbows, and slings, with such effect that twenty men fell at the first onset. A panic seized the garrison, thence spread to the camp, and thence to the surrounding hordes of marauders; an earthquake combined with the terror of the moment; the confusion increased; the Israelites who had been taken slaves by the Philistines during the last three days (Sept.) rose in mutiny; the Israelites who lay hid in the numerous caverns and deep holes in which the rocks of the neighborhood abound, sprang out of their subterranean dwellings. Saul and his little band had watched in  astonishment the wild retreat from the heights of Gibeah; he now joined in the pursuit, which led him headlong after the fugitives, over the rugged plateau of Bethel, and down the pass of Beth-horon to Ajalon (1Sa 14:15-31). SEE GIBEAH.

The father and son had not met on that day: Saul only conjectured his son's absence from not finding him when he numbered the people. Jonathan had not. heard of the rash curse (1Sa 14:24) which Saul invoked on any one who ate before the evening. In the dizziness and darkness (Hebrew, 1Sa 14:27) that came on after his desperate exertions, he put forth the staff which apparently had (with his sling and bow) been his chief weapon, and tasted the honey which lay on the ground as they passed through the forest. The pursuers in general were restrained even from this slight indulgence by fear of the royal curse; but the moment that the day, with its enforced fast, was over, they flew, like Muslims at sunset during the fast of Ramadan, on the captured cattle, and devoured them, even to the brutal neglect of the law which forbade the dismemberment of the fresh carcasses with the blood. This violation of the law Saul endeavored to prevent and to expiate by erecting a large stone, which served both as a rude table and as an altar; the first altar that was raised under the monarchy. It was in the dead of night, after this wild revel was over, that he proposed that the pursuit should be continued fill dawn; 'and then; when the silence of the oracle of the high priest indicated that something had occurred to intercept the divine favor, the lot was tried, and Jonathan appeared as the culprit. Jephthah's dreadful sacrifice would have been repeated; but the people interposed in behalf of the hero of that great day, and Jonathan was saved (1Sa 14:24-46).

2. But the chief interest of Jonathan's career is derived from the friendship with David, which began on the day of David's return from the victory over the champion of Gath, and continued till his death. It is the first Biblical instance of a romantic friendship, such as was common afterwards in Greece, and has been since in Christendom; and is remarkable both as giving its sanction to these, and as filled with a pathos of its own, which has been imitated, but never surpassed, in modern works of fiction. "The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul" — "Thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women" (1Sa 18:1 2Sa 1:26). Each found in each the affection that he found not in his own family; no jealousy of rivalry between the two, as claimants for the same throne, ever interposed: "Thou shalt be king in Israel, and I shall be next unto thee" (1Sa 23:17).  The friendship was confirmed, after the manner of the time, by a solemn compact often repeated. The first was immediately on their first acquaintance. Jonathan gave David as a pledge his royal mantle, his sword, his girdle, and his famous bow (1Sa 18:4). His fidelity was soon called into action by the insane rage of his father against David. He interceded for his life, at first with success (1Sa 19:1-7). Then the madness returned, and David fled. It was in a secret interview during this flight, by the stone of Ezel, that the second covenant was made between the two friends, of a still more binding kind, extending to their mutual posterity — Jonathan laying such emphasis on this portion of the compact as almost to suggest the belief of a slight misgiving on his part of David's future conduct in this respect. It is this interview which brings out the character of Jonathan in the liveliest colors — his little artifices — his love for both his father and his friend — his bitter disappointment at his father's unmanageable fury — his familiar sport of archery. With passionate embraces and tears the two friends parted, B.C. cir. 1062, to meet only once more (1 Samuel 20). That one more meeting was far away in the forest of Ziph, during Saul's pursuit of David. Jonathan's alarm for his friend's life is now changed into a confidence that he will escape: "He strengthened his hand in God." Finally, and for the third time, they renewed the covenant, and then parted forever (1Sa 23:16-18). B.C. cir. 1061.

From this time forth we hear no more till the battle of Gilboa. In that battle he fell, with his two brothers and his father, and his corpse shared their fate (1Sa 31:2; 1Sa 31:8). B.C. 1053. His remains were buried first at Jabesh- Gilead (ib. 13), but afterwards removed with those of his father to Zelah in Benjamin (2Sa 21:12). The news of his death occasioned the celebrated elegy of David, in which, as the friend, he naturally occupies the chief place (2Sa 1:22-23; 2Sa 1:25-26), and which seems to have been sung in the education of the archers of Judah, in commemoration of the one great archer, Jonathan: "He bade them teach the children of Judah the use of the bow" (2Sa 1:17-18).

Jonathan left one son, aged five years old at the time of his death (2Sa 4:4), to whom he had probably given his original name of Merib- baal, afterwards changed for Mephibosheth (comp. 1Ch 8:34; 1Ch 9:40). SEE MEPHIBOSHETH. Through him the line of descendants was continued down to the time of Ezra (1Ch 9:40), and even then their great ancestor's archery was practiced among them. SEE DAVLD.  See Niemeyer, Charakter. 4, 413; Herder, Geist. der Hebr. Poesie, 2, 287; Koster, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1832, 2, 366; Ewald, Isr. Gesch. 2, 530; Pareau, Elegia Davidis, etc. (Groning. 1829); Simon, De amicitia Davidii et Jonah (Hildburgh. 1739).

IV. Son of Shage, a relative of Ahiam, both among David's famous warriors and descendants of Jashen of the mountains of Judah (2Sa 23:32; 1Ch 11:34). B.C. 1046. SEE HARARITE.

V. Son of the high priest Abiathar, and one of the adherents to David's cause during the rebellion of Absalom (2Sa 15:27; 2Sa 15:36). He remained at En-rogel under pretence of procuring water, and reported to his master the proceedings in the camp of the insurgents (2Sa 17:20; Josephus Ι᾿ωνάθης, Ant. 7, 9, 2). B.C. cir. 1023. At a later date his constancy was manifested on a similar occasion by announcing to the ambitious Adonijah the forestallment of his measures by the succession of Solomon (1 Kings 1, 42, 43). B.C. cir. 1015. "On both occasions it may be remarked that he appears as the swift and trusty messenger. He is the last descendant of Eli of whom we hear anything" (Smith). SEE DAVID.

VI. Son of Shammah (Shimeah or Shimea), and David's nephew, as well as one of his chief warriors, a position which he earned by slaying a gigantic relative of Goliath (2Sa 21:21; 1Ch 20:7; Josephus Ι᾿ωνάθης, Ant. 7, 12, 2). B.C. 1018. He was also made secretary of the royal cabinet (1Ch 27:32, where דּוֹד is mistaken in the Auth. Vers. for the usual sense of "uncle"). B.C. 1014. "Jerome (Quest. Hebr. on 1Sa 17:12) conjectures that this was Nathan the prophet, thus making up the eighth son, not named in 1Ch 2:13-15. But this is not probable" (Smith).

VII. Son of Uzziah, and steward of the agricultural revenue of David (1Ch 27:25; Heb. and A.V. "JEHONATHAN").

VIII. One of the Levites sent by Jehoshaphat to aid in teaching the Law to the people (1Ch 17:8; Heb. and A.V. "JEHONATHAN").

IX. A scribe whose house was converted into a prison in which Jeremiah was closely confined (Jer 27:15; Jer 27:20; Jer 38:26). B.C. 589.  X. Brother of Johanan, the son of Kareah, and associated with him in his intercourse with Gedaliah. the Babylonian governor of Jerusalem (Jer 40:8). B.C. 587.

XI. Son of Shemaiah and priest contemporary with Joiakim (Neh 12:18; Heb. and A.V. "JEHONATHAN").

XII. Son of Melicu and priest contemporary with Joiakim. (Neh 12:14). B.C. between 536 and 459.

XIII. Father of Ebed, which latter was an Israelite of the "sons" of Adin that returned from Babylon with Ezra (Ezr 8:6) at the head of fifty males, a number which is increased to 250 in 1Es 8:32, where Jonathan is written Ι᾿ωνάθας. B.C. ante 459.

XIV. Son of Asahel, a chief Israelite associated with Jahaziah in separating the returned exiles from their Gentile wives (Ezr 10:15). B.C. 459.

XV. Son of Joiada and father of Jaddua, Jewish high priests (Neh 12:11); elsewhere called JOHANAN (Neh 12:22), and apparently John by Josephus, who relates his assassination of his own brother Jesus in the Temple(Ant. 11, 7, 1 and 2). Jonathan, or John, was high priest for thirty-two years, according to Eusebius and the Alexandr. Chronicles (Selden, De Success. in Pontif. cap. 6, 7). SEE HIGH PRIEST.

XVI. Son of Shemaiah, of the family of Asaph, and father of Zechariah, which last was one of the priests appointed to flourish the trumpets as the procession moved around the rebuilt walls of Jerusalem (Neh 12:35). B.C. ante 446.

XVII. A son of Mattathias, and leader of the Jews in their war of independence after the death of his brother Judas Maccabaeus, B.C. 161 (1Ma 9:19 sq.). — Smith. SEE MACCABEES.

XVIII. A son of Absalom (1Ma 13:11), sent by Simon with a force to occupy Joppa, which was already in the hands of the Jews (1Ma 12:33), though probably held only by a weak garrison. Jonathan expelled the inhabitants (τοὺς ὄντας ἐν αὐτῆ); comp. Josephus, Ant. 13, 6, 3) and secured the city. Jonathan was probably a brother of Mattathias (2) (1Ma 11:70).

XIX. A priest who is said to have offered up a solemn prayer on the occasion of the sacrifice made by Nehemiah after the recovery of the sacred fire (2 Macc. 1, 23 sq.; compare Ewald, Gesch. d. V. Isr. 4, 184 sq.). The narrative is interesting, as it presents a singular example of the combination of Dublic prayer with sacrifice (Grimm, ad 2 Maccabees 1.c.).

XX. A Sadducee at whose instigation Hyrcanus (q.v.) abandoned the Pharisees for their mild sentence against his maligner Eleazar (Josephus, Ant. 13, 10, 6).

XXI. Son of Ananus, appointed Jewish high priest, A.D. 36, by Vitelius in place of Joseph Caiaphas (Ant. 18, 4, 2), and deposed after two years, when his brother Theophilus succeeded him (ib. 5, 2). He was reappointed by Agrippa A.D. 43, but this time he declined that honor in favor of his brother Matthias (Josephus, Ant. 19, 6, 4); he was sent by Cumanus to Claudius in a quarrel with the Samaritans, but appears to have been released by the emperor (War, 2, 12, 6 and 7); he was at last murdered by the Sicarii (War, 2, 13, 3). He was perhaps the high priest whom Felix caused to be assassinated for his reproofs of his bad government (Josephus, Ant. 20, 8, 5). (See Frankel, Monatsschrift, 1, 589; Grätz, Gesch. der Juden, 3, 263, 287, 357.) SEE HIGH PRIEST.

XXII. A common weaver, leader of the Sicarii in Cyrene, captured and put to death by the Romans after various adventures (Josephus, War, 7, 11, 12).

XXIII. A Jew who challenged the Romans to single combat during the last siege, and. after slaying one combatant, Pudens, was at length killed by Priscus (Josephus, War, 6, 2,10).

## Jonathan ben-Anan[[@Headword:Jonathan ben-Anan]]

             SEE JONATHAN, 21.

## Jonathan ben-Uzziel[[@Headword:Jonathan ben-Uzziel]]

             the celebrated translator of the Hebrew prophetical writings into Chaldee, a disciple of Hillel I, one of the first of those thirty disciples of Hillel who, in the language of the Talmud, "were worthy to possess the power of stopping the sun like Joshua," flourished about B.C. 30. His expositions were especially on Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, a fanciful reason for  which is given in the Talmud: "When the illuminating sun arose upon the dark passages of the prophets, through this translation, the length and breadth of Palestine were agitated, and everywhere the voice of God (קול בת) or the voice of the people (vox populi vox dei) was heard asking, 'Who has disclosed these mysteries to the sons of men?' With great humility and becoming modesty Jonathan b.-Uzziel answered, 'I have disclosed the mysteries; but thou, O Lord, knowest that I have not done it to get glory for myself, or for the house of my father, but for thy glory's sake, that discussion might not increase in Israel'" (Megilla, 3, a). From these notices in the Talmud, it is manifest that Jonathan was only the Chaldee translator of the prophets; for it is distinctly declared in the last quoted passage that when Jonathan wished also to translate the Hagiographa (כתובים), the same voice from heaven (בת קול) emphatically forbade it (דיין), because of the great Messianic mysteries contained therein (ביה קוֹ משיח דאית), especially in the book of Daniel (comp. Rashi in loco). But tradition has also ascribed to him the paraphrase of the Pentateuch known under the name of Pseudo-Jonathan and the Targum of the five Megilloth.

The question of the authorship of the paraphrases will be treated in full in the article TARGUM SEE TARGUM (q.v.). We have room here only for a few points in the discussion, and will mainly speak of the work which is generally fastened upon him. Firstly, then, as to this Paraphrase on the Prophets (ואחרונים תרגים נביאים ראשנים), which embraces Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor prophets, its importance is not only great because it contains expositions of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, but mainly so because, dating, as it does, from a period when the Hebrew language gave place to the Aramaic dialect, and when ancient Jewish traditions and scriptural expositions were introduced in the paraphrases read during the divine services of the Jewish people, it contains very many ancient readings, which go far to explain many an obscure passage in the prophetical writings, and thus prevent false criticism and loose conjecture. A list of these various readings has been collected in the Hebrew annual entitled החלווֹ(Lemburg, 1852), 1, 109 sq. The paraphrase was first published in 1494, and afterwards with that of Onkelos on the Pentateuch (Venice). It is found in all the Rabbinic Bibles; also in Walton's Biblia Polygl. (2, 3, and 4), and in Buxtorf's Biblia Hebroea (Basle, 1720, 2-4), etc., with a Latin translation.

As to the other reputed writings of Jonathan, we have

(a) the Paraphrase on the Pentateuch (על התורה תרגום יונתן); it is nothing more or less than a completed version of what is called the Jerusalem or Palestine Targum (תרגום ירושלמר), which of itself is in reality only desultory glosses on Onkelos's paraphrase. This completed version was at first called Targum Jerusalem, after the fragment on which it was based, but afterwards it obtained the name of Targum Jonathan, by erroneously resolving the abbreviation ת8י= ירושלמי תרגוםinto תרגים יהונתן. The additions to the work were probably not made prior to the seventh century. The work was first published in Venice 1590-91, with the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch, the paraphrase of Onkelos, the fragments of the Jerusalem glosses, the commentaries of Rashi and Jacob ben-Asher, then in Basle (1607), Hanau (1614), Amsterdam (1640), Prague (1646), etc., and has lately been printed, with a commentary, in the beautiful edition of the Pentateuch with the Rabbinic commentaries (Vienna, 1859). Explanations of it were also written by David b.-Jacob (Prague, 1609), Feiwel b.-David Secharja (Hanau, 1614), Mordecai Kremsier (Amsterdam, 1671); and it was translated into Latin by Chevallier, in Walton's Polyglot. An English translation was published by the late learned Wesleyan preacher, J.W. Etheridge (Lond. 1862, 2 vols. 8vo); but the masterly treatises on this Pseudo-Jonathan are by Seligsohn and Traub, and by Frankel, Zeitschr. f. d. relig. Int. d. Judenth. (1846), p. 100 sq. (comp. Seligsohn and Traub, in Frankel's Monatsschrift, Lpz. 1856, 6, 96-114, 138-149; Etheridge, Introd. to Jewish Lit. p. 195; Wiener, De Jonathanis in Pent. paraphrasi Chaldaica; Petermann, De duabus Pent. paraphrasibus Chaldaicis): —

(b) the Paraphrase on the Five Megilloth. Some early critics have attributed this work to Mar Josef, of Sora (died 332), but of late it is assigned to a later period even than the paraphrase of the Pentateuch, and is considered simply a compilation from ancient materials made by several individuals. This version is generally published, together with the Hebrew text, in the Jewish editions of the Pentateuch, and is contained in all the Rabbinic Bibles. A rhymed version of the whole of this paraphrase was published by Jacob ben-Samuel, also called Koppelmann ben-Bonem (about 1584). A Latin version of it is given in Walton's Polyglot. Gill has given an English translation of the entire paraphrase on the Song of Songs (Comment. on the Song, 1728); and Dr. Ginsburg has lately translated the first chapter of the paraphrase of the Song (Comment. on the Song, p. 29 sq.), and the whole of Ecclesiastes (Comment. on Eccles. p. 503 sq.).  Hebrew commentaries on this paraphrase have been written by Mordecai Lorca (Cracow, 1580) and Chajim Feiwel (Berlin, 1705). See also Bartolocci, Biblioth. Magna Rabbinica, 3, 788 sp.; Wolf, Biblioth. Hebroea, 2, 1159 sp.; Zunz, Die Gottesdientl. Vorträge d. Juden, p. 62 sq.; Geiger Urschrift u. Uebersetzungen d. Bibel; Jost, Geschichte d. Juden, 1, 269; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 2, 105, 107; Kitto, Cyclop. Biblical Lit. 2, s.v.

## Jonathas[[@Headword:Jonathas]]

             (Ι᾿ωνάθαν v.r. Ι᾿αθάν; Vulg. Jonathus v.r. Nathan), the Latin form of the common name Jonathan, which is preserved in the A.V. at Tobit 5, 13.

## Joncourt, Peter De[[@Headword:Joncourt, Peter De]]

             a French Protestant theologian, was born at Clermont towards the middle of the 17th century. A few years before the revocation of the Edict of Nantes he removed to Holland, and became pastor of Middelburg in 1678, and of La Haye in 1699. He died in the latter city in 1725. He was considered one of the best preachers of his day. He wrote Entretiens sur les differentes Methodes d'expliquer l'Ecriture et de precher de ceux qu'on appelle Cocceiens et Voetiens, etc. (Amst. 1707, 12mo): — Nouveaux entretiens, etc. (Amst. 1708, 12mo); quite a controversy resulted from this work, but Joncourt was ordered by the synod of Nimeguen to desist from his attacks, and to retract, which he did in the Lettre aux eglises Wallonnes des Pays-Bas (La Haye, 1708, 12mo): — Pensees utiles aux Chretiens de tous les etats, etc. (La Haye, 1710, 8vo): — Lettres sur les Jeux de Hasard et sur l'usage de se faire celer pour eviter une visite incommode (La Haye, 1713, 12mo), mostly against La Placette's Divers Traites sur des matieres de conscience (Amst. 1708, 12mo), and a work which gave rise to several pamphlets on this question: — Lettres critiques sur divers sujets importants de l'Ecriture Sainte (Amst. 1715, 12mo): — Entretiens sur l'etat present de la Religion en. France (La Haye, 1725, 12mo). He also published a revised edition of Clement Marot and Th. de Beza's translation of the Psalms (Amsterd. 1716, 12mo). See J.G. Walch, Biblioth. Theologica selecta, vol. 2; Journal des Savants, June, 1714, p. 579; January, 1715, p. 85; February, p. 123; Querard, La France Litteraire; Haag, La France Protestante; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 26, 901. (J.N.P.)

## Jones, Alexander, D.D[[@Headword:Jones, Alexander, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Charleston, S.C., November 8, 1796. He graduated from Brown University in 1814; pursued his theological studies under the direction of bishop Griswold, at Bristol, R.I., took charge of a school for some years in Bardstown, Kentucky; was ordained deacon in 1822; in 1824 became rector of Zion Church, in Charlestown, Virginia; in 1851 of St. Paul's Church, in Richmond, and afterwards was settled as rector of St. Peter's Church, in Perth Amboy, N.J., where he remained seventeen years (1857-74), and then having had a stroke of paralysis, he was obliged to abandon all ministerial labor. He died at Perth Amboy, February 15, 1874. "He had a high rank among the clergy of the Episcopal Church for scholarship and useful service, and was a gentleman of genial manners and refined taste." (J.C.S.)

## Jones, Arthur, D.D[[@Headword:Jones, Arthur, D.D]]

             a Welsh Congregational minister, was born at Llanrwst, Denbighshire, February 12, 1776. He was converted when about eighteen years of age, joined the Calvinistic Methodists, and soon became an exhorter and preacher. He was ordained at Bangor in 1810, where he labored earnestly as pastor; in 1815 he removed to the Welsh churches at Deptford and Woolwich, Kent; in 1823 he returned to his former charge at Bangor; in 1854 he retired to Chester, where he died, February 29, 1860. He  published several tracts and sermons, besides his work entitled, Pyngeian Athrawiaethol (doctrinal points). See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1861, page 215.

## Jones, Benjamin (1)[[@Headword:Jones, Benjamin (1)]]

             an early Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in South Carolina about 1774; entered the itinerancy in 1801; was stationed at Charleston in 1802; and died suddenly on Bladen Circuit in 1804. He was a man of much seriousness and Christian gentleness, and a very useful preacher. — Conf. Minutes, 1, 125. (G.L.T.)

## Jones, Benjamin (2)[[@Headword:Jones, Benjamin (2)]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Sandwich, Mass., July 28,1786; united with the Church in 1805; entered the New York Conference in 1809; was made presiding elder in 1820; was delegate to the General Conference in 1832 and in 1840; was by poor health superannuated in 1846; and died at Lincolnville, Me., July 18, 1850, aged 64. Mr. Jones was a man of more than ordinary ability and influence. His preaching was bold, sustained, and independent; dealing in truthful logic and the word of God rather than fancy, and very strong in argument. His efforts were often eloquent in the highest degree. — Conf. Min. 4, 606; Stevens, Memorials of Methodism, chap. 42. (G.L.T.)

## Jones, Charles Colcock, D.D.[[@Headword:Jones, Charles Colcock, D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born at Liberty Hall, Ga., Dec. 20, 1804. While yet a youth he entered a large counting house in Savannah, Ga., but when converted, in his 18th year, he decided to quit mercantile life and enter the ministry. He prepared for college at Phillips Academy, then entered Andover Seminary, and later the theological seminary at Princeton. He was licensed in 1830 by the New Brunswick Presbytery at Allentown, New Jersey, and returned to Georgia in the autumn, and shortly afterwards became missionary to the negroes of Liberty County, Ga. He soon became interested in the colored race, and during the remainder of his life sought by extensive correspondence, by his annual reports as a missionary, and by all other means in his power, to engage the attention of the Christian public to the moral condition of this class of our population. In 1835 he was elected professor of Church history and polity in the seminary at Columbia, and after having been earnestly urged to accept the chair, on the plea that he might even there continue to work for the colored people, by inciting the students to engage with him in the work, he accepted the position in 1836. But he felt restless in his new place, and in 1838 returned again to his former work. In 1847 he was reelected to the professorship, and again  prevailed upon to accept the proffered honor; he now continued in the seminary until its close in 1850. At the same time he filled the position of secretary to the Board of Missions for the South and Southwest. In 1850 he removed to Philadelphia, to assume the duties of secretary of the Assembly's Board of Domestic Missions, and this position he filled until Oct. 1853, when failing health necessitated his return to Georgia. During the Rebellion he attached himself to the Southern cause. But his health was too feeble to permit much exertion, for he suffered from consumption. He died March 16, 1863. "Dr. Jones filled a large place in the esteem and affections of the Church of God. As a man there was decision and energy of character, united with great friendliness of heart, cheerfulness of disposition, activity of mind, and ease and polish of manners. Few equaled him in all that makes up the ease and polish of the Christian gentleman. As a preacher there was much that was attractive in his appearance and manner. A delightful simplicity, ease, and unction pervaded his happiest efforts." Dr. Jones published a Catechism of Scripture Doctr. and Practice: — Catechism on the Creed: — Hist. Catechism of the O.T. and N.T.; besides several pamphlets on the Religious Instr. of the Negro. His Catechism of Script. Doctrine and Practice was extensively used, and was found so serviceable to missionaries generally that it was translated into several languages, and was made a manual for the instruction of the heathen. He also began a History of the Church of God, which he did not live to complete (it was published by Scribner). See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 438. (J.H.W.)

## Jones, Cornelius[[@Headword:Jones, Cornelius]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Hinsdale, Mass., May 20,1800; was converted in Geauga Co., Ohio, Feb. 1821; entered the Pittsburgh Conference in 1827; and died at Alleghanytown, Aug. 27, 1835. He was a diligent student, an able minister, and a successful evangelist. — Conference Minutes, 2, 483.

## Jones, David (1)[[@Headword:Jones, David (1)]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in White Clay Creek Hundred, Newcastle Co., Del., May 12, 1736. In 1758 he was converted, and soon after determined to improve his education, which had been somewhat neglected. He entered Hopewell School, and remained there three years, eagerly pursuing the study of the classic languages. In 1761 he became a licentiate, and was  regularly ordained pastor in 1767 to the church at Freehold, Monmouth Co., New Jersey. In 1772 he removed to enter upon the missionary work among the Indians in Ohio. But he failed so utterly in these efforts that after the lapse of two years he returned again to his former charge. In the Revolutionary War he served as chaplain, and only resumed the regular work of the ministry at the close of the war. In 1786 he became pastor at Southampton, Pa. In 1794 he again entered the army, this time at the special request of general Wayne. He also served as chaplain during the War of 1812. He died in Chester Co., Pa., Feb. 5, 1820. See Sprague, Annals Am. Pulpit, 6, 85 sq.

## Jones, David (2)[[@Headword:Jones, David (2)]]

             another Baptist minister, was born in the north of Wales in April, 1785. He united with the Independent Church when about fifteen years old. Shortly after he emigrated to this country, and lived in Ohio. After a stay of two years among the Baptists, who were thickly settled in that immediate vicinity, he joined their Church, and was licensed to preach. He accepted a call to the Beaver Creek Baptist Church, teaching at the same time. From 1810 to 1813 he had no settled charge, and he traveled through several of the middle and border states, preaching from place to place. In 1813 he went to Newark, New Jersey, as pastor from which, in 1821, he was called to assume the pastorate of the Baptist Church at "Lower Dublin," near Philadelphia, where he had preached occasionally before his departure for Newark. With this people he spent the remainder of his life. He died April 9, 1833. He was (in part) the author of a tract on Baptism, entitled Letters of David and John, and wrote also the tract Salvation by Grace, published by the Baptist General Tract Society. See Sprague, Annals Am. Pulpit, 6, 518 sq.

## Jones, Greenbury R.[[@Headword:Jones, Greenbury R.]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Brownsville, Pa., April 7, 1784; was converted in August, 1803; entered the itinerancy at Steubenville, Ohio, in 1818; was presiding elder on Scioto District in 1821; Miami District in 1827; Portland District in 1832; but superannuated in that year, and so remained until 1839; and died at Marietta Conference Sept. 20, 1844. Mr. Jones was a zealous and capable minister, of fine tact and sound judgment. He was several times secretary of the Ohio Conference, nine years presiding elder, and twice delegate to the General Conference.  He was faithful in all things. and much beloved. — Minutes of Conferences, 3, 651; Sprague, Annals Am. Pulpit, 7, 587. (G.L.T.)

## Jones, Griffith[[@Headword:Jones, Griffith]]

             a Welsh divine, generally known as the Welsh Apostle, was born at Kilreddis, Caermarthenshire, in 1684. His parents, who were eminently pious, took great pains to imbue the mind of their son from his earliest years with impressions of religion. The serious turn which they thus gave to his mind inclined him towards the Christian ministry. At the completion of his theological studies he was ordained by bishop Bull, Sept. 19, 1708, and shortly after appointed to the rectory of Llanddowror by Sir John Philips, whose own religious character made him anxious to secure the services of a man of piety and learning like Jones. "In this situation," says Middleton (Evangelical Biography, s.v.), "he soon developed all the best qualities of a man of God, and a most eloquent and evangelical preacher. Christ was all to him; and it was his greatest delight to publish and exalt the unsearchable riches of his Redeemer's righteousness. Nor was he less blessed in his private plans of doing good. He founded among his countrymen free schools, and by this means more than a hundred and fifty thousand poor people were taught to read. He also circulated thirty thousand copies of the Welsh Bible among them, besides other religious and useful books. His humility gave luster to all these labors of love. On his dying bed he said, 'I must bear witness to the goodness of God to me. Blessed be God, his comforts fill my soul.' He died in April, 1761. It may be truly said of Griffith Jones that few lives were more heavenly and useful, and few deaths more triumphant." Jones also wrote and published several religious treatises in Welsh and English, of which many thousands were distributed as had been the Bible. See Jamieson, Cyclop. Relig. Biog. p. 289; Alibone, Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors, vol. 2, s.v.

## Jones, Horatio Gates[[@Headword:Jones, Horatio Gates]]

             (son of David Jones, 1), also a Baptist minister, was born at Easttown, Chester County, Pa., Feb. 11, 1777. His early education was quite thorough, and remarkably so for a young man destined for agricultural life. Gifted with great fluency of speech, young Jones became "the politician" of his own immediate vicinity, and before he had reached his majority enjoyed the prospect of preferment in political life. Just about this time he became conscious, however, of his responsibility to his Maker, and, believing  himself to have been the subject of spiritual renovation, he made public declaration of his belief, June 24, 1798, and determined to devote his life to the Christian ministry. He was licensed Sept. 26, 1801, and called to Salem, New Jersey, Feb. 13, 1802. In 1805 his health became enfeebled, and he was obliged to resign, however reluctantly, the charge. Hereafter he devoted himself to farm life on a place which he bought on the banks of the Schuylkill River, about five miles above Philadelphia. But Jones had engaged too heartily in the cause of his Master not to be tempted to reenter the work of the Christian ministry whenever his health should warrant the task. At first he went to different places from time to time and preached; finally he made "Thomson's Meeting house" at Lower Merion, Montgomery County, belonging to the Presbyterians, his headquarters, and he succeeded, after several years of ardent labor, in building up there a Baptist Church, which he served until the end of his earthly days, Dec. 12, 1853. Mr. Jones held a prominent position in the board of trustees of the University of Lewisburg, Pa., and was at one time its chancellor. This high school conferred on him the degree of D.D. The degree of M.A. he received from Brown University in 1812. He was also a member of the Baptist Board of Missions, and was at one time (1829) president of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, of which society he published a History in 1823, and held a coeditorship of the Latter-day Luminary, an early Baptist missionary magazine. Indeed, we are told that '"few men of his day have written so much and so well, and published so little." See Sprague, Annals Am. Pulpit, 6, 452 sq.

## Jones, Hugh, D.D[[@Headword:Jones, Hugh, D.D]]

             a Welsh Baptist minister, was born at Bodedeyrn, Anglesea, July 10, 1831. At the age of seventeen he was baptized, soon after began topreach, in 1857 graduated from the college at Haverfordwest, became pastor at Llandudno, in 1859 at Llangollen, in 1862 assistant at the new college there, in 1866 its president, and died there, May 28, 1883. See(Lond.) Baptist Hand-book, 1884, page 292.

## Jones, Inigo[[@Headword:Jones, Inigo]]

             an eminent English architect, was born in London in 1572. He went to Venice and studied the works of Palladio, and his reputation procured him the appointment of chief architect to Christian IV, king of Denmark, who, in 1606, brought Jones with him to England. He was induced to remain, and was appointed architect to the queen, and subsequently to Henry, prince of Wales. He invented many ingenious decorations and wonderful machines. Among his works are the palace of lord Pembroke, at Wilton, in the county of Wilts; the queen's chapel, St. James; the facades of Holyrood House; and Heriot's Hospital, Edinburgh. He died in London, July 21, 1652. A collection of Inigo Jones's architectural designs was published by Kent in 1712 and 1724. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Jones, Jeremiah[[@Headword:Jones, Jeremiah]]

             a learned English dissenting minister, was born, as is supposed, of parents in opulent circumstances, in the north of England, in 1693. After finishing his education under the Rev. Samuel Jones, of Tewksbury, who was also the tutor of Chandler, Butler, Seeker, and many other distinguished divines, he became minister of a congregation at Forest Green, in Glouoetershire, where he also kept an academy. He died in 1734. His works are as follows: A Vindication of the former Part of the Gospel by Matthew from Mr. Whiston's Charge of Dislocation, etc. (London, 1719, 8vo; Salop, 1721, 8vo, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1803): — also, A new and full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament (London, 1726, 2 vols. 8vo; vol. 3, 1727, 8vo; Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1798, 3 vols. 8vo, and since). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. (London);  Gentleman's Magazine, vol. 23; Monthly Magazine, April 1803; Allibone, Dict. of English and American Authors, 2, 988.

## Jones, Joel[[@Headword:Jones, Joel]]

             a celebrated lay writer on theological subjects, and jurist by profession, was born of Puritan ancestry at Coventry, Conn., Oct. 26, 1795, and educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1817. He was one of the judges of the Philadelphia District Court, and later mayor of Philadelphia. In 1848 he was elected president of Girard College, and he held that position for two years. He died Feb. 3, 1860. Distinguished for his great legal abilities, judge Jones deserves a place in our work on account of his extended researches in the Biblical department. His acquirements extended far beyond the widest range of professional attainment. Judge Jones wrote extensively for literary journals and quarterlies; he also published largely. Of special interest to the theological student are, Story of Joseph, or Patriarchal Age (originally published for the use of Girard College students): — The Knowledge of One Another in the Future State: — Notes on Scripture (published by his widow, Phila. 1860). He also edited several English works on Prophecy, which he published under the title of Literalist (5 vols. 8vo), enriched with many valuable additions of his own, and translated from the French, Outlines of a History of the Court of Rome and of the Temporal Power of the Popes (to which he appended many original notes). Judge Jones was a ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church, and held positions in various ecclesiastical boards, where his services were greatly prized. See Princeton Review, Index, 2, 219 sq.

## Jones, John[[@Headword:Jones, John]]

             an English Wesleyan minister, was born at Llandwrog, Carnarvonshire, in 1825, entered the ministry in 1854, and died Dec. 17,1889. He published a work on the Atonement: — Expository Sermons: — Poem on the Bible: — Logic: — besides contributing to many periodicals. See Minutes of the British Conference, 1890, p. 24.

## Jones, John (1)[[@Headword:Jones, John (1)]]

             an English Roman Catholic theologian, was born at London in 1575. He studied at St. John's College, Oxford, where he roomed with Laud, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury. Having turned Roman Catholic, he went to Spain, completed his studies at the University of Compostello, and became a Benedictine under the name of Leander a Sancto-Martino. After teaching for a while Hebrew and theology in the College of St. Vedast, he returned to England at the invitation of Laud, and died at London, Dec. 17, 1636. He wrote Sacra Alrs Memorioe, ad Scripturas divinas in promptu habendas accomodata (Douay, 1623, 8vo): — Conciliatio locorum communium totius Scripturoe (Douay, 1623, 8vo). He also published some editions of the Bible, with interlinear glosses (6 vols. fol.); of the works of  Blosius; of Arnobe, Adversus Gentes (Douay, 1634); and worked with P. Reyner on the Apostolatus Benedictinorum. See Wood, Athenes Oxoniensis, vol. 1; Dodd, Ch. History; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 26, 905. (J.N.P.)

## Jones, John (2)[[@Headword:Jones, John (2)]]

             an English Protestant divine, was born in 1700. He was educated at Worcester College, Oxford, and ordained in 1726. Having become vicar of Aconbury, he resigned in 1751, to take the rectory of Boulne Hurat, Bedfordshire. His death was caused by a fall from his horse; the time of its occurrence is not recorded. He wrote [Anon.] Free and candid Disquisitions relating to the Church of England, etc. (Lond. 1753, 8vo): this work produced a great controversy, lasting several years: — Cursory Animadversions upon "Free and Candid Disquisitions," etc. (Lond. 1753, 8vo): — Catholic Faith and Practice (1765). See Nichols, Literary Anecdotes; London Gentl. Magazine, 81, pt. 1, p. 510 sq.; Allibone, Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth. 2, s.v.

## Jones, John (3), LL.D.[[@Headword:Jones, John (3), LL.D.]]

             a Welsh Socinian divine and philological writer, was born in Caermarthenshire, and educated at the Unitarian New College, Hackney. In 1792 Mr. Jones was appointed classical and mathematical teacher in the Welsh Academy, Swansea, which situation he held about three years, and then settled at Plymouth Dock over the Unitarian congregation. In 1797 he became minister of the Unitarian congregation at Halifax in Yorkshire, and about 1800 he removed to London, where he resided during the remainder of his life, chiefly occupied as a classical teacher, and preaching only occasionally. He died January 10, 1827. A few years before his death he received the diploma of LL.D. from the University of Aberdeen. Dr. Jones was the author of several works, some of which are religious, chiefly in support or defense of the evidences of Christianity. Of these the most important are Illustrations of the Four Gospels, founded on circumstances peculiar to our Lord and the Evangelists (Lond. 1808, 8vo): — Ecclesiastical Researches, or Philo and Josephus proved to be historians and apologists of Christ, etc. (London, 1812 — a sequel, 1813, 2 vols. 8vo): — Epistle to the Romans analyzed (1802, 8vo): — New Version of the Epistles to the Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and the general Epistle of James (1819-20, 12mo): — New Version of the first  three Chapters of Genesis (1819, 8vo). He also wrote a number of philological works which are considered valuable. It may not be out of place here to state that Dr. Jones was the first English philologian who taught Greek by the medium of the English instead of the Latin. See Lond. Gentl. Mag. April, 1827; Engl. Cyclop. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth. 2, S.V.

## Jones, John Collier, D.D[[@Headword:Jones, John Collier, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born at Plympton, Devonshire, October 7, 1770. He graduated from Exeter College, Oxford, June 6, 1792, and shortly after was elected to a Petrean fellowship. Entering holy orders, he became curate of Mortlake, in Surrey, but afterwards accepted a chaplainship on board the Namiur, and was present in the action off cape St. Vincent, in 1797. In 1808 he became one of the tutors of his college; in 1812 a public examiner; select preacher in 1819; and on the death of Dr. Cole was elected to the rectorship of Exeter. Dr. Jones's other official appointments were, delegate of accounts in 1824; vice-chancellor from October 1828, to 1832; and joint curator of the Sheldonian Theatre in 1829. He was also vicar of Kidlington, and an acting magistrate for the county of Oxford. He died in 1838. His inflexible integrity, gracefulness of manner, and kindness of disposition won for him the esteem and love of all with whom he came in contact. See (Lond.) Christian Remembrancer, September 1838, page 568.

## Jones, John Emlyn, LL.D[[@Headword:Jones, John Emlyn, LL.D]]

             a Welsh Baptist minister, was born at Newcastle Emlyn, Carmarthenshire, January 8, 1820. He was baptized at the age of thirteen; received a good  education; was ordained in 1852 co-pastor at Pontypridd; was then pastor in Ebbw Vale; then in Cardiff; in 1865 removed to Merthyr; in 1869 to Llandudno, North Wales, and finally returned to Ebbw Vale, where he died, January 18, 1873. He was ever busy with his pen, as with his tongue, contributing largely to both the Welsh and the English newspaper press. He published Welsh translations of Gill's Commentary and Hamilton's Grammar. He wrote Hanes Prydain Flawr, am yr Haner Canrif Diweddaf ("The History of Great Britain for the Past Half Century"). For several years he was busily engaged in writing his Y Parthsyllydd, Sef, Haner yr Boll Fyd ("The History of the Whole World"), one volume of which was published. See, (Lond.) Baptist Hand-book, 1874, page 282. (J.C.S.)

## Jones, John M[[@Headword:Jones, John M]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister and native of England, was born about 1810. He was educated a Romanist in France, and while young emigrated first to Canada and then to Maryland, where he was a teacher in a Romish institution in St. George's County. He was converted to Protestantism in 1834, and two years after entered the Baltimore Conference, and "for twenty years pursued the ministerial calling, laboring day and night with quenchless zeal to rescue souls from death." He died at South Baltimore Station April 20, 1855. He "was a man of rare excellence and many virtues," of deep piety, and an able and devoted minister. — Conf. Minutes, 6, 201. (G.L.T.)

## Jones, John Taylor, D.D[[@Headword:Jones, John Taylor, D.D]]

             a Baptist missionary, was born at New Ipswich, N.H., July 16, 1802. He graduated at Amherst College in 1825; studied theology at Andover and Newton Seminary; and, having joined the Baptist Church in 1828, was the following year appointed a missionary to Burmah. He arrived at Maulmain, his destined place of labor, in Feb. 1831, and, after having mastered the Taling and Siamese languages, he was chosen to go to the kingdom of Siam, and reached Bangkok in April 1833. After a successful mission, he left Siam in 1839, on account of his children, went to Singapore, and thence on a visit to the United States. After returning to Siam for six years he came home again in 1846, and in the fall of 1847 went away for the last time. He died at Bangkok Sept. 13, 1851. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him a few years before his death. Dr. Jones published three tracts in Siamese, 1834; and a translation of the New Testament in the same language, Oct. 1843. The Rev. William Dean says of Dr. Jones's qualifications for the missionary work, "Take him altogether, I have never seen his equal; and among more than a hundred men I have met among the heathen, I would select Dr. Jones as the model missionary." — Sprague, Annals Am. Pulpit, 6, 772.

## Jones, Joseph Huntington, D.D[[@Headword:Jones, Joseph Huntington, D.D]]

             an able Presbyterian minister, and brother of judge Joel (see above), was born at Coventry, Conn., Aug. 24, 1797, and graduated at Harvard College in 1817. After teaching a short time at Bowdoin College, he decided on the ministry for his life work, and entered Princeton Theological Seminary. His first charge he entered June 1, 1824 at Woodbury, New Jersey. The year following, after a most successful work on the small and feeble charge, he was called to New Brunswick, and was installed the second Wednesday of July, 1825. In 1838 he removed to Philadelphia, to take charge of the Sixth Presbyterian Church in that city, and he continued his relation there for twenty-three years. "Beginning with a church reduced so low that a resuscitation was deemed well nigh impossible, and struggling with difficulties that would have discouraged ordinary men, a manifest blessing crowned his efforts." In 1861, finding that the secretaryship of the committee on the "fund for disabled ministers," etc., which he had filled nearly for seven years in connection with his pastoral duties, was of itself onerous enough in its duties, he resigned his position as pastor, and devoted himself hereafter entirely to this noble cause of providing for those of his brethren who were in need of assistance. He died Dec. 22, 1868, in the midst of his work, "suddenly, as it were with the harness on." In 1843 Lafayette College conferred on him the degree of D.D. Dr. Jones published Revivals of Religion (Phila. 1839): — Effects of Physical Causes on Christian Experience (1846, and often, 18mo): — Memoir of the Rev. Ashbel Green, D.D. (N.Y. 1849, 8vo): — History of the Revival at New Brunswick in 1837; and several of his sermons and essays. — Princeton Reviews, Index, vol. 2, 222 sq.

## Jones, Lot, D.D[[@Headword:Jones, Lot, D.D]]

             a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Brunswick, Maine, Feb. 21, 1797, and was educated at Bowdoin College, Maine, where he graduated in 1821. Joining the Protestant Episcopal Church, he studied for the ministry under bishop Griswold, and was by him ordained deacon January 1823, and priest September 1823. In 1823 he was settled at Marblehead and Marshfield, Mass.; in 1825 at Macon, Ga.; in 1827 at Savannah; in 1828 at Gardiner, Maine; in 1829 at South Leicester, Mass.; and in January 1833, he removed to New York, and took charge of the new mission church of the Epiphany. Here his humility, single hearted devotion to his one great work, and untiring industry, made his ministry  remarkably effective. In 1858 he published his 25th anniversary discourse. During those 25 years he baptized 2501-253 adults and 2248 children, married 759 couples, presented 915 for confirmation, enrolled 1494 as communicants, and attended 1362 funerals. He died in Philadelphia Oct. 12, 1865. His death was the result of accident in falling upon the pavement at St. Luke's Church, where he was in attendance upon the meeting of the Board of Missions. — Church Review, Jan. 1866, p. 669.

## Jones, Robert C[[@Headword:Jones, Robert C]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Petersburg, Va., Dec. 23, 1808. He graduated at William and Mary's College in 1828, studied law and was ready for practice, when he was converted in 1833, and at once prepared for the ministry. He entered the Virginia Conference in 1836, and died Aug. 2, 1838. Mr. Jones was a man of good abilities, much modesty, and a consistent witness of sanctifying grace. He was a dignified and conscientious minister, and a very successful evangelist. — Conf. Minutes, 2, 667.

## Jones, Samuel Beach, D.D[[@Headword:Jones, Samuel Beach, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Charleston, S.C., November 23, 1811. He studied at Yale College; spent four years in Princeton Theological Seminary (1832-36); acted one year as assistant secretary of the Board of Missions; was ordained in 1837; became professor of Hebrew in the Oakland Seminary, Mississippi, in 1838; was pastor of the First Presbyterian Church at Bridgeton, N.J., from 1839 to 1863; preached in Fairfield from 1870 to 1875, and died at Bridgeton, March 19, 1883. See (N.Y.) Observer, March 22, 1883. (W.P.S.) —

## Jones, Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Jones, Samuel, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Glamorganshire, South Wales, Jan. 14,1735, and was brought by his parents to this country during his infancy, and was educated in the College of Philadelphia, where he received the degree of M.A. May 18, 1762, and turned his attention to the study of theology. He was ordained in January 1763, and became pastor of the united churches of Pennepek and Southampton. In the same year he, by request, remodeled the draft of the charter of a college in Newport, R.I., which institution afterwards became Brown University. In 1770 he resigned the care of the Southampton Church and devoted himself thereafter to that of Pennepek, afterwards called Lower Dublin. He received the honorary degree of M.A. from the College of Rhode island in 1769, and that of D.D. from the College of Pennsylvania in 1788. While attending faithfully to his ministerial labors, he also devoted much time to teaching, in which he was very successful. He died Feb. 7, 1814. Dr. Jones made several compilations for divers associations in which he filled high offices, and published some occasional sermons. — Sprague, Annals, 6, 104 sq.

## Jones, Sir William[[@Headword:Jones, Sir William]]

             an eminent poet, scholar, and lawyer, was born in London Sept. 28, 1746, and was sent to Harrow in 1753, where he soon eclipsed all his fellows, particularly in classical knowledge. In 1764 he was entered at University College, Oxford, where he was enabled to gratify that desire for a knowledge of the Oriental languages which had shown itself during the last two years of his residence at Harrow. In 1765 he left Oxford, to become tutor to the eldest son of earl Spencer, with whom he traveled on the Continent. In 1770 he was admitted to the Inner Temple, and the same year he published, at the request of the king of Denmark, a Life of Nadir Shah, translated into French from the Persian; in the following year a Persian Grammar, republished some years ago, with corrections and additions, by the late professor Lee; and in 1774 his Commentaries of Asiatic Poetry, republished by Eichhorn at Leipsic in 1776. In 1776 he was made a commissioner of bankrupts. In 1780 he completed a translation of  seven Arabic poems, known as the Moallakat; wrote an essay On the Legal Mode of Suppressing Riots, and another, entitled Essay on the Law of Bailments, and two or three odes. In March, 1783, Jones obtained a judgeship in the Supreme Court of Judicature in Bengal, and landed at Calcutta in September. He at once set about the acquisition and promulgation of the knowledge of Oriental languages, literature, and customs. He established the Royal Asiatic Society "for investigating the history, antiquities, arts, sciences, and literature of Asia," of which he was the first president. To the volumes of the Asiatic Researches Sir William contributed largely. Besides these, he wrote and published a story in verse, called The Enchanted Fruit, or the Hindu Wife; and a translation of an ancient Indian drama, called Sacontala, or the Fatal Ring. A translation by him of the Ordinances of Menu (q.v.) appeared in 1794. He was busily employed on a digest of the Hindu and Mohammedan laws, when he was attacked with an inflammation of the liver, which terminated fatally April 27, 1794. Sir Wm. Jones was one of the first linguists and Oriental scholars that Great Britain has produced, being more or less acquainted with no less than twenty-eight different languages. His poems are always elegant, often animated, and their versification is mellifluous. His learning was extensive, his legal knowledge was profound, and he was an enlightened and zealous champion of constitutional principles. He was also an earnest Christian. To devotional exercises he was habitually attentive. In addition to the above works, Sir William Jones published a translation of Isaeus; and also translations of two Mohammedan law tracts On the Law of Inheritance, and of Succession to Property of lntestates: — Tales and Fables. by Nizami: — Two Hymns to Pracriti; and Extracts from the Vedas. The East India Company erected a monument to his memory in St. Paul's Cathedral, and a statue in Bengal. A complete edition of his works, in 6 vols. 4to, was published by lady Jones in 1799; and another appeared, in 13 vols. 8vo, in 1807, with a life of the author by lord Teignmouth.

## Jones, Thomas[[@Headword:Jones, Thomas]]

             an English divine, was born in 1729, and educated at Queen's College, Cambridge. He was chaplain at St. Savior's, Southwark, and is noted for his deep piety and great exertions in behalf of the conversion of the masses at a time when the English pulpit was in that deep lethargy from which Wesley and his coadjutors first earnestly aroused it. Like the Wesleyans he met with much opposition in his noble efforts, and "his sweetness of natural temper," says his biographer, "great as it was, would never have supported him under the numberless insults he met with had it not been strengthened, as well as adorned, by a sublimer influence." His health finally gave way under his extraordinary labors, and he died, while yet a young man, in 1761. — Middleton, Evang. Biog. 4, 380.

## Jones, Thomas (1), D.D[[@Headword:Jones, Thomas (1), D.D]]

             an Irish prelate, was born in Lancashire, and educated at Christ College, Cambridge. His first promotion was to the chancellorship of St. Patrick's Cathedral; in 1581 he was elected its dean; in May, 1584, dean Jones was promoted to the see of Meath, and on May 12 was consecrated in St. Patrick's Church. Having presided over that see twenty-one years, he was translated to that of Dublin in 1605, and was consecrated November 9 of the same year. In 1611, he, and the other archbishops o£ the Established Church, held a council in Dublin, wherein it was decreed that the suffragans should reside in their respective dioceses, visit all the churches, and institute such regulations as would be best calculated to prevent sectarianism and extirpate popery. In 1613 he was one of the justices in commission with sir Richard Wingfield. In 1614 he had a grant of the temporalities of the bishoprics of Kilmore and Ardagh during vacancy. During the episcopacy of archbishop Jones he repaired a great part of  Christ Church. He died at his palace of St. Sepulchre's in April 1619. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 250.

## Jones, Thomas (2)[[@Headword:Jones, Thomas (2)]]

             an English divine, was born near Havod, Cardiganshire, Wales, April 2, 1752. He was educated at the grammar-school of Ystradmeirig, and ordained in 1774. Having labored in the curacy of Llangevelin and Eglwysvach from 1774 to 1778, he removed to Leintwardine, Herefordshire, England, thence to Longnor, Shropshire, and from this place to Oswestry. His next curacy was Loppington; and in 1785 he was appointed to the living of Creation, Northamptonshire, where he remained till the increasing infirmities of age obliged him to reign his office in 1833., He died January 7, 1845. His works are, Jonah's Portrait (1818, 12mo; 9th ed. 1845. 8vo): — Scripture Directori (Lond. 1811, 8vo; 8th ed. 1839, 12mo): — The True Christian (5th ed. 1844, sq.): — The Prodigal's Pilgrimage (1831, 12mo; new ed. 1847, 16mo): — Sober Views of the Millennium (1835, 12mo): — Fountain of Life (3d ed. 1848, 16mo): — Notes of Fifty-five Sermons, edited by Reverend John Owen (1851, 12mo). See The (Lond.) Christian Guardian, July 1845, pages 281, 329; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Jones, William, M.A., F.R.S[[@Headword:Jones, William, M.A., F.R.S]]

             of Nayland, as he is generally called, was born at Lowick, in Northamptonshire, July 30, 1726. He was educated at the Charter House and University College, Oxford. He there became a convert to the philosophy of Hutchinson, and, having induced Mr. Home, afterwards bishop of Norwich, to adopt the same system, together they became the principal champions of that philosophy. He was admitted to deacon's orders after having received the degree of B.A., in 1749. In 1751 he was ordained priest by the bishop of Lincoln, and on quitting the university became curate of Finedon, and afterwards of Wadsohoe, both in his native county. In 1764 archbishop Secker presented him to the vicarage of Bethersden, in Kent, and in the next year to the rectory of Pluckley, in the same county. In 1776 he took up his residence at Nayland, in Suffolk, where he held the perpetual curacy; and soon after he exchanged his living of Pluckley for the rectory of Paston, in Northamptonshire. In 1780 he became fellow of the Royal Society of London. During many years he was engaged in the composition of a treatise on philosophy, which was intended to elucidate his favorite system. In that work he displayed great learning and ingenuity, as well as ardent attachment to the interests of piety and virtue, united with the eccentric peculiarities of the Hutchinsonian school. Alarmed at the progress of radical and revolutionary opinions during the French Revolution, he employed his pen in opposition to the advocates of such destructive principles, and his writings were widely circulated by the friends of the British government. He treated with equal success questions of theology, morals, literature, philosophy, and, in  addition to all these, showed great talents in musical composition. "He was a man of quick penetration," says bishop Horsley, "of extensive learning, and the soundest piety, and he had the talent of writing upon the deepest subjects for the plainest understanding." In the year 1792 he met with a severe loss in the death of his most intimate friend, bishop Home, to whom he was chaplain. Being now of advanced age, and obliged, by his growing infirmities, to discontinue his practice of taking pupils, that he might not be subjected to inconvenience from the diminution of his income, in the year 1798 the archbishop of Canterbury presented him to the sinecure rectory of Hollingbourn in Kent, which, however, he did not live long to enjoy, dying Feb. 6, 1800, in consequence of a paralytic stroke. His most important works are, A full Answer to Bp. Clayton's Essay on Spirit (1753, 8vo): Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity proved from Scripture:(1757): — Course of Lectures on the Figurative Language of the Holy Scriptures (1787, 8vo): — Sermons — (1790, 2 vols. 8vo): — The Scholar armed against the Errors of the Times (2 vols. 8vo): — Memoirs of the Life, Studies, and Writings of George Horne (1795 and 1799, 8vo). The most complete collection of his works is that in 12 vols. 8vo (Lond. 1801). The theological and miscellaneous works were republished separately (London, 1810, 6 vols. 8vo). Two posthumous volumes of sermons were published for the first time in 1830 (London, 8vo). See W. Stevens, Life of W. Jones (1801), Aikin, Gen. Biography; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, 26, 908; Buck; Davenport; Darling, Cyclopoedia Bibliog. 2, 1682. (E. de P.)

## Jonsson, Finn[[@Headword:Jonsson, Finn]]

             (known also by the Latin name of Finnus Johannoeus), the historian of the Icelandic Church and literature, was born on the 16th of January, 1704, at Hitardal, in Iceland, where his father, Jon Haldorsson, was minister. He was educated at the School of Skalholt, and in 1725 passed to the University of Copenhagen. On his return to Iceland his intention was to become a lawyer, but the death of his uncle, a parish priest, who left behind him a numerous family of small children, led his father to request him to  alter his views to the Church, that he might bring up the orphans. He obtained the vacant benefice, brought up the family, married, and in 1754 was appointed to the bishopric of Skalholt. He was very attentive to the revenues of his diocese, and the account of his episcopate by Petursson is chiefly occupied with his disputes with refractory tenants of Church property. He died on the 23d of July, 1789. He composed several works in Latin and Icelandic, especially a Historia Ecclesiastica Islandioe, first published with valuable additions by his son Finnson (Copenhagen, 1772-8, 4 vols. 4to), and continued by Petursson down to 1840 (ib. 1841), a valuable and interesting work, embracing the literary as well as ecclesiastical affairs of Iceland. — English Cyclop. s.v.

## Joppa[[@Headword:Joppa]]

             (Heb. Yapho', יָפוֹ, Jos 19:46; 2Ch 2:16; Jon 1:3, or יָפוֹא, Ezr 3:7; beauty; Sept., N.T., and Josephus Ι᾿όππη, other Greek writers Ι᾿ώππη, Ι᾿ώπη, or Ι᾿όπη; Vulgate Joppe; Auth. Vers. "Japho," except in Jonah; usually "Joppe" in the Apocrypha), a town on the southwest coast of Palestine, the port of Jerusalem in the days of Solomon, as it has been ever since.

1. Legends. — The etymology of the name is variously explained; Rabbinical writers deriving it from Japhet, but classical geographers from Iopa (Ι᾿όπη), daughter of AEolus and wife of Cepheus, Andromeda's father, its reputed founder; others interpreting it "the watchtower of joy," and so forth (Reland, Paloest. p. 864). The fact is, that, from its being a seaport, it had a profane as well as a sacred history. Pliny, following Mela (De situ Orb. 1, 12), says that it was of antediluvian antiquity (Hist. Nat. 5, 14); and even Sir John Maundeville, in the 14th century, bears witness — though, it must be confessed, a clumsy one — to that tradition (Early Travels in P. p. 142). According to Josephus, it originally belonged to the Phoenicians (Ant. 13, 15, 4). Here, writes Strabo, some say Andromeda was exposed to the whale (Geograph. 16, p. 759; comp. Müller's Hist. Groec. Fragm. 4, 325, and his Geograph. Groec. Min. 1, 79), and he appeals to its elevated position in behalf of those who laid the scene there; though, in order to do so consistently, he had already shown that it would be necessary to transport Ethiopia into Phoenicia (Strabo, 1, 43). However, in Pliny's age — and Josephus had just before affirmed the same (War, 3, 9, 3) — they still showed the chains by which Andromeda was bound; and not only so, but M. Scaurus the younger, the same that was so  much employed in Judaea by Pompey (War, 1, 6, 2 sq.), had the bones of the monster transported to Rome from Joppa, where till then they had been exhibited (Mela, ibid.), and displayed them there during his aedileship to the public amongst other prodigies. Nor would they have been uninteresting to the modern geologist, if his report be correct; for they measured forty feet in length, the span of the ribs exceeding that of the Indian elephant, and the thickness of the spine or vertebra being one foot and a half ("sesquipedalis," i.e. in circumference — when Solinus says "semipedalis," he means in diameter, see Pliny, Hist. Nat. 9, 5 and the note, Delphin ed.). Reland would trace the adventures of Jonah in this legendary guise, SEE JONAH; but it is far more probable that it symbolizes the first interchange of commerce between the Greeks, personified in their errant hero Perseus, and the Phoenicians, whose lovely, but till then unexplored clime may be shadowed forth in the fair virgin Andromeda. Perseus in the tale, is said to have plunged his dagger into the right shoulder of the monster. Possibly he may have discovered or improved the harbor, the roar from whose foaming reefs on the north could scarcely have been surpassed by the barkings of Scylla or Charybdis. Even the chains shown there may have been those by which his ship was attached to the shore. Rings used by the Romans for mooring their vessels are still to be seen near Terracina, in the south angle of the ancient port (Murray's Handbk. for S. Italy, p. 10, 2d ed.).

2. History. — We find that Japho or Joppa was situated in the portion of Dan (Jos 19:46), on the coast towards the south, and on a hill so high, says Strabo, that people affirmed (but incorrectly) that Jerusalem was visible from its summit. Having a harbor attached to it — though always, as still, a dangerous one — it became the port of Jerusalem, when Jerusalem became metropolis of the kingdom of the house of David; and certainly never did port and metropolis more strikingly resemble each other in difficulty of approach both by sea and land. Hence, except in journeys to and from Jerusalem, it was not much used. Accordingly, after the above incidental notice, the place is not mentioned till the times of Solomon, when, as being almost the only available seaport, Joppa was the place fixed upon for the cedar and pine wood from Mount Lebanon to be landed by the servants of Hiram, king of Tyre, thence to be conveyed to Jerusalem by the servants of Solomon for the erection of the first "house of habitation" ever made with hands for the invisible Jehovah. It was by way of Joppa similarly that like materials were conveyed from the same locality, by  permission of Cyrus, for the rebuilding of the second Temple under Zerubbabel (1Ki 5:9; 2Ch 2:16; Ezr 3:7). Here Jonah, whenever and wherever he may have lived (2Ki 14:25, certainly does not clear up the first of these points), "took ship to flee from the presence of his Maker" (Jon 1:3), and accomplished that singular history which our Lord has appropriated as a type of one of the principal scenes in the great drama of his own (Mat 12:40).

After the close of O.T. history Joppa rose in importance. The sea was then beginning to be the highway of nations. Greece, Egypt, Persia, and some of the little kingdoms of Asia Minor had their fleets for commerce and war. Until the construction of Caesarea by Herod, Joppa was the only port in Palestine proper at which foreign ships could touch; it was thus not only the shipping capital, but the key of the whole country on the seaboard. During the wars of the Maccabees it was one of the principal strongholds of Palestine (1Ma 10:75; 1Ma 14:5; 1Ma 14:34; Josephus, Ant. 13, 15, 1). It would seem that Jews then constituted only a minority of the population, and the foreign residents — Greeks, Egyptians, and Syrians — were so rich and powerful, and so aided by the fleets of their own nations, as to be able to rule the city. During this period, therefore, Joppa experienced many vicissitudes. It had sided with Apollonius, and was attacked and captured by Jonathan Maccabaeus (1Ma 10:76). It witnessed the meeting between the latter and Ptolemy (ibid. 11:6). Simon had his suspicions of its inhabitants, and set a garrison there (ibid. 12:34), which he afterwards strengthened considerably (ibid. 13:11). But when peace was restored, he reestablished it once more as a haven (ibid. 14:5). He likewise rebuilt the fortifications (ibid. 5:34). This occupation of Joppa was one of the grounds of complaint urged by Antiochus, son of Demetrius, against Simon; but the latter alleged in excuse the mischief which had been done by its inhabitants to his fellow citizens (ibid. 15:30 and 35). It would appear that Judas Maccabaeus had burned their haven some time back for a gross act of barbarity (2Ma 12:6). Tribute was subsequently exacted for its possession from Hyrcanus by Antiochus Sidetes. By Pompey it was once more made independent, and comprehended under Syria (Josephus, Ant. 14, 4, 4); but by Caesar it was not only restored to the Jews, but its revenues — whether from land or from export duties — were bestowed upon the 2d Hyrcanus and his heirs (14, 10, 6). When Herod the Great commenced operations, it was seized by him, lest he should leave a hostile stronghold in his rear when he marched upon Jerusalem (14, 15, 1), and  Augustus confirmed him in its possession (15, 7, 4). It was afterwards assigned to Archelaus when constituted ethnarch (17, 11,4), and passed with Syria under Cyrenius when Archelaus had been deposed (17, 12, 5). Under Cestius (i.e. Gessius Florus) it was destroyed amidst great slaughter of its inhabitants (War, 2, 18, 8, 10); and such a nest of pirates had it become when Vespasian arrived in those parts that it underwent a second and entire destruction, together with the adjacent villages, at his hands (3, 9, 3). Thus it appears that this port had already begun to be the den of robbers and outcasts which it was in Strabo's time (Geograph. 16, 759), while the district around it was so populous that from Jamnia, a neighboring town. and its vicinity, 40,000 armed men could be collected (ibid.). There was a vast plain around it, as we learn from Josephus (Ant. 13, 4, 4); it lay between Jamnia and Caesarea — the latter of which might be reached "on the morrow" from it (Act 10:9; Act 10:24) — not far from Lydda (Act 9:38), and distant from Antipatris 150 stadia (Joseph. Ant. 13, 15, 1).

It was at Joppa, on the house top of Simon the tanner, "by the seaside" — with the view therefore circumscribed on the east by the high ground on which the town stood, but commanding a boundless prospect over the western waters — that the apostle Peter had his "vision of tolerance," as it has been happily designated, and went forth like a second Perseus — but from the east to emancipate, from still worse thralldom, the virgin daughter of the west. The Christian poet Arator has not failed to discover a mystical connection between the raising to life of the aged Tabitha — the occasion of Peter's visit to Joppa — and the baptism of the first Gentile household (De Act. Apostol. 1. 840, ap. Migne, Patrol. Curs. Compl. 68, 164).

In the 4th century Eusebius calls Joppa a city (Onomast. s.v.); and it was then made the seat of a bishopric, an honor which it retained till the conquest of the country by the Saracens (Reland, p. 868; S. Paul, Geogr. Sac. p. 305); the subscriptions of its prelates are preserved in the acts of various synods of the 5th and 6th centuries (Le Quien, Oriens Christian. 3, 629). Joppa has been the landing place of pilgrims going to Jerusalem for more than a thousand years, from Arculf in the 7th century to his royal highness the prince of Wales in the 19th, and it is mentioned in almost all the itineraries and books of travel in the Holy Land which have appeared in different languages (Early Travels in Pal. p. 10, 34, 142, 286). None of the early travelers, however, give any explicit description of the place. During the Crusades Joppa was several times taken and retaken by Franks and  Saracens.

It had been taken possession of by the forces of Godfrey de Bouillon previously to the capture of Jerusalem. The town had been deserted. and was allowed to fall into ruin, the Crusaders contenting themselves with possession of the citadel (William of Tyre, Hist. 8, 9); and it was in part assigned subsequently for the support of the Church of the Resurrection (ibid. 9, 16), though there seem to have been bishops of Joppa (perhaps only titular after all) between A.D. 1253 and 1363 (Le Quien, 1291; compare p. 1241). Saladin, in A.D. 1188, destroyed its fortifications (Sanut. Secret. Fid. Crucis, lib. 3, part 10, c. 5); but Richard of England, who was confined here by sickness, rebuilt them (ibid., and Richard of Devizes in Bohn's Ant. Lib. p. 61). Its last occupation by Christians was that of St. Louis, A.D. 1253, and when he came it was still a city and governed by a count. "Of the immense sums," says Joinville, "which it cost the king to enclose Jaffa, it does not become me to speak, for they were countless. He enclosed the town from one side of the sea to the other; and there were twenty-four towers, including small and great. The ditches were well scoured, and kept clean, both within and without. There were three gates" (Chronicles of Crus. p. 495, Bohn). So restored, it fell into the hands of the sultans of Egypt, together with the rest of Palestine, by whom it was once more laid in ruins; so much so that Bertrand de la Brocquiere, visiting it about the middle of the 15th century, states that it then consisted only of a few tents covered with reeds, having been a strong place under the Christians. Guides, accredited by the sultan, here met the pilgrims and received the customary tribute from them; and here the papal indulgences offered to pilgrims commenced (Early Travels, p. 286). Finally, Jaffa fell under the Turks, in whose hands it still is, exhibiting the usual decrepitude of the cities possessed by them, and depending on Christian commerce for its feeble existence. During the period of their rule it has been three times sacked — by the Arabs in, 1722, by the Mamelukes in 1775, and lastly by Napoleon I in 1799, when a body of 4000 Albanians, who held a strong position in the town, surrendered on promise of having their lives spared. Yet the whole 4000 were afterwards pinioned and shot on the strand! When Napoleon was compelled to retreat to Egypt, between 400 and 500 French soldiers lay ill of the plague in the hospitals of Joppa. They could not be removed, and Napoleon ordered them to be poisoned! (Porter, Handbook for S. and P. p. 288).

3. Description. — Yafa is the modern name of Joppa, and is identical with the old Hebrew Japho. It contains about 5000 inhabitants, of whom 1000  are Christians, about 150 Jews, and the rest Moslems. It is beautifully situated on a little rounded hill, dipping on the west into the waves of the Mediterranean, and on the land side encompassed by orchards of orange, lemon, apricot, and other trees, which for luxuriance and beauty are not surpassed in the world. They extend for several miles across the great plain. Like most Oriental towns, however, it looks best in the distance. The houses are huddled together without order; the streets are narrow, crooked, and filthy; the town is so crowded along the steep sides of the hill that the rickety dwellings in the upper part seem to be toppling over on the flat roofs of those below. The most prominent features of the architecture from without are the flattened domes by which most of the buildings are surmounted, and the appearance of arched vaults. But the aspect of the whole is mean and gloomy, and inside the place has all the appearance of a poor though large village. From the steepness of the site many of the streets are connected by flights of steps, and the one that runs along the seawall is the most clean and regular of the whole. There are three mosques in Joppa, and Latin, Greek, and Armenian convents. The former is that in which European pilgrims and travelers usually lodge.

The bazaars are worth a visit. The chief manufacture is soap. It has no port, and it is only under favorable circumstances of wind and weather that vessels can ride at anchor a mile or so from the shore. There is a place on the shore which is called "the harbor." It consists of a strip of water from fifteen to twenty yards wide and two or three deep, enclosed on the sea side by a ridge of low and partially sunken rocks. It may afford a little shelter to boats, but it is worse than useless so far as commerce is concerned. The town is defended by a wall, on which a few old guns are mounted. With the exception of a few broken columns scattered about the streets, and through the gardens on the southern slope of the hill, and the large stones in the foundations of the castle, Joppa has no remains of antiquity; and none of its modern buildings, not even the reputed "house of Simon the tanner," which the monks show, are worthy of note, although the locality of the last is not badly chosen (Stanley, S. and P. p. 263, 274; and see Seddon's Memoir, p. 86, 185). The town has still a considerable trade as the port of Jerusalem. The oranges of Jaffa are the finest in all Palestine and Syria; its pomegranates and watermelons are likewise in high repute, and its gardens and orange and citron groves deliciously fragrant and fertile. But among its population are fugitives and vagabonds from all countries; and Europeans have little security, whether of life or property, to induce a permanent  abode there. A British consul is now resident in the place, and a railroad has been projected to Jerusalem.

See Raumer's Palästina; Volney, 1, 136 sq.; Chateaubriand, 2, 103; Clarke, 4, 438 sq.; Buckingham, 1, 227 sq.; Richter, p. 12; Richardsun, 2, 16; Skinner, 1, 175-184; Robinson, 1, 18; Stent, 2, 27; M'Culloch's Gazetteer; Reland, p. 864; Cellar. Not. 2, 524;. Hamelsveld, 1, 442; 2, 229, Hasselquist, p. 137; Niebuhr, 3, 41; Joliffe, p. 243; Light, p. 125; Ritter, Erdk. 2, 400; Schwarz, p. 142, 373, 375; Thomson, Land and Book 2, 273.

## Joppa (2)[[@Headword:Joppa (2)]]

             Of the modern Yafa (called Jaffa by the Europeans) a tolerably full account is given in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (2:275 sq.); and the description by Lieut. Conder (Tent Work, 1:1 sq.) contains some interesting particulars:

"The town rose from the shore on a brown hillock; the dark, flat-roofed houses climbing the hill one above another, but no prominent building breaking the sky outline. The yellow, gleaming beach, with its low cliffs and sand-dunes, stretched away north and south, and in the distance the dim blue Judean hills were visible in shadow.

"Jaffa is called the port of Jerusalem, but has no proper harbor at present. In ancient times the 'Moon Pool,' south of the town, now silted up, was perhaps the landing-place for Hiram's rafts of cedar-  wood; but the traveller passes through a narrow opening in a dangerous reef running parallel with the shore, or, if the weather is bad, he is obliged to make a long detour round the northern end of the same reef. By ten in the morning the land breeze rises, and a considerable swell is therefore always to be expected. The entrance through the reef is only sufficient for one boat, and thus every year boats are wrecked on the rocks and lives lost. It is said also that each year at least one person is killed by the sharks close to land. The little Russian steamer was anchored about two miles from shore, and rolled considerably. The decks were crowded with a motley assemblage, specimens of every Levantine nationality. Each deck passenger had his bedding with him, and the general effect was that of a great rag-heap, with human faces — black, brown, and white — legs, arms, and umbrellas sticking out of the rags in unexpected places. Apart from the rest sat a group of swarthy Bedouin, with their huge headshawls, not unlike a coalscuttle in effect, bound with a white cord round the brow. They wore their best dresses, the black hair cloak, with red slippers. The rugged dark faces with white beards and sunscorched eyes wore a curious mixed expression of assumed dignity and badly concealed curiosity concerning the wonders of civilization surrounding them. The coloring of these various groups would have been a treat to an artist. The dull rich tints were lit up here and there by patches of red leather and yellow silk. Like all Oriental color, it was saved from any gaudiness of effect by the large masses of drill brown or indigo which predominated.

The steamer was soon besieged by a fleet of long, flat boats with sturdy rowers, and into these the passengers were precipitated, and their luggage dropped in after them. The swell was so great that we were in constant danger of being capsized under the accommodation ladder. As we rowed off, and sank in the trough of the waves, the shore and town disappeared, and only the nearest boats were visible high up on the crest of the rollers. The exciting moment of reaching the reef came next; the women closed their eyes, the rowers got into a regular swing, chanting a rude rhyme, and, waiting for the wave, we were suddenly carried past the ugly black rocks into smooth water close to the wharf. The landing at Jaffa has been from time immemorial an exciting scene. We have the terrible and graphic account of the old pilgrim (Seewulf) who, from his sins or from the badness of the  ship, was almost wrecked, and who witnessed from the shore the death of his companions, helpless in a great storm in the offing. We have the account of Richard Lion-Heart springing, fully-armed, into the surf and fighting his way on shore. The little port made by the reef has been long the only place south of Acre where landing was possible; but the storms which have covered the beach with modern wrecks were equally fatal to the Genoese galleys and crusading war-ships.

"The town of Jaffa contains little of interest, though it is sufficiently striking to a newcomer. The broad effects of light and shadow are perhaps enhanced here by the numerous arched streets and the flights of steps which limb from the sea-level to the higher part of the town. "The glory of Jaffa consists in its beautiful gardens, which stretch inland about a mile and a half, and extend north and south over a length of two miles. Oranges, lemons, palms, bananas, pomegranates, and other fruits grow in thick groves surrounded by old cactus hedges, having narrow lanes between them deep in sand. Sweet water is found in abundance at a moderate depth. The scent of the oranges is said to be at times perceptible some miles from land, to approaching ships. Still more curious is the fact that the beautiful little sunbird, peculiar to the Jordan valley, is also to be found in these gardens. How this African wanderer can have made its way across districts entirely unfitted for its abode, to spots separated by the great mountain chain, it is not easy to explain.

"Outside the town on the north-east is the little German colony, the neat white houses of which were built originally by an American society which was almost exterminated by fever, and finally broken up by internal differences, caused, I understand, by some resemblance in the views of the chief to those of Brigham Young. The land and buildings were bought by the thrifty German settlers, members of the Temple Society, with the views and history of which sect I became further acquainted during the following winter. SEE PALESTINE, COTONISTS IN.

"The soil of the Jaffa plain is naturally of great fertility. Even the negligent. tillage of the peasantry produces fine harvests. The Germans ploughed deeper, and were rewarded by a crop of thistles, which to a good farmer would have been a subject of satisfaction as  proving the existence of virgin soil, only requiring to be scoured by other crops for a year or two in order to yield fine harvests of corn. At this time of.year, the barley had been gathered in, and only the dry stubble was left."

## Joppe[[@Headword:Joppe]]

             (Ι᾿όππη), the Greek form (1Es 5:55; 1Ma 10:75-76; 1Ma 11:6; 1Ma 12:33; 1Ma 13:11; 1Ma 14:5; 1Ma 14:34; 1Ma 15:28; 1Ma 15:35; 2Ma 4:21; 2 Maccabees 12, 3, 7 [Ι᾿οππίτης]) of the name of the town JOPPA SEE JOPPA (q.v.).

## Jorah[[@Headword:Jorah]]

             (Heb. Yorah', יוֹרָה, prob. for יוֹרֶה, sprinkling, or autumnal rain; Sept. Ι᾿ωρά v.r. ΟὐράVulg. Jora), a man whose descendants (or a place whose former inhabitants) to the number of 112 returned from the Babylonian captivity (Ezr 2:18); called HARIPH in the parallel passage (Neh 7:24). "In Ezra two of De Rossi's MSS., and originally one of Kennicott's, had יודה, i.e. Jodah, which is the reading of the Syriac and Arabic versions. One of Kennicott's MSS. had the original reading in Ezra altered to,יור, i.e. Joram; and two in Nehemiah read,חרי, i.e. Harim, which corresponds with Α᾿ρείμ of the Alexandrian MS., and Churom of the Syriac. In any case, the change or confusion of letters which might have caused the variation of the name is so slight that it is difficult to pronounce. which is the true form, the corruption of Jorah into Hariph being as easily conceivable as the reverse. Burrington (Geneal. 2, 75) decides in favor of the latter, but from a comparison of both passages with Ezr 10:31 we should be inclined to regard Harim (חרם) as the true reading in all cases. But, on any supposition, it is difficult to account for the form Azephurith. or, more properly, Α᾿ρσιφομρίθ, in 1Es 5:16, which Burrington considers as having originated in a corruption of the two readings in Ezra and Nehemiah, the second syllable arising from an error of the transcriber in mistaking the uncial E for Σ"

## Jorai[[@Headword:Jorai]]

             (Heb. Yoray', יוֹרִי, perh. i.q. Jorah; Sept. Ι᾿ωρεέ, Vulg. Jorai), the fourth name of the seven chieftains of the Gadites other than those resident in Bashan (1Ch 5:13). B.C. perh. cir. 782. "Four of Kennicott's MSS., and the printed copy used by Luther, read יודי, i.e. Jodai" (Smith).

## Joram[[@Headword:Joram]]

             (Heb.,יוֹרָ; Sept. Ι᾿ωράμ), prop. a shortened form of the name JEHORAM (q.v.), for which it is indifferently used in the Heb., and arbitrarily in the A.V., as the following classification shows:

a. The son of the king of Zobah (2Sa 8:10; Sept. Ι᾿εδδουράμ; elsewhere called HADORAM).

b. The king of Judah (2Ki 8:21; 2Ki 8:23-24; 2Ki 11:2; 1Ch 3:11; elsewhere Jehoram).

c. The king of Israel (2Ki 8:16; 2Ki 8:25; 2Ki 8:28 [twice],  2Ki 8:29 [twice]; 2Ki 9:14 [twice],  2Ki 9:15-16 [twice],  2Ki 9:29; incorrectly for Jehoram, 2Ki 9:17; 2Ki 9:21 [twice],  2Ki 9:22-23; elsewhere correctly so).

d. The Levite (1Ch 26:25,יֹרָ). i.e. By error for JOZABAD (1Es 1:9).

## Jordaens, Jakob[[@Headword:Jordaens, Jakob]]

             an eminent Flemish painter, was born at Antwerp, May 19, 1594, studied under Adam van Oort, and copied the pictures of Titian and Paul Veronese. He was employed by the king of Spain to do some important work. His paintings are very numerous, and abound in the churches and public edifices of the Netherlands. Some of the most celebrated are St. Apollonia, in the church of the Augustines at Antwerp; Christ Disputing with the Doctors, in that of St. Walburg at Fumes; The Triumphal Entry. He died at Antwerp, October 18, 1678. There are a few other etchings by him, among which are the following: The Flight into Egypt; Christ Driving the Traders from the Temple; The Descent from the Cross. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Jordan[[@Headword:Jordan]]

             (Heb. Yarden', יִרְדֵּן, always with the article הִיִּיְדֵּן; Ι᾿ορδάνης), the chief and most celebrated river of Palestine, flowing through a deep valley down the center of the country from north to south. The principal river of the entire region. however (hence usually styled in the original "the River "), is the Euphrates (q.v.). SEE RIVER.

1. The Name. — This signifies descender, from the root יָרִד, "to descend — a name most applicable to it, whether we consider the rapidity of its current, or the great depth of the valley through which it runs. From whatever part of the country its banks are approached, the descent is long and steep. That this is the true etymology of the word seems evident from an incidental remark in Jos 3:16, where, in describing the effect of the opening of a passage for the Israelites, the word used for the "coming  down" of the waters (הִיַֹּרדַיםהִמִּיַם) is almost the same as the name of the river (see Stanley, S. and P. p. 279, note). Other derivations have been given. Some say it is compounded of יאֹר, a river, and דִּן, the name of the city where it rises, but this etymology is impossible (Reland, Paloest. p. 271). Another view is, that the river having two sources, the name of the one was Jor, and of the other Dan; hence the united stream is called Jordan. So Jerome (Comm. in Mat 16:13). This theory has been copied by Adamnanus (De Loc. Sanct. 2, 19), William of Tyre (8, 18), Brocardus (p. 3), Adrichomius (p. 109), and others; and the etymology seems to have spread among the Christians in Palestine, from whom Burckhardt heard it (Travels in Syria, p. 42, 43; see Robinson, Bib. Res. 3, 412, note). Arab geographers call the river either El-Urdon, which is equivalent to the Hebrew, or Esh-sheriah, which signifies "the watering place;" and this latter is the name almost universally given to it by the modern Syrians, who sometimes attach the appellative el-Kebir, "the great," by way of distinction from the Sheriat el-Mandhur, or Hieromax.

2. Sources. — The snows that deeply cover Hermon during the whole winter, and that still cap its glittering summit during the hottest days of summer, are the real springs of the Jordan. They feed its perennial fountains, and they supply from a thousand channels those superabundant waters which make the river "overflow all its banks in harvest time" (Jos 3:15). The Jordan has two historical sources.

a. In the midst of a rich but marshy plain, lying between the southern prolongation of Hermon and the mountains of Naphtali, is a low cup shaped hill, thickly covered with shrubs. On it once stood Dan, the northern border city of Palestine; and from its western base gushes forth the great fountain of the Jordan. The waters at once form a large pond encircled with rank grass and jungle — now the home of the wild boar — and then flow off southward. Within the rim of the cup, beneath the spreading branches of a gigantic oak, is a smaller spring. It is fed, doubtless, by the same source, and its stream, breaking through the rim, joins its sister, and forms a river some forty feet wide, deep and rapid. The modern name of the hill is Tell el-Kady, "the hill of the judge;" and both fountain and river are called Leddan — evidently the name Dan corrupted by a double article, Eled-Dan (Robinson, Bib. Res. 3, 394; Thomson, Land and Book, p. 214; and in Bibliotheca Sac. 1846, p. 196). Josephus calls this stream "Little Jordan" (τὸν μικρὸν Ι᾿ορδάνην, War, 4, 1, 1; comp.  Ant. 1, 10, 1; 8, 8, 4); but it is the principal source of the river, and the largest fountain in Syria.

b. Four miles east of Tell el-Kady, on a lower terrace of Hermon, amid forests of oak, lie the ruins of Banias, the ancient Caesarea-Philippi, and more ancient Panium. Beside the ruins is a lofty cliff of red limestone, having a large fountain at its base. Beneath the cliff there was formerly, as Josephus tells us, a gloomy cave, and within it a yawning abyss of unfathomable depth, filled with water. This was the other source of the Jordan (War, 1, 21, 3; comp. Ant. 15, 10, 3; Pliny, 5, 12; Mishna, Para, 8, 12). A temple was erected over the cave by Herod, and its ruins now fill it and conceal the fountain. From it a foaming torrent still bursts, and dashes down to the plain through a narrow rocky ravine, and then glides swiftly on till it joins the other about four miles south of Tell el-Kady (Robinson, 3, 397; Porter Handbook, p. 446).

c. The Jordan has also a fabled fountain, thus described by Josephus: "Apparently Panium is the source of the Jordan, but the water is, in reality, conveyed thither unseen by a subterranean channel from Phiala, as it is called, which lies not far from the high road, on the right as you ascend to Trachonitis, at the distance of 120 stadia from Caesarea.... That the Jordan hence derived its origin was formerly unknown, until it was ascertained by Philip, tetrarch of Trachonitis, who, having thrown chaff into Phiala, found it cast out at Panium" (War, 3, 10, 7). The lake here referred to appears to be Burket er-Ram, which Robinson visited and described (Bib. Res. 3, 399). The legend has no foundation in reality.

d. Other fountains in this region, though unnamed in history, contribute much to the Jordan. The chief of these, and the highest perennial source of the Jordan, is in the bottom of a valley at the western base of Hermon, a short distance from the town of Hasbeiya, and twelve miles north of Tell el-Kady. The fountain is in a pool at the foot of a basalt cliff; the stream from it, called Hasbany (from Hasbeiya), flows through a narrow glen into the plain, and falls into the main stream about a mile south of the junction of the Leddan and Baniasy. The relative size of the three streams Robinson thus estimates: "That from Banias is twice as large as the Hasbany, while the Leddan is twice, if not three times the size of that from Banias" (Bib. Res. 3, 395). The united river flows southward through the marshy plain for six miles, and then falls into Lake Huleh, called in Scripture "The Waters of Merom." SEE MEROM.

e. Besides these, a considerable stream comes down from the plain of Ijon, west of the Hasbany; and two large fountains (called Balat and Mellahah) burst forth from the base of the mountain chain of Naphtali (Porter, Handbook for S. and P. p. 436).

3. Physical Features of the Jordan and its Valley. — The most remarkable feature of the Jordan is, that throughout nearly its entire course it is below the level of the sea. Its valley is thus like a huge fissure in the earth's crust. The following measurements, taken from Van de Velde's Memoir accompanying his Map, will give the best idea of the depression of this singular valley:

Fountain of Jordan at Hasbeiya... 1700 ft. elevation.

Fountain of Jordan at Banias..... 1147 ft. elevation.

Fountain of Jordan at Dan.......... 647 ft. elevation.

Lake Hileh............…….....about 120 ft. elevation.

Lake of Tiberias.................. 650 ft. depression.

Dead Sea.......................... 1312 ft. depression.

There may be some error in the elevations of the fountains as here given. Lake Haleh is encompassed by a great plain, extending to Dan; and as it appears to the eye almost level, it is difficult to believe that there could be a difference of 500 feet in the elevations of the fountain and the lake. Porter estimated it on the spot at not above 100 feet; but it is worthy of note that Von Wildenbruch makes it by measurement 537 feet, and De Bertou 344.

The general course of the Jordan is due south. From their fountains the three streams flow south to the points of junction, and continue in the same direction to the Huleh; and from the southern extremity of this lake the Jordan again issues and resumes its old course. For some two miles its banks are flat, and its current not very rapid; but on passing through Jisr Benat Yakub ("the Bridge of Jacob's Daughters"), the banks suddenly contract and rise high on each side, and the river dashes in sheets of foam over a rocky bed, rebounding from cliff to cliff in its mad career. Here and there the retreating banks have a little green meadow, with its fringe of oleanders all wet and glistening with spray. Thus it rushes on, often winding, occasionally doubling back like the coils of a serpent, till, breaking from rocky barriers, it enters the rich plain of Batihah, where on the left bank stand the ruins of Bethsaida (q.v.). The stream now expands, and glides lazily along till it falls on the still bosom of the Sea of Galilee. Between Bethsaida and the sea the Jordan averages about twenty yards in  width, and flows sluggishly between low alluvial banks. Bars of sand extend across its channel here and there, at which it is easily forded (Porter, Handbook, p. 426; Robinson, 2, 414 sq.; Burckhardt, Symria, p. 315). From Jisr Benat Yakub the distance is only seven miles, and yet in that distance the river falls 700 feet. The total length of the section between the two lakes is about eleven miles as the crow flies.

An old tradition tells us that the Jordan flows direct through the Sea of Galilee without mingling with its waters. The origin of the story may be the fact that the river enters the lake at the northern extremity, and leaves it at a point exactly opposite at the southern, without apparent increase or diminution.

The third section of the river, lying between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea, is the Jordan of Scripture, the other two sections not being directly mentioned either in the O.T. or N.T. Until the last few years little was known of it. The notices of ancient geographers are not full. Travelers had crossed it at several points, but all the portions between these points were unknown. When the remarkable depression of the Dead Sea was ascertained by trigonometrical measurement, and when it was shown that the Jordan must have a fall of 1400 feet in its short course of about 100 miles, the measurements were called in question by that distinguished geographer Dr. Robinson, in a paper read before the Royal Geographical Society in 1847 (Journal, vol. 18, part 2). In that same year lieutenant Molyneux, R.N., conveyed a boat from the Sea of Galilee to the Dead Sea, mostly in the river, but in places on the backs of camels, where rocks and rapids prevented navigation. Owing to the hostility of the Arabs the expedition was not successful, and the Jordan was not yet explored. Lieutenant Lynch, of the United States Navy, headed a much more successful expedition in 1848, and was the first fully to describe the course, and fully to solve the mysteries of the Jordan. His Official Report is the standard work on the river. Molyneux's paper in the Journal of the Royal Geog. Society also contains some useful matter (vol. 18, part 2).

The valley through which this section of the Jordan flows is a long, low plain, running from north to south, and shut in by steep and rugged parallel ridges, the eastern ridge rising fully 5000 feet above the river's bed, and the western about 3000. This plain is the great plain of the later Jews; the great desert (πολλὴνἐρημίαν) of Josephus; the Aulon. or "channel" of the Greek geographers; the "region of Jordan" of the N.T. (Mat 3:5; Luk 3:3); and the Ghor or "sunken plain" of the modern Arabs (Stanley, p. 277; Josephus, War, 3, 9, 7; 4, 8, 2; Reland, Paloest. p. 305, 361, 377 sq.). It is about six miles wide at its northern end, but it gradually expands until it attains a width of upwards of twelve at Jericho. Its sides are not straight lines, nor is its surface perfectly level. The mountains on each side here and there send out rocky spurs, and long, low roots far into it. Winter torrents, descending from wild ravines, cut deeply through its soft strata. As a whole it is now a desert. In its northern division, above the fords of Succoth, small portions are cultivated around fountains, and along the banks of streamlets, where irrigation is easy; but all the rest is a wilderness — in spring covered with rank grass and thistles, but in summer parched and bare. The southern section — known as the "plain of Jericho" — is different in aspect. Its surface is covered with a white nitrous crust, like hoarfrost. through which not a blade of grass or green herb springs. Nothing could be imagined more dreary or desolate than this part of the plain.

Down the midst of the plain winds a ravine, varying from 200 yards to half a mile in breadth, and from 40 to 150 feet in depth. Through this the Jordan flows in a tortuous course, now sweeping the western, and now the eastern bank; now making a wide, graceful curve, and now doubling back, but everywhere fringed by a narrow, dense border of trees and shrubs. The river has thus two distinct lines of banks. The first or lower banks confine the stream, and are from five to ten feet high, the height of course decreasing in spring when the river is high; the second or upper are at some distance from the channel, and in places rise to a height of 150 feet. The scenery of the river is peculiar and striking. Lynch thus describes the upper section: "The high alluvial terraces on each side were everywhere shaped by the action of the winter rains into numbers of conical hills, some of them pyramidal and cuneiform, presenting the appearance of a giant encampment. This singular conformation extended southwards as far as the eye could reach. At intervals I caught a glimpse of the river in its graceful meanderings, sometimes glittering like a spearhead through an opening in the foliage, and again clasping some little island in its shining arms, or, far away, snapping with the fierceness and white foam of a torrent by some projecting point.... The banks were fringed with the lauarustinus, the oleander, the willow, and the tamarisk, and further inland, on the slope of the second terrace, grew a small species of oak, and the cedar."  The Jordan issues from the Sea of Galilee close to the hills on the western side of the plain, and sweeps round a little peninsula, on which lie the ruins of Tarichaea (Porter, Handb. p. 321; Robinson, 1, 538). The stream is about 100 feet wide, and the current strong (Lynch). A short distance down are the remains of a Roman bridge, whose fallen arches greatly obstruct the river, and make it dash through in sheets of foam. Below this are several weirs, constructed of rough stones, and intended to raise the water and turn it into canals, so as to irrigate the neighboring plain (Molyneux). Five miles from the lake the Jordan receives its largest tributary, the Sheriat el-Mandhur (the Hieromax of the Greeks), which drains a large section of Bashan and Gilead. This stream is 130 feet wide at its mouth. Two miles further is Jisr el-Mejamia, the only bridge now standing on the Lower Jordan. It is a quaint structure, one large pointed arch spanning the stream, and double tiers of smaller arches supporting the roadway on each side. The river is here deep and impetuous, breaking over high ledges of rocks.

Below this point the ravine inclines eastwards to the center of the plain, and its banks contract. Its sides are bare and white, and the chalky strata are deeply furrowed. The margin of the river has still its beautiful fringe of foliage, and the little islets which occur here and there are covered with shrubbery. Fifteen miles south of the bridge, wady Yabes (so called from Jabesh-gilead), containing a winter torrent, falls in from the east. A short distance above it a barren sandy island divides the channel, and with its bars on each side forms a ford, probably the one by which Jacob crossed as the site of Succoth has been identified on the western, bank. The plain round Succoth is extensively cultivated, and abundantly watered by fountains and streamlets from the adjoining mountains. The richness of the soil is wonderful. Dr. Robinson says, "The grass, intermingled with tall daisies and wild oats, reached to our horses' backs, while the thistles sometimes over topped the riders' heads. All was now dry, and in some places it was difficult to make our way through this exuberant growth." (3, p. 313). Jacob exercised a wise choice when "he made booths for his cattle" at this favored spot (Gen 33:17). No other place in the great plain equals it in richness. The ravine of the Jordan is here 150 feet below the plain, and shut in by steep, bare banks of chalky strata (Robinson, l.c. p. 316). About nine miles below Succoth, and about halfway between the lakes, the Jabbok, the only other considerable tributary, falls into the Jordan, coming down through a deep, wild glen in the mountains of Gilead.  When Lynch passed (April 17) it was "a small stream trickling down a deep and wide torrent bed.... There was another bed, quite dry, showing that in times of freshet there were two outlets." Lynch gives some good pictures of the scenery above the junction. "The plain that sloped away from the bases of the hills was broken into ridges and multitudinous cone like mounds... A low, pale yellow ridge of conical hills marked the termination of the higher terrace, beneath which swept gently this low plain, with a similar undulating surface, half redeemed from barrenness by sparse verdure and thistle-covered hillocks. Still lower was the valley of the Jordan — its banks fringed with perpetual verdure — winding a thousand graceful mazes... its course a bright line in this cheerless waste."

Below the Jabbok the fall of the river is still greater than above, but there is less obstruction from rocks and cliffs. The jungles along the banks become denser, the sides of the river glen more regular, and the plain above more dreary and desolate.

On approaching the Dead Sea, the plain of the Jordan attains its greatest breadth — about twelve miles. The mountain ranges on each side are — higher, more rugged, and more desolate. The plain is coated with a nitrous crust, like hoarfrost, and not a tree, shrub, or blade of grass is seen except by fountains or rivulets. The glen winds like a serpent through the center, between two tiers of banks. The bottom is smooth, and sprinkled on the outside with stunted shrubs. The river winds in ceaseless coils along the bottom, now touching one side and now another, with its beautiful border of green foliage, looking all the greener from contrast with the desert above. The banks are of soft clay, in places ten feet high; the stream varies from 80 to 150 feet in breadth, and from five to twelve in depth. Near its mouth the current becomes more sluggish, and the stream expands. Where wady Hesban falls in, Lynch found the river 150 feet wide and 11 deep, "the current four knots." Further down the banks are low and sedgy; the width gradually increases to 180 yards at its mouth, but the depth is only three feet (Lynch, Official Report; Robinson, 1, 538 sq.; Stanley, p. 290).

Lynch in a few words explains the secret of the great and almost incredible fall in the Jordan. "The great secret is solved by the tortuous course of the Jordan. In a space of 60 miles of latitude, and four or five of longitude, the Jordan traverses at least 200 miles.... We have plunged down twenty-seven threatening rapids, besides a great many of lesser magnitude."

Dr. Robinson (Researches, 2, 257 sq.) describes the banks as consisting of three series, with terraces between, the outer ones composed of the mountains bordering the river, the middle ones being the true bank, and the third the proper channel of the stream; and he argues that the scriptural allusions to the overflow of the Jordan at harvest (Jos 3:15; 1Ch 12:15; compare Jer 12:5; Jer 49:19; Jeremiah 1, 44; Zec 11:3; Sirach 24:26, 36) simply refer to the full stream, or at most to its expansion as far as to the middle one of these three banks, at the time of the annual melting of snows on Lebanon and Hermon, rather than to any true freshet or inundation. The river in this respect probably resembles other mountain streams, which have an overflow of their secondary boundaries or alluvial "bottoms" during the spring and early summer months. Comp. Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 452 sq.

4. The Fords of the Jordan have always been important in connection with the history of the country. The three streams which flow from the fountains are fordable at almost every point. It is south of Lake Huleh that the river begins to form a serious barrier. The bridge called Jisr Benat Yakub has for centuries been the leading pass from western Palestine to Damascus. The first reference to it is in A.D. 1450 (in Gumpenberg's day; see Robinson, Researches, 3, 362), though as early as the Crusades a "Ford of Jacob" (Vadum Jacob, Will. Tyr. Hist. 18, 13) is mentioned, and was reckoned a most important pass. The bridge was probably built during the 15th century, when the caravan road was constructed from Damascus to Egypt (Porter, Handbook, 2, 466). The origin of the name, "Bridge of Jacob's Daughters," is unknown. Perhaps this place may have been confounded with the ford of Succoth, where the patriarch crossed the Jordan or perhaps the "Jacob" referred to was some Muslim saint or Turkish pasha (Ritter, Pal. and Syr. p. 269 sq.). SEE BRIDGE.

Between Bethsaida-Julias and the Sea of Galilee there are several fords. The river is there shallow and the current sluggish. At this place the multitudes that followed our Lord from Capernaum and the neighborhood were able to cross the river to where he fed the 5000 (Mar 6:32 sq.; Robinson, 2, 414).

The first ford on the southern section of the Jordan is about half a mile from the lake, where the ruins of the Roman bridge now lie. It was the means of communication between Tiberias and Gadara, and it was  doubtless at this point our Lord crossed when he went from Galilee to Judaea "by the farther side of Jordan (Mar 10:1; Mat 19:1-2). Jisr el-Mejamia is a Saracenic bridge on an old caravan route from Damascus to Egypt. Probably a Roman bridge may have stood at the same place, connecting Scythopolis with the other cities of Decapolis. There is no ford here. At a point east of the ruins of Scythopolis, ten miles below the bridge, the river is now fordable, but the passage is deep and dangerous (Robinson, 3, 325; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 137).

At Succoth is one of the best and most important fords over the Jordan. Here Jacob crossed with his cattle. This, too, is possibly the Bethbarah, "house, or ford of passage," where the Israelites intercepted the routed Midianites (Jdg 7:24), and it was probably here that the men of Gilead slew the Ephraimites (12:6). Not far off, in "the clay ground between Succoth and Zarthan," were the brass foundries of king Solomon (1Ki 7:46). These fords undoubtedly witnessed the first recorded passage of the Jordan in the O.T.; we say recorded, because there can be little dispute but that Abraham must have crossed it likewise. It is still the place at which the eastern Bedawin cross in their periodical invasions of Esdraelon. From Succoth to the mouth of the Jabbok the river becomes very low during the summer, and is fordable at many points. At one spot are the remains of a Roman bridge (Molyneux, p. 115 sq.; Lynch, April 16; Burckhardt, p. 344 sq.). Ten miles south of the Jabbok there is a noted ford on the road from Nabulus to Es-Salt. Traces of a Roman road and bridge were here discovered by Van de Velde (Memoir, p. 124). The only other fords of note are those in the plain of Jericho, one above and one below the pilgrims' bathing place. They are much deeper than those higher up, and when the river is swollen they become impassable.

5. Historical Notices. — The first notice of the Jordan is in the story of the separation of Abraham and Lot — Lot "beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah" (Gen 13:10). Abraham had just left Egypt (12:10-20), and therefore the comparison between the fertilizing properties of the Jordan and of the Nile is very apposite. The section of the valley visible from the heights of Bethel, where the patriarchs stood, was the plain of Jericho and southward over a part of the Dead Sea. The "plain" or circle (כַּכִּר) of the Jordan must have been different then from what it is now. It  is now a parched desert — then it was well watered everywhere. The waters of numerous springs, mountain torrents, and probably of the Jordan, raised by weirs such as are seen at its northern end, were used by the old Phoenician inhabitants in the irrigation of the vast plain. The curse had not yet come upon it; the fire of heaven had not yet passed over it; the Lord had not yet destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah (Stanley, p. 215). It is manifest that some great physical change was produced in the valley by the convulsion at the destruction of the cities. The bed of the Dead Sea was probably lowered, and a greater fall thus given to the river. SEE DEAD SEA.

Another wonderful epoch in the Jordan's history was the passage of the Israelites. They were encamped on the "plains of Moab" — on the broad plain east of the river, extending along the northern shore of the sea to the foot of the mountains. It was harvest time — the beginning of April — when the rains were still failing heavily in Hermon, and the winter. snows were melting under the rays of the warm sun, and when a thousand mountain torrents thus fed swept into the Jordan, and made it "overflow all its banks;" or, as the Hebrew literally signifies, made it full up to all its banks (see Robinson, Bib. Res. 1, 540); that is, perhaps, up not merely to the banks of the stream itself, but up to the banks of the glen; covering, as it still does in a few places (Molyneux, p. 116; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 125), the whole bottom of the glen, and thus rendering the fords impassable for such a host as the Israelites. There can be no doubt that in ancient times the Jordan rose higher than it does now. When the country was more thickly wooded and more extensively cultivated, more rain and more snow must have fallen (Van de Velde, Narrative, 2, 272). There are wet seasons even yet, when the river rises several feet more than ordinarily (Reland, p. 273; Raumer, Paläst. p. 61, 2d ed.). The opening of a passage through the river at such a season was the greater miracle. Had it been late in summer it might have been thought that natural causes operated, but in harvest — the time of the overflow — the finger of God must have been manifest to all. It is a remarkable fact that at this same spot the Jordan was afterwards twice miraculously opened — by Elijah and Elisha (2Ki 2:8; 2Ki 2:14).

At a later period it was considered a feat of high daring that a party of David's "mighty men" crossed the Jordan "in the first month (April), when it had overflown all its banks," and subdued their enemies on the east side (1Ch 12:15). Jeremiah speaks of the lions "coming up" from  the "swellings of the Jordan;" but the Hebrew word גָּאוֹֹן signifies beauty or glory, and refers to the dense jungles and verdant foliage of its banks; these jungles are impenetrable except to the wild beasts that dwell there. No allusion is made to the rise or overflow of the river (Gesenius, Thesaurus, s.v.; Robinson, 1, 540). Travelers have often seen wild; swine, hyenas, and jackals, and also the tracks of panthers, on the banks of the Jordan (Molyneux, p. 118).

The passage of the river by king David in his flight from Absalom has one peculiarity — a ferry boat was used to convey his household over the channel (2Sa 19:18). The passage was probably effected at one of the fords in the plain of Jericho. The word עברה simply signifies a thing for crossing; it may have been a "boat," or a "raft," or a few inflated skins, such as are represented on the monuments of Nineveh, and are still used on the Euphrates and the Jordan. SEE FERRY.

Naaman's indignant depreciation of the Jordan, as compared with the "rivers of Damascus," is well known. The rivers of Damascus water its great plain, converting a desert into a paradise; the Jordan rolls on in its deep bed, useless, to the Sea of Death.

The great event of the N.T. history enacted at the Jordan was the baptism of our Lord. This has made it the queen of rivers, and has given it the title "sacred." The exact spot is disputed. SEE BETHBARA; SEE AENON. The topography and the incidents of the narrative, both before and after the baptism, unquestionably point to the same place, already famous as the scene of three miracles (Porter, Handbook, p. 198). In commemoration of the baptism, the Christian pilgrims who assemble at Jerusalem at Easter visit the Jordan in a body and bathe at this spot (Stanley, p. 308).

The references to the Jordan in the writings of Josephus contain nothing of importance beyond what has already been mentioned in connection with the fountains and the physical features. Greek and Roman geographers seem to have known but little of the river. Pliny praises its beauty, and states that, "with the greatest reluctance, as it were, it moves onward towards Asphaltites, a lake of gloomy and unpropitious nature, by which it is at last swallowed up" (Hist. Nat. 5, 15). Strabo makes the singular assertion that it is "navigated upwards with vessels of burden!" Of course, he can only refer to the Sea of Galilee (16, 2, 16). Pausanias tells how strangely the river disappears in the Dead Sea (book 5, 7, 4).

6. Mineral, Animal, and Vegetable Productions. — Some of these have been incidentally noticed above. As there were slime pits, or pits of bitumen, and salt pits (Gen 11:3; Zep 2:9) in the vale of Siddim; on the extreme south, so Mr. Thompson speaks of bitumen wells twenty minutes from the bridge over the Hashbeiya on the extreme north; while Ain-el Mellahah above Lake-Huleh is emphatically "the fountain of the salt works" (Lynch's Narrative, p. 470). Thermal springs are frequent about the Lake of Tiberias; the most celebrated, below the town bearing that name (Robinson, 2, 384, 385); some near Emmaus (Lynch, p. 467), some near Magdala, and some not far from Gadara (Irby., p. 90, 91). The hill of Dan is said to be an extinct crater, and masses of volcanic rock and tufa are noticed by Lynch not far from the mouth of the Yermak (Narrative, April 12). Dark basalt is the characteristic of the rocks in the upper stage; trap, limestone, sandstone, and conglomerate in the lower. On the second day of the passage a bank of fuller's earth was observed.

How far the Jordan in olden time was ever a zone of cultivation, like the Nile, is uncertain. Now, with the exception of the eastern shores of the Lake Huleh, the hand of man may be said to have disappeared from its banks. The genuine Arab is a nomad by nature, and contemns agriculture. There, however, Dr. Robinson, in the month of May, found the land tilled almost down to the lake, and large crops of wheat, barley, maize, sesame, and rice rewarded the husbandman. Horses, cattle, and sheep — all belonging to the Ghawarinah tribe — fattened on the rich pasture; and large herds of black buffaloes luxuriated in the streams and in the deep mire of the marshes (3, 396). These are doubtless lineal descendants of the "fat bulls of Bashan;" as the "oaks of Bashan" are still the magnificent staple tree of those regions. Cultivation degenerates as we advance southward. Cornfields wave around Gennesareth on the west, and the palm and vine, fig and pomegranate, are still to be seen here and there. Melons grown on its shores are of great size and much esteemed. Pink oleanders, and a rose colored species of hollyhock, in great profusion, wait upon every approach to a rill or spring. These gems of nature reappear in the lower course of the Jordan. There the purple thistle, the bright yellow marigold, and scarlet anemone, saluted the adventurers of the New World: the laurustinus and oleander, cedar and arbutus, willow and tamarisk, accompanied them on their route. As the climate became more tropical, and the Lower Ghor was entered, large ghurrah trees, like the aspen, with silvery foliage, overhung them; and the cane, frequently impenetrable; and now in blossom, "was  ever at the water's edge." Only once during the whole voyage, on the fourth day, were patches of wheat and barley visible; but the hand that had sowed them lived far away. As Jeremiah in the O.T., and St. Jerome and Phocas (see Relaud) among Christian pilgrims, had spoken of the Jordan as the resort of lions, so tracks of tigers, wild boars, and the like presented themselves from time to time to these explorers. Flocks of wild ducks, of cranes, of pigeons, and of swallows were scared by their approach; and a specimen of the bulbul, or Syrian nightingale, fell into their hands. The scenery throughout was not inspiring — it was of a subdued character when they started, profoundly gloomy and dreary near ford Sukwa, and then utterly sterile just before they reached Jericho. With the exception of a few Arab tribes — so savage as: scarcely to be considered exceptions — humanity had become extinct on its banks.

Such, then, is the river Jordan, without any parallel, historical or physical, in the whole world.. A complete river beneath the level of the sea! Disappearing in a lake which has no outlet, which could have none, and which originated in a miracle! Thrice were its waters divided by the direct agency of God, that his servants; might pass in safety and comfort. It is a river that has never been navigable, flowing into a sea that has never known a port — has never been a high road to more hospitable coasts — has never possessed a fishery — a river that has never boasted of a single town of eminence upon its banks; in fine, it is, if not "the river of God" in the book of Psalms, at least that of his chosen people throughout their history, and as such, it figures largely in the poetical symbolism of the passage from this world to the next.

In addition to the works above cited on the physical features of the Jordan, the following afford important information: Journal of R. Geog. Society, 18, part 2, articles by Robinson, Petermann, and Molyneux; Bertou, in Bulletin de la Soc. Geograph. de Paris, 12, 166 sq.; Wildenbruch, Monatsberichte der Gesellschaft fur Erdkunde zu Berlin, 1845-46; Capt. Newbold, Jour. of Roy. Asiat. Society, 16, 8 sq.; Rev. W. Thompson, Bibl. Sac. 3, 184 sq. A clear summary of all known about the Jordan up to 1850 is given by Ritter, in Palastina und Syrien, 2, 152-556; also in his separate essay, Der Jordan und die Beschiffung des todten Meeres (Berlin, 1850). More popular descriptions are those published by the Religious Tract Society (London, 1858), and Nelson (ib. 1854). Most travelers in Palestine have likewise given an account of the river, chiefly at its mouth. SEE PALESTINE.

## Jordan Valley[[@Headword:Jordan Valley]]

             We extract some interesting particulars on this, the one great river of the Holy Land, from Lieut. Conder's Tent Work in Palestine (2:35 sq.), which summarizes the whole information in a clear and compact form.

"The Jordan Valley is not only the most remarkable feature of Palestine, but one of the most curious places in the world. It has no exact counterpart elsewhere, and the extraordinary phenomenon of clouds sweeping as a Srthick mist 500 feet below the level of the sea, is one which few European eyes have seen, but which we witnessed in the early storms of the spring of 1874.

"The Jordan rises as a full-grown river, issuing from the cave at Banias, about 1000 feet above the level of the Mediterranean. In the short distance of twelve miles it falls not less than 1000 feet, passing through the papyrus marshes, and reaching the Huleh Lake. This lake is four miles long, and from its southern extremity to the north end of the Sea of Galilee is ten and a half miles. The second lake has been determined, by our line of levels, as 682 feet below  the Mediterranean; thus in twenty-six and a half miles there is a fall of 1682 feet, or more than sixty feet to the mile.

"The Sea of Galilee is twelve and a half miles long, and thence the Jordan flows sixty-five miles, measuring in a straight line (the bends make it a good deal more) to the Dead Sea, 1292 feet below the Mediterranean. The fall in this distance is, however, not regular. Above the Jisr Mujami'a it is over forty feet to the mile. From the south end of the Sea of Galilee to the Damieh ford is a distance of forty-two miles, and a fall of only 460 feet. From the Damieh to the mouth of Wady el 'Aujeh is thirteen miles, with sixty feet fall, and thence to the Dead Sea is ten miles, with ninety feet of fall.

"It will be seen from the above that the total direct length of Jordan is about 104 miles, or only half the length of the Thames; that the fall to the Sea of Galilee is over sixty feet to the mile; thence to the Damieh, at first forty feet, afterwards not quite eleven feet per mile; from the Damieh to the Aujeh not much over four and a half feet to the mile; and for the last ten miles, about nine feet per mile. The break down of the immense chasm may thus be said to commence immediately north of the Sea of Galilee.

"The valley may be divided into eight sections. First, the portion between Bantas and the Huleh, where it is some five miles broad, with steep cliffs some 2000 feet high on either side and a broad marsh between. Secondly, from the Huleh to the Sea of Galilee, where the stream runs close to the eastern hills, and about four miles from the base of those on the west, which rise towards the high Safed mountains, more than 3500 feet above the lake. Thirdly, for thirteen miles from the south end of the Sea of Galilee to the neighborhood of Beisan, the valley is only one and a half miles broad west of the river, and about three on the east, the steep cliffs of the plateau of Kaukab el-Hawa on the west reaching an altitude of 1800 feet above the stream.

"South of Beisan is the fourth district, with a plain west of Jordan, twelve miles long and six miles broad, the line of hills on the east being straight, and the foot of the mountain on this side about two miles from the river. In the neighborhood of Beisan the cross section of the plain shows three levels: that of the shelf on which Beisan stands, about 300 feet below sea-level; that of the Ghor  itself, some 400 feet lower, reached by an almost precipitous descent; and that of the Zor, or narrow trench, from half to a quarter of a mile wide, and about 150 feet lower still. The higher shelf extends westward to the foot of Gilboa; it dies away on the south, but on the north it gradually rises into the plateau of Kaskab and to the western table-land above the Sea ofGa;ilee, 1800 feet above Jordan.

"After leaving the Beisin plain the river passes through a narrow valley twelve miles long and two to three miles wide, with a raised table-land to the west, having a level averaging about 500 feet above the sea. The Beisan plain is full of springs of fresh water, some of which are thermal, but a large current of salt warm water flows down Wady Maleh, at the north extremity of this fifth district.

"In the sixth district, the Damieh region, the valley again opens to a width of about three miles on the west, and five on the east of Jordan. The great block of the Kurn Stirtubeh here stands out like a bastion, on the west, 2400 feet above the river. Passing this mountain the seventh district is entered-a broad valley extending from near Fusail to 'Osh el-GhiIrab, north of Jericho. In this region the Ghor itself is five miles broad west of the river, and rather more on the east; the lower trench, or Zor, is also wider here, and more distinctly separated from the Ghor. A curious geographical feature of this region was also discovered by the survey party. The great affluents of the Fir'ah and 'Aujeh do not flow straight to Jordan, but turn south about a mile west of it, and each runs, for about six miles, nearly parallel with the river; thus the mouth of the Far'ah is actually to be found just where that of the next valley is shown on most maps. This curious feature was not discovered even by Captain Warren, and nothing more surprised me, in surveying the district, than the unsuspected parallel course of the streams. The whole of the valley in the seventh region is full of salt springs and salt marshes, but the Far'ah, flowing from the AEnon springs, is a perennial stream of freshwater.

"The eighth and last district is that of the plain of Jericho, which, with the corresponding basin (Ghor-es-Seiseban) east of Jordan, measures over eight miles north and south, and more than fourteen  across, with Jordan about in the middle. The Zor is here about a mile wide, and some 200 feet below the broad plain of the Ghor."

## Jordan, Joseph[[@Headword:Jordan, Joseph]]

             a minister of the Society of Friends, was born in Nansemond County, Va., in 695, and began preaching about 1718, first in the States, and later in various parts of England and Ireland, and some portions of Holland. He died Sept. 26, 1735. "He acquitted himself," was the testimony of the annual meeting of Virginia Quakers in the year of his death, "as a workman that need not be ashamed." See Janney, Hist. of friends, 3, 261.

## Jordan, Richard (1)[[@Headword:Jordan, Richard (1)]]

             a minister of the Society of Friends was born in Nansemond County, Va., in 1693, and began preaching the same year with his younger brother Joseph (see above). The two brothers frequently traveled together, preaching the word of God, in Virginia, Maryland, and Carolina, and suffered no little from persecution. In 1728 he visited the Quakers in England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and in Barbados. After two years he returned to the States, and settled in Philadelphia, where he died August 5, 1742. "His ministry was convincing and consolatory, his delivery graceful, but unaffected; in prayer he was solemn and reverent." See Janney, Hist. of Friends, 3, 270.

## Jordan, Richard (2)[[@Headword:Jordan, Richard (2)]]

             a minister of the Society of Friends, was born in Norfolk County, Va., Dec. 12, 1756. He entered on ministerial labors in 1797 in New York and New England, and in 1802 visited Europe, where he spent two years. On his return he settled at Hartford, Conn., and five years later removed to Newton, N. J., where he died Oct. 14, 1826. He was an able minister of the Gospel, devoted to the service of his heavenly Master. See Janney, Hist. of Friends, 4, 105.

## Jordanes[[@Headword:Jordanes]]

             SEE JORNANDEZ.

## Jordanus Da Giano, Or De Yane[[@Headword:Jordanus Da Giano, Or De Yane]]

             SEE MINORITES.

## Jordanus Of Saxona[[@Headword:Jordanus Of Saxona]]

             second general of the Dominicans, was born at Borrentrick, in the diocese of Paderborn, near the close of the twelfth century. After studying theology at the University of Paris, he joined the Dominicans in 1219, and in 1220 took part in the first general chapter of his order. In 1221 he was made prior of the province of Lombardy, and finally elected general in 1222, ten months after the death of St. Dominic. The order grew rapidly under his administration, and soon possessed establishments as far as Poland, and even in Palestine, whither Jordanus went in 1228. The ship was wrecked on the return voyage, and Jordanus drowned, in 1236. He wrote, De Principio Ordinis Proedicatorum (Echard, Scriptores Ordinis Proedicatorum, vol. 1): — Epistola de Translatione corporis B. Dominici (Bzovius, Annales, 1233, vol. 1): — Super Priscianum, et quoedam grammaticalia, a MS. in the Leipzig Library. See Acta Sanctorum, Feb., 2, 720; Echard, Scriptores Ordinis Proedicatorum, 6, 93; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 26, 941. (J.N.P.)

## Joribas[[@Headword:Joribas]]

             (1Es 8:44) or Jor'ibus (1Es 9:19), Graecized forms (Ι᾿ώριβος, Vulg. Joribus) of the name JARIB SEE JARIB (q.v.) of two persons (corresponding to Ezr 8:16, and Ezr 10:18, in the Hebrew text of the above passages respectively).

## Jorim[[@Headword:Jorim]]

             (Ι᾿ωρείμ, perh. i.q. Joram), the son of Matthat and father of Eleazar, maternal ancestors of Jesus, not mentioned in the O. Test. (Luk 3:29). B.C. post 876. SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

## Joris, David[[@Headword:Joris, David]]

             (really JORISZOON, i.e. Georg'sson, hence also called Georgii), DAVID, founder of an Anabaptist sect of the 16th century, known under the name of Davidists, or more generally under that of Jorists, himself altogether a most extraordinary character was born either in 1501 or 1502, at Delft, in Holland, or, as Nippold thinks, at Ghent. He has generally been spoken of as of low parentage, but Nippold holds that David's father was originally a merchant, and afterwards the head of a company who went about acting the play of the life of David the psalmist, but that his mother was of noble  origin. David was early placed at school, but the boy's inclination was more to a roving life, like that of his father, than to books. He early evinced a particular fondness for the art of glass painting. He was therefore finally taken from school and apprenticed to a glass painter, and soon displayed great aptitude in his profession. To perfect himself in this art he set out on a journey to neighboring countries, and traveled through Belgium, France, and England, until a dangerous disease hastened his return to Holland. He now (1524) settled at Delft, and married. Hitherto the young painter had displayed no extraordinary religious zeal; it is true he had been strict in all his religious observances, and had frequently declared himself in favor of vital piety, but this, at a time when the reformatory movement was in its infancy, was not remarkable. Even now he continued his attention to his business, and only on a few public occasions during the religious commotions of this time he dropped a word against the fanatic zeal of the Romish clergy, and the religious excesses of the Romish Church.

In 1530, however, he appears more prominently on the stage. It is true he had previously written a few pamphlets against Romanism, but these had failed to provoke reply, or a demand for interference on the part of the authorities. But this year, while a procession of Roman Catholics was moving through the streets of Delft, he stopped the priests and accused them of the crime of deceiving the people by false teachings; he especially reproached them for their worship of images and pictures. The burgomaster of Delft favored Joris not a little, being a friend of his; but this daring action could not go unpunished, and Joris was arrested and imprisoned for some time. After a trial, however, he escaped, no doubt by the aid of his friend, without any severe punishment. He quitted Delft for six years, and it was during his wanderings at this time that he became estranged from the true Reformation principles and an adherent to Anabaptist views, and finally even the founder of an independent sect. His roving life, so vary much akin to that of all the Anabaptist leaders, inclined him to their cause; but, being as yet more moderate than they, and opposed to their tumultuous proceedings, especially to their views of establishing their authority by the sword, it was not until 1534 that he actually joined them by rebaptism. At this time the Anabaptists were at the zenith of their success, especially, at Munster. SEE ANABAPTISTS.

Being requested to preach and espouse their cause before the people, he at first hesitated, and pleaded incompetency; but at last was prevailed upon, and was consecrated by Dammas, Ubbo, and others as bishop of Delft. The same zeal which he had. manifested in the cause, of the Lutherans he now displayed in behalf  of the Anabaptists, and we may infer from the hesitancy of the authorities to interfere with Joris that his influence had become quite extended and his followers very numerous. Certainly Joris himself was quite conscious of the extent of his power, and he hesitated not to use it for the accomplishment of the one great object that seemed to be nearest his heart, the union of all Anabaptist forces under one common leader, the secure establishment of the principles which he himself espoused, and which no doubt he as yet believed to be based on the Scriptures and indorsed by divine favor. But his course soon, aroused suspicion among the other Anabaptist leaders. They were not slow to recognize in Joris an. able and. determined leader, and, jealous of the success he had already achieved, and fearful of their own position, they, openly disavowed him.

Such a course was adopted, especially, by Batenburg himself, the founder of an Anabaptist sect, a determined ruffian, void of all feelings who, under the garb of religion, sought the enjoyment of wealth and power. He preached the extinction of all non-Anabaptists by the sword. Strangely enough, however, his very followers, after his decease, became the most faithful adherents of Joris. Opposed within the camp of the Anabaptists, Joris, in 1536, at the Convocation of Anabaptists. held at Bocholt, assumed a still more independent position, and proudly declared himself divinely appointed as leader. This further provoked, the jealousy of the other leaders; and as, immediately after the Convocation of Bocholt, Joris issued a pamphlet calling all parties to a peaceful union, the wrath of the different leaders was stimulated anew, and resulted in an entire estrangement of most of the Anabaptists. Those who now continued to espouse his cause were hereafter known as Jorists or Davidists. Providence, seemed to favor his effort. Letters came to him from all directions urging him to stand firm in this trying hour; to these were added visions and revelations which he fancied he had. Even the persecutions to which his followers were now subjected by the authorities were interpreted by him as a further proof of the divine favor. Was it not gain for them to die? From Holland we see him hasten to Westphalia, and thence back again to his native state to comfort his suffering adherents, and to attend and animate them in their dying hours. Nor did he waver when he saw his own mother led to the scaffold (at Delft, 1537), attesting in her dying hour the doctrines which her son was propagating. The extent of his influence may be inferred from the number who at this time became the subjects of persecution. At Delft thirty-five persons were executed for their adherence to Joris; at Haarlem, Amsterdam, Leyden, Rotterdam, and other cities also many suffered  likewise. In the space of two years more than two hundred betokened their faithfulness to Anabaptist views at the expense of their life. Nor was Joris himself safe from persecution. He was obliged to leave Delft, where he had lived for a while secretly, and, after fleeing from place to place in his native country, he at last quitted Holland. Admonitory letter which he dispatched to the senate of his native land cost the bearer, his head. To return to Holland then became for Joris a hazardous undertaking; he therefore sought a home within the dominions of the landgrave of Hesse, but the latter also refused the weary wanderer a resting place unless he came as a Lutheran. Of course Joris was not now likely to yield up a that his imagination had fancied to be divine truth, and he continued his rovings until he felt safe nowhere.

Suddenly we meet in Switzerland, in the city of Basle, a person by the name of John of Bruges, the owner of real estate in the town and in the country, a peaceable and good citizen, a communicant in the Reformed Church, who had come to Basle with his family in the spring of 1544. This man was none other than David Joris, the celebrated Anabaptist leader, who, tired of years of wandering, preferred a life of safety and comfort under a fictitious name to a life of celebrity and danger as the leader of a large religious sect. No one ever suspected under the garb of John of Bruges the form of David Joris, and he ended his days peacefully, in the midst of his family, in 1556. By the people of Basle, John of Bruges, alias David Joris, was highly esteemed while he lived among them, for, being a man of wealth, he united magnificence with virtue and integrity. But they thought differently after his death, when his son-in-law, Nicholas Blesdyck, a Reformed preacher in the Palatinate, an avaricious and unprincipled man, charged the deceased with the most blasphemous errors. However much David's family might remonstrate and deny the serious charges, the university and the clergy were called upon to pronounce Joris's opinions as heretical, and. his body was ordered to be dug up forthwith and committed to the common hangman to be burned. Thus, strangely enough, the Basle people actually brought to pass what Joris himself had told some of his disciples before his decease, that he would rise again at the end of three years. Respecting the character and opinions of Joris, Mosheim says (Eccles. Hist. bk. 4, cent, 16, sec. 3, pt. 2, ch. 3), "He possessed, more sense and more virtue than is commonly supposed, as is evinced not only by his books, of which he published a great many, but also by his disciples, who were persons by no means base, but of great simplicity of manners and character.... In the manner of the more moderate Anabaptists, he labored hard to revive languishing piety  among his fellow men; and in this matter his imagination, which was excessively warm, so deceived him that he falsely supposed he had divine visions; and he placed religion in the exclusion of all eternal objects from the thoughts, and the cultivation of silence, contemplation, and a peculiar and indescribable state of the soul.

The Mystics, therefore, of the highest order, and the Quakers, might claim him if they would. and they might assign him no mean rank among their sort of people." He believed that the true word of God is no external letter, but God himself, his word, and his voice in man himself. He opposed the doctrine of the Church concerning the Trinity on the ground that God is impersonal. "Is it not contrary to the manifestations of God in the creature to believe him to be three, and to call all three one?" he asks; and then replies, "God reveals himself in three periods, following each other successively — the periods of faith, hope, and love, all of them headed by a Godman appearing in God's stead." The second commenced with Jesus Christ, but the third and higher period, the period of perfect manhood, was inaugurated with the appearance of David Joris. The true Christ is the spiritual, the eternal word, eternally hid in the Father, the heart and the nature of God. This spiritual Christ has by no means really become flesh, but Jesus took the form of Christ in the flesh to make himself manifest. All that was done on or by Jesus in the body was a shadow (type) of what man will do and suffer in the spirit. Hence also there. was no power for salvation in Christ's external (i.e. bodily) sufferings and death, but we of our own accord must save ourselves by the sufferings and death of our old man. This deeper and more complete revelation is made to the world by David Joris, the true David, the Christ, not by descent in the flesh, but in the Spirit, and not in the spirit of the crucified and deceased, but of the resurrected and living Christ. With Joris's appearance must terminate the announcement of Christ after the flesh. Joris himself is to establish, both. internally and externally, the eternal kingdom of Christ, which hitherto was the kingdom of Christ only internally. He who has reached the perfection of this kingdom [which, of course, could also be done in this world, his external kingdom] is freed thereafter from all law, be it human or divine. Evidently Joris's doctrine was nothing but a fully developed system of Montanism (q.v.). He denied the doctrine of future judgment, as he declared that perfection is attained in this world, and thereafter the dependence of the subject on the Creator ceases. Of course he also ruled out of existence angels, both good and bad. He held, with Manes, that the body only, and not the. soul, was defiled by sin; and he  took a most impolitic step when he adopted the principles of the Adamites with respect to marriage.

Of his 250 books and 1000 letters, the most important is his Book of Miracles, which appeared at Deventer in 1542, under the title of Wonderboeck, etc. (2d ed. 1551, folio). A list of all his. writings, and a very elaborate. statement of his life and work, were written by Prof. Nippolt, of Heidelberg University, in the Zeitschrift fur. hist. Theol; 1863, p. 389; 1864, p. 483 sq.; 1868, p. 476 sq. See also Arnold, Kirchen u. Ketzerhistomrie, pt. 2, bk. 16, ch. 21, § 36. p. 873 sq.; Trechsel, Protest. Antitrinit. 1, 36, 55; Escher, in Ersch. und Gruber, Allem. Encylop. 23; 36- 47; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformation, 5, 442 sq., 469 sq.; Henke, Kirchengesch. 3, 148 sq.; Cramer, in the Archiv. of Kist en Royaards, 5, 1 sq.; 6, 291 sq. SEE ANABAPTISTS. (J.H.W.)

## Jorissen, Matthias[[@Headword:Jorissen, Matthias]]

             a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, was born at Wezel, Holland, October 26,. 1739, and educated at the University of Utrecht. His first settlement was at Havezathen, whence he was called to Hasselt, and thence, in 1782; to the Hague, to preach to a German congregation. This charge he held up to his death, Jan. 13, 1823. Jorissen's characteristics were clearness and vigor of intellect, warmth of affection, solidity of judgment, and a remarkable talent to read men and things. His native endowments were cultivated by extensive reading, thorough study, and much intercourse with the best society. He was evangelical in sentiment, of eminent personal piety, devoted to the best interests of his flock, and commanded universal esteem and love. He was one of the founders of the Netherlands Missionary Society. A new version of the Psalms in German was prepared by him. To it he added a few hymns. It was welcomed and adopted by German congregations in the Reformed Church of Holland. His other published writings are comparatively few... See Glasius, Godgeleerd Nederland, 1, 186 sq.; Geschiedeneis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk, by A. Ypeij and J. Dermont, 4, 320. (J.P.W.)

## Jorkoam[[@Headword:Jorkoam]]

             [some Jorko'äm] (Hebrew Yorkeäm',יָרְקְעָ, paleness of the people, or perh. extended people Sept. Ι᾿ερκαάν v.r. Ι᾿εκλάν, both confounded with Rekem following; Vulgate Jercaam), a person apparently named as the son of Raham, of the descendants of Caleb, the brother of Jerahmeel, of the  tribe of Judah (1Ch 2:44); but others (e.g. Gesenius after Jarchi) understand "father" there to mean founder, so that this would be the name of a town settled by Raham — an interpretation sustained by a similar use of other names in the same connection. The locality thus alluded to is otherwise unknown, but from the associated places may be presumed to have been a place in the region southeast of Hebron.

## Jormungand[[@Headword:Jormungand]]

             in Norse mythology, was the Midgard-snake, the daughter of Loke and the giantess. Angerbode, also the sister of the wolf Fenris and the blue Hela. The gods threw Jormungand into the ocean, where she grew so as to encircle the earth. When she drinks, there is low tide; when she gives back the water again, it is high tide. Thus she will live until Ragnarokr (world's end) comes. Thor will then slay her with his miolner, or hammer, but will himself be drowned in the poisonous streams issuing from her mouth.

## Jornandez[[@Headword:Jornandez]]

             (Jornandes or Jordanes), a celebrated historian of the 6th century, was by birth a Goth, or both of Alan and Gothic descent. After adopting the Christian religion he became a zealous churchman, subsequently entered a monastery, and was finally made bishop of Croton, in Italy. He wrote two historical works in the Latin language, De Regnorum ac Temporum Successione — a short compendium of the most important events in history from the Creation down to A.D. 552; valuable from the. accounts it contains of several barbarous northern nations — and De Getarum Origine et Rebus Gestis (concerning the origin and deeds of the Goths), which has obtained great renown, chiefly from its being our only source of information about the Goths and other barbarian tribes, except when they are casually mentioned by some Greek or Latin historian. The work, which in the main is a compilation of other writers, is full of inaccuracies, both of time, place, and person; Jornandez himself, however, seems to have been aware of the imperfect condition of his works, for he makes no claims to erudition or extended research. The aim of the works is believed to have been first to extol the Gothic nation, and, secondly, to bring about a union of the Goths and the Romans, for he tries to prove that both nations have long been friends and confederates, and that their perpetuation depended upon the most intimate alliance of the two. See Grimm and Krafft, K. gesch. d. gener. Volker, 1, 1, 77, etc.; Schmidt's Zeitschr. J. Geschichtl. Wissenschaft., 6, 516 sq.; Sybel. De fontibus libri Jordanis, etc. (Berlin, 1838), Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, s.v.

## Jortin, Johns, D. D.[[@Headword:Jortin, Johns, D. D.]]

             an eminent English divine, was born in London Oct. 23, 1698. His parents were French Huguenots, and formed part of that noble and devoted band who fled from France at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, giving up all in preference to abjuring their faith. He received his grammatical education at the Charter House. In May, 1715, he was admitted to Jesus College, in  Cambridge, of which he became in due time a fellow. He very soon, attracted attention by his remarkable proficiency as a scholar, particularly his mastery of the learned languages, and two years after being admitted to the college was recommended by his tutor, Dr. Styan Thirlby, to make extracts from Eustathius for the use of Pope's Homer, and for his services in the work he received the highest commendations from that distinguished poet. While at Cambridge he published a small volume of poems, which are greatly admired, and allowed by scholars to possess a very high rank among modern Latin verses. In 1723 he was admitted to deacon's orders, and the following June to that of priest. In 1726-27 he was presented to the living of Swavesey, near Cambridge, but, in consequence of his marriage soon after, he resigned that living, and removed to London, where he soon became an admired and popular preacher. When his friend, Dr. Osbaldeston, became bishop of London in 1762, Jortin was appointed his domestic chaplain, and was presented with a prebend in the Church of St. Paul and the living of Kensington. To these was soon added the archdeaconry of London. He fixed his residence at Kensington, where he died in 1770.

He was as much beloved for his private virtues as admired for his learning, abilities, liberality of mind, and contempt of subserviency. Few men have ever enjoyed the intimacy of so many eminent persons. Among these may be mentioned the names of bishops Horsley, Warburton, Sherlock, Hare, Lowth, and Secker, besides Cudworth, Middleton, Pope, Akenside, Dr. Samuel Johnson, Dr. Parr, Dr. Doddridge, and others. The most intimate relations subsisted between Dr. Jortin and bishop Warburton until he incurred the displeasure of that distinguished prelate by controverting his doctrine with regard to the state of the dead, as described by Homer and Virgil, in his "Divine Legation of Moses." The critical writings of Dr. Jortin are greatly admired by all who have a taste for curious literature. It is not merely on account of the learning which is displayed in them, and the use which is made of obscure authors, but there is a terseness in the expression, and a light, playful satire in the thoughts, which render them very entertaining. His principal works are, Discourses concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion, etc. (Lond. 1746, 3 vols. 8vo): — Life of Erasmus (Lond. 1758-60, 2 vols. 4to): — Sermons on different Subjects, and the Doctrine of a Future State, etc. (Lond. 1771, 4 vols. 8vo): — Six Dissertations upon different Subjects (Lond. 1772, 7 vols. 8vo): — Tracts, philological, critical, and miscellaneous (Lond. 1790, 2 vols. 8vo): — Miscellaneous Observations upon Authors, ancient and modern (1731, 2 vols. 8vo): — On Covetousness (Tracts of Angl.  Fathers, 4, 226); and Remarks on Ecclesiastical History, a work which is universally allowed to be curious, interesting, and impartial; full of manly sense, acuteness, and profound erudition. — English Cyclopoedia, s.v.; Allibone, Dictionary of English and American Authors, s.v. (E. de P.)

## Josabad[[@Headword:Josabad]]

             a less correct form for

1. JOZABAD SEE JOZABAD (q.v.), a, 1Ch 12:4; b. ( Ι᾿ωζαβδός. v.r. Ι᾿ωσαβδός), 1Es 8:63; compare Ezr 8:33.

2. For ZABDAI (Ι᾿ωζάβδος v.r. Ι᾿ωσάβαδος, ᾿Ωζάβαδος, and Ζαβδός), 1Es 9:29; comp. Ezr 10:28.

## Josaphat[[@Headword:Josaphat]]

             (Ι᾿ωσαφάτ), a Graecized form (Mat 1:8) of the name of JEHOSHAPHAT SEE JEHOSHAPHAT (q.v.), king of Judah.

## Josaphias[[@Headword:Josaphias]]

             (Ι᾿ωσαφαίς), a Graecized form (1Es 8:36) of the name JOSIPHIA SEE JOSIPHIA (q.v.) of the Heb. text (Ezr 8:10).

## Joscelin[[@Headword:Joscelin]]

             bishop of Soissons, a rival of Abelard, and one of the most distinguished teachers in Paris, was born in the latter part of the 11th century. In 1115 he became archdeacon of Soissons, and in 1126 succeeded Lisiard as bishop of that see. He took part in the councils of Troyes and Rouen, and in the coronation of king Philip. In 1131 Innocent II sent him, together with St. Bernard, on a mission to the archbishop and to the count of Bordeaux. On his return in 1132 he founded the abbey of Longpont. In 1140 he was one of the judges of Abelard at the Council of Sens, and at the Council of Paris in 1147 was commissioned to inquire into the propositions attributed to Gilbert de la Porrée. He died Oct. 25, 1152. Joscelin enjoyed great reputation for learning and wisdom, and in his diocese fulfilled all the duties of his charge with scrupulous faithfulness. He wrote an Expositio symboli and an Expositio Orationis Dominicoe, both of which were published in Martene and Durand's Amplissima Collectio, 9, 1101, 1111, Martene, Anecdota, p. 434, gives also two of his letters. See Gallia Christ.  9, 357; Hist. Litt. de la France, 12, 412. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 26, 948. (J.N.P.)

## Joscius[[@Headword:Joscius]]

             (called also JODOCUS, JOSCIONUS, JOSCELINUS, JOSTHO, and GOTHO), a French Roman Catholic prelate, became bishop of St. Brieuc in 1150. In 1157 he was translated to the see of Tours, and immediately began to quarrel with the convents of his diocese, till king Louis VII was obliged to interfere. When Frederick Barbarossa pretended to judge the claims of the rival popes, Victor and Alexander, Joscius was sent to the latter by England and France to assure him of their support and bring him to France. In 1167 Joscius was the prelate who, after the murder of Thomas à Becket, was commissioned by the pope to excommunicate the king of England. It was Joscius also who, when Henry had received absolution in 1172, went to him at Caen, and publicly declared him reconciled to the Church. He died in 1173 or 1174. See Gallia Christ. vol. 14, col. 89, 1088. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, 26, 949.

## Jose[[@Headword:Jose]]

             (Ι᾿ωσή, or, rather, Ι᾿ωσῆ, Gen. of Ι᾿ωσής, Joses), the son of Eleazar and father of Er, among the maternal ancestors of Christ, unmentioned in the O.T. (Luk 3:29). B.C. between 876 and 628. SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

## Jose Ben-Chalefta[[@Headword:Jose Ben-Chalefta]]

             (surnamed the thinker), a Jewish rabbi, was born at Sepphoris, in Palestine, about the year 80 A.D. Involved in the political schemes of rabbi Akiba (q.v.), he was obliged, in the year 124, to save himself from the Roman sword by fleeing to Asia Minor, from whence, on the death of the emperor Hadrian, in 136, he returned to Sepphoris, and died as the head of a school in that place, in 150. Jose's life is said to have been an edifying example of moral conduct, diligence in acquiring and communicating. knowledge, and an amiable modesty and humility. "I would rather," said he, "be a learner in a school than be founder of the school. I would rather, in the fulfilment of my duty, die a bitter death, than be infamous in the too well beaten way. I would rather overdo my duty than fail in it. I would rather collect for the poor than, by, distributing among them, gain consideration for myself. I would rather be unjustly blamed, than really do what is wrong." Jose is the author of a historical work, which has been preserved, and is possessed of lasting, interest, the Seder Olam (q.v.). See Hamburger, Real-Encyklop. 2:493 sq.; Bacher, Die Agada der Tanaiten (Strasburg, 1884), pages 20, 87, 99, 110, 139, 207, 223, 242, 246, 247, 284, 305, 337, 381,422, 438: Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:107 sq. (B.P.)

## Josedec[[@Headword:Josedec]]

             (Ι᾿ωσεδέκ), a Graecized form (1Es 5:5; 1Es 5:48; 1Es 5:56; 1Es 6:2; 1Es 9:19; Sir 49:12) of Josedech, tile high priest (Hag 1:1). SEE JEHOZADAK.

## Josenhaus, Johannes[[@Headword:Josenhaus, Johannes]]

             a Protestant theologian, for some time inspector of the Basle Missionary Institute, who died December 25, 1884, is the author of, Die Herrlichkeit Jesu Christi des Sohnes Gottes (Stuttgart, 1846): — Bilder aus der Missionswelt (Basle, 1858): — Atlas derevangelischen  Missionsgesellschaft zu Basel (2d ed. ibid. 1859). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:628. (B.P.)

## Joseph[[@Headword:Joseph]]

             (Heb. Yoseph', יוֹסֵ, containing, according to Gen 30:23-24, a two-fold significance [the two Heb. roots coinciding in form in Hiphil], remover, from אָסִ, and increaser, from יָסִ, the latter favored by the uncontracted or Chaldaistic form Yehoseph', יְהוֹסֵ, occurring only Psa 81:6; Sept. and N.T. Ι᾿ωσήφ, i.q. Josephus), the name of several men in the Scriptures and Josephus, all doubtless after the first of the name, whose beautiful history is told at length in the Scriptures with inimitable simplicity. SEE JOSEPHUS.

I. The elder son of Jacob and Rachel, born (B.C. 1913; comp. Gen 41:46) under peculiar circumstances, as may be seen in Gen 30:22; on which account, and because he was the son of his old age (Gen 37:3), he was beloved by his father more than were the rest of his children, though Benjamin, as being also a son of Jacob's favorite wife Rachel, was in a peculiar manner dear to the patriarch. The partiality evinced towards Joseph by his father excited jealousy on the part of his brethren, the rather as they were born of different mothers (Gen 37:2). Jacob at this time had two small pieces of land in Canaan, Abraham's burying place at Hebron in the south, and the "parcel of a field, where he [Jacob] had spread his tent" (Gen 33:19), at Shechem in the north, the latter being probably, from its price, the lesser of the two. He seems then to have stayed at Hebron with the aged Isaac, while his sons kept his flocks.

1. Joseph had reached his seventeenth year, having hitherto been engaged in boyish sports, or aiding in pastoral duties, when some conduct on the part of "the sons of Bilhah and the sons of Zilpah, his father's wives," seems to have been such as, in the opinion of Joseph, to require the special attention of Jacob, to whom accordingly he communicated the facts. This regard to virtue, and this manifestation of filial fidelity, greatly increased his brothers' dislike, who henceforth "hated him, and could not speak peaceably unto him" (Gen 37:4). Their jealousy was aggravated by the fact that Jacob had shown his preference by making him a dress (פִּסַּיםכְּתֹנֶת), which appears to have been a long tunic with sleeves, worn by youths and maidens of the richer class. SEE ATTIRE.

Their aversion, however, was carried to the highest pitch when Joseph acquainted them with the two dreams that he had had, to the effect — the first, that while he and they were binding sheaves, his sheaf arose and stood erect, while theirs stood round and did obeisance to his; the second, that "the sun and the moon and the eleven stars did him homage." These dreams appeared to indicate that Joseph would acquire preeminence in the family, if not sovereignty; and while even his father rebuked him, his brothers were filled with envy (Gen 37:11). Jacob, however, was not aware of the depth of their ill will; so that, on one occasion, having a desire to hear intelligence of his sons, who were pasturing their flocks at a distance, he did not hesitate to make Joseph his messenger for that purpose. They had gone to Shechem to feed the flock and Joseph was sent thither from the vale of Hebron by his father to bring him word of their welfare and that of the flock. They were not at Shechem, but had gone to Dothan, which appears  to have been not very far distant, pasturing their flock like the Arabs of the present day, wherever the wild country (Gen 37:22) was unowned. His appearing in view of his brothers was the signal for their malice to gain head.

They began to devise means for his immediate destruction, which they would have unhesitatingly effected but for his half brother Reuben, who, as the eldest son might well be the party to interfere on behalf of Joseph. A compromise was entered into, in virtue of which the youth was stripped of the distinguishing vestments which he owed to his father's affection, and cast into a pit. Having performed this evil deed, and while they were taking refreshment, the brothers beheld a caravan of Arabian merchants (Ishmaelites =Midianites), who were bearing the spices and aromatic gums of India down to the well known and much frequented mart, Egypt. Judah on this feels a better emotion arise in his mind, and proposes that instead of allowing Joseph to perish, they should sell him to the merchants, whose trade obviously from this embraced human beings as well as spicery. Accordingly the unhappy young man was sold for a slave (at the price of twenty shekels of silver, a sort of fixed rate: see Lev 27:5), to be conveyed by his masters into Egypt. While on his way thither, Reuben returned to the pit, intending to rescue his brother, and convey him safely back to their father. Finding Joseph gone, he returned with expostulations to the wicked young men, who, so far from relenting, now concerted a fresh act of treachery, by which at once to cover their crime and also punish their father for his partiality towards the unoffending sufferer. With this view they dipped Joseph's party colored garment in the blood of a kid and sent it to Jacob in order to make him believe that his favorite child had been torn to pieces by some wild beast. The trick succeeded, and Jacob was grieved beyond measure (Gen 38:12-30). B.C. 1895.

2. Meanwhile the merchants sold Joseph to Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh's, and captain of the royal guard, who was a native of the country (Gen 37:36). It is by no means easy to determine who at this time was the Pharaoh, or ruling monarch, though, what is far more important, the condition of the country, and therein the progress of civilization, are in certain general and important features made clear in the course of the narration. According to Syncellus, however, the general opinion in his day was that the sovereign's name who ruled Egypt at the time of the deportation of Joseph was Aphophis. SEE EGYPT.

In Potiphar's house Joseph enjoyed the highest confidence and the largest prosperity. A higher  power watched over him; and whatever he undertook succeeded, till at length his master gave everything into his hands. He was placed over all his master's property with perfect trust, and "the Lord blessed the Egyptian's house for Joseph's sake" (Gen 37:5). The sculptures and paintings of the ancient Egyptian tombs bring vividly before us the daily life and duties of Joseph. The property of great men is shown to have been managed by scribes, who exercised a most methodical and minute supervision over all the operations of agriculture, gardening, the keeping of livestock, and fishing. Every product was carefully registered to check the dishonesty of the laborers, who in Egypt have always been famous in this respect. Probably in no country was farming ever more systematic. Joseph's previous knowledge of tending flocks, and perhaps of husbandry, and his truthful character, exactly fitted him for the post of overseer.

The Hebrew race have always been remarkable for personal beauty, of which Joseph seems, to have had an unusual share. This fact explains, though, it cannot palliate, the conduct of Potiphar's wife, who, with the well known profligacy of the Egyptian women; tried every means to bring the pure minded youth to fulfill her unchaste desires. Foiled in her evil wishes, she resolved to punish Joseph, who thus a second time innocently brings on himself the vengeance of the ill disposed. Charged with the very crime to which he had in vain been tempted; he is, with a fickleness characteristic of Oriental lords, at once cast into the state prison. (Genesis 39). If the suddenness and magnitude of this and other changes in the lot of Joseph should surprise anyone, the feeling will be mainly owing to his want of acquaintance with the manners and customs of the East, where vicissitudes not less marked and sudden than are those presented in our present history are not uncommon; for those who come into the charmed circle of an Eastern court, especially if they are persons of great energy of character, are subject to the most wonderful alternations of fortune, the slave of today being the vizier of tomorrow, and vice versa.

It must not be supposed, from the lowness of the morals of the Egyptians in practice, that the sin of unfaithfulness in a wife was not ranked among the heaviest vices. The punishment of adulterers was severe, and a moral tale, entitled "The Two Brothers" (contained in a papyrus of the 19th dynasty, found in the British Museum, and translated in the Cambridge Essays for 1858), is founded upon a case nearly resembling that of Joseph.  It has, indeed, been imagined that this story was based upon the trial of Joseph, and as it was written for the heir to the throne of Egypt at a later period, there is some reason in the idea that the virtue of one who had held so high a position as Joseph might have been in the mind of the writer, were this part of his history well known to the priests, which, however, is not likely. This incident, moreover, is not so remarkable as to justify great stress being laid upon the similarity to it of the main event of a moral tale. The story of Bellerophon might as reasonably be traced to it, were it Egyptian and not Greek. The Muslims have founded upon the history of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, whom they call Yusuf and Zelikha, a famous religious allegory. This is much to be wondered at, as the Koran relates the tempting of Joseph with no material variation in the main particulars from the authentic narrative. The commentators say that, after the death of Potiphar (Kitfir), Joseph married Zelikha (Sale, chap. 12). This mistake was probably caused by the circumstance that Joseph's father-in-law bore the same name as his master.

Potiphar, although believing Joseph guilty, does not appear to have brought him before a tribunal, where the enormity of his alleged crime, especially after the trust placed in him, and the fact of his being a foreigner, which was made much of by his master's wife (Gen 39:14; Gen 39:17), would probably have insured a punishment of the severest kind. He seems to have only cast him into the prison, which appears to have been in his house, or, at least, under his control since afterwards prisoners are related to have been put "in ward. [in] the house of the captain of the executioners, into the prison" (Gen 40:3), and simply "in ward [in] the captain of the executioners' house" (Gen 41:10; comp. Gen 40:7). The prison is described as "a place where the king's prisoners [were] bound" (Gen 39:20). Here the hardest time of Joseph's period of probation began. He was cast into prison on a false accusation, to remain there for at least two years, and perhaps for a much longer time. At first he was treated with severity; this we learn from Psalms 105, "He sent a mail before them, Joseph [who] was sold for a slave: whose feet they afflicted with the fetter: the iron entered into his soul" (Psa 105:17-18). There is probably here a connection between "fetter" and "iron" (comp. Gen 49:8), in which case the signification of the last clause would be "the iron entered into him," meaning that the fetters cut his feet or legs. This is not inconsistent with the statement in Genesis that the keeper of the prison treated Joseph well (Gen 39:21), for we are not justified in thence inferring that he was  kind from the first. In the prison, as in Potiphar's house. Joseph was found worthy of complete trust, and the keeper of the prison placed everything under his control, God's especial blessing attending his honest service. After a while Pharaoh was incensed against two of his officers, "the chief of the cup bearers" (שִׂר הַמִּשְׁקַים), and "the chief of the bakers" (הָאוֹפַיםשִׂר), and cast them into the prison where Joseph was. Here the chief of the executioners, doubtless a successor of Potiphar (for, had the latter been convinced of Joseph's innocence, he would not have left him in the prison, and if not so convinced he would not have trusted him), charged Joseph to serve these prisoners. Like Potiphar, they were "officers" of Pharaoh (40:2), and though it may be a mistake to call them grandees, their easy access to the king would give them an importance that explains the care taken of them by the chief of the executioners. Each dreamed a prophetic dream, which Joseph correctly interpreted, disclaiming human skill and acknowledging that interpretations were of God. It is not necessary here to discuss in detail the particulars of this part of Joseph's history, since they do not materially affect the leading events of his life; they are, however, very interesting, from their perfect agreement with the manners of the ancient Egyptians as represented on their monuments. On the authority of Herodotus and others, it was long denied that the vine grew in Egypt; and if so, the imagery of the butler's dream would hardly have been appropriate. Wilkinson, however, has shown beyond a question that vines did grow in Egypt, and thus not only removed a doubt, but given a positive confirmation of the sacred record (Manners of the Anc. Egypt. 2, 152).

The butler, whose fate was auspicious, promised the young Hebrew to employ his influence to procure his restoration to the free air of day; but when again in the enjoyment of his "butlership," "he forgat" Joseph (Genesis 40). B.C. 1885. Pharaoh himself, however, had two dreams, which found in Joseph a successful expounder; for the butler remembered the skill of his prison companion, and advised his royal master to put it to the test in his own case. Pharaoh's dream, as interpreted by. Joseph, foreboded the approach of a seven years' famine; to abate the evils of which Joseph recommended that some "discreet and wise man" should be chosen and set in full power over the land of Egypt. The monarch was alarmed, and called a council of his advisers. The wisdom of Joseph was recognized as of divine origin and supereminent value; and the king and his ministers (whence it appears that the Egyptian monarchy — at Memphis — was not despotic, but constitutional) resolved that Joseph should be made  (to borrow a term from Rome) dictator in the approaching time of need. "And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, Forasmuch as God hath showed thee all this, there is none so discreet and wise as thou art. Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled. only in the throne will I be greater than thou. See, I have set thee over all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh took off his ring and put it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck; and he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had; and they cried before him, Bow the knee. SEE ABRECI.

And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, I am Pharaoh, and without thee shall no man lift up his hand or foot in all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh called Joseph's name Zaphnath-paaneah [savior of the world; comp. Jablonsky, Opusc. 1, 207.sq.]; and he gave him to wife Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On. And Joseph went out over all the land of Egypt" (Gen 41:39 sq.). The monuments show that on the investiture of a high official in Egypt, one of the chief ceremonies was the putting on him a collar of gold (see Ancient Egyptians, pl. 80); the other particulars, the vestures of fine linen and the riding in the second chariot, are equally in accordance with the manners of the country. It has been supposed that Joseph was taken into the priestly order, and thus ennobled. The Biblical narrative does not support this opinion, though it leaves it without a doubt that in reality, if not in form as well, the highest trust and the proudest honors of the state were conferred on one so recently a Hebrew slave. The age of Joseph is stated to have been thirty years at the time of this promotion (41:46). B.C. 1883.

3. Seven years of abundance afforded Joseph opportunity to carry into effect such plans as secured an ample provision against the seven years of need. The famine came, but it found a prepared people. The representations of the monuments, which show that the contents of the granaries were accurately noted by the scribes when they were filled, well illustrate this part of the history. SEE GRANARY.

The visitation was not merely local, for "the famine was over all the face of the earth;" "and all countries came into Egypt to Joseph to buy corn" (Genesis 40:56, 57). The expressions here used, however, do not require us to suppose that the famine extended beyond the countries around Egypt, such as Palestine, Syria, and Arabia, as well as some part of Africa, although of course it may have been more widely experienced. It may be observed, that although famines in Egypt depend immediately upon the failure of the inundation, and in other countries upon the failure of rain, yet that, as the rise of the  Nile is caused by heavy rains in Ethiopia, an extremely dry season there and in Palestine would produce the result described in the sacred narrative. It must also be recollected that Egypt was anciently the granary of neighboring countries and that a famine there would cause first scarcity, and then famine, around. Famines are not very unfrequent in the history of Egypt; but the famous seven years' famine in the reign of the Fatimite Caliph El'Mustansir-billah is the only known parallel to that of Joseph. SEE FAMINE.

Early in the time of famine, Joseph's brethren came to buy corn, a part of the history which we mention here only as indicating the liberal policy of the governor of Egypt, by which the storehouses were opened to all buyers, of whatever nation they were.

After the famine had lasted for a time, apparently two years, there was "no bread in all the land; for the famine [was] very sore, so that the land of Egypt and [all] the land of Canaan fainted by reason of the famine. And Joseph gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, for the corn which they bought; and Joseph brought the money into Pharaoh's house" (Gen 47:13-14). When all the money of Egypt and Canaan was exhausted, barter became necessary. Joseph then obtained all the cattle of Egypt, and in the next year, all the land, except that of the priests, and apparently, as a consequence, the Egyptians themselves. He demanded, however, only a fifth part of the produce as Pharaoh's right. It has been attempted to trace this enactment of Joseph in the fragments of Egyptian history preserved by profane writers, but the result has not been satisfactory. Even were the latter sources trustworthy as to the early period of Egyptian history, it would be difficult to determine the age referred to, as the actions of at least two kings are ascribed by the Greeks to Sesostris, the king particularized. Herodotus says that, according to the Egyptians, Sesostris "made a division of the soil of Egypt among the inhabitants, assigning square plots of ground of equal size to all, and obtaining his chief revenue from the rent which the holders were required to pay him every year" (2, 109). Elsewhere he speaks of the priests as having no expenses, being supported by the property of the temples (2, 37), but he does not assign to Sesostris, as has been rashly supposed, the exemption from taxation that we may reasonably infer. Diodorus Siculus ascribes the division of Egypt into nomes to Sesostris, whom he calls Sesoosis. Taking into consideration. the general character of the information given by Herodotus respecting the history of Egypt at periods remote from his own time, we are not justified in supposing  anything more than that some tradition of an ancient allotment of the soil by the crown among the population was current when he visited the country. The testimony of Diodorus is of far less weight.

There is a notice, in an ancient Egyptian inscription, of a famine which has been supposed to be that of Joseph. The inscription is in a tomb at Beni Hasan, and records of Ameni, a governor of a district of Upper Egypt, that when there were years of famine, his district was supplied with food. This was in the time of Sesertesen 1, of the twelfth dynasty. It has been supposed by Bunsen (Egypt's Place, 3, 334) that this must be Joseph's famine; but not only are the particulars of the record inapplicable to that instance, but the calamity it relates was never unusual in Egypt, as its ancient inscriptions and modern history equally testify.

Joseph's policy towards the subjects of Pharaoh is important in reference to forming an estimate of his character. It displays the resolution and breadth of view that mark his whole career. He perceived a great advantage to be gained, and he lost no part of it. He put all Egypt under Pharaoh. First the money, then the cattle, last of all the land, and the Egyptians themselves, became the property of the sovereign, and that. too, by the voluntary act of the people without any pressure. This being effected, he exercised a great act of generosity, and required only a fifth of the produce as a recognition of the rights of the crown. Of the wisdom of this policy there can be no doubt. Its justice can hardly be questioned when it is borne in mind that the Egyptians were not forcibly deprived of their liberties, and that when these had been given up they were at once restored. We do not know all the circumstances; but if, as we may reasonably suppose, the people were warned of the famine, and yet made no preparation during the years of overflowing abundance, the government had a clear claim upon its subjects for having taken precautions they had neglected. In any case it may have been desirable to make a new allotment of land, and to reduce an unequal system of taxation to a simple claim to a fifth of the produce. We have no evidence whether Joseph were in this matter divinely aided, but we cannot doubt that if not he acted in accord with a judgment of great clearness in distinguishing good and evil.

4. We have now to consider the conduct of Joseph at this time towards his brethren and his father. Early in the time of famine, which prevailed equally in Canaan and Egypt, Jacob reproved his helpless sons and sent them to Egypt, where he knew there was corn to be bought. Benjamin alone he  kept with him. Joseph was now governor, an Egyptian in habits and speech, for like all men of large mind he had suffered no scruples of prejudice to make him a stranger to the people he ruled. In his exalted station he labored with the zeal that he showed in all his various charges, presiding himself at the sale of corn. They had, of necessity, to appear before Joseph, whose license for the purchase of corn was indispensable. Joseph had probably expected to see them, and he seems to have formed a deliberate plan of action. His conduct has brought on him the always ready charges of those who would rather impeach than study the Bible, and even friends of that sacred book have hardly in this case done Joseph full justice (Niemeyer, Charakt. 2, 366; Heuser, Diss. non inhumaniter sed prudenttissime Josephum cum fratribus fecisse, Hal. 1773). Joseph's main object appears to have been to make his brothers feel and recognize their guilt in their conduct towards him. For this purpose suffering, then as well as now, was indispensable. Accordingly, Joseph feigned not to know his brothers, charged them with being spies, threatened them with imprisonment and allowed them to return home to fetch their younger brother, as a proof of their veracity, only on condition that one of them should remain behind in chains, with a prospect of death before him should not their words be verified. Then it was, and not before, that "they said one to another, We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul and would not hear; therefore is this distress come upon us. And Reuben said, Spake I not unto you, saying, Do not sin against the child, and ye would not hear? therefore. behold, also his blood is required" (Gen 42:21). Upon this after weeping bitterly, he by common agreement bound his brother Simeon, and left him in custody. How deeply concerned Joseph was for his family, how true and affectionate a heart he had, may be learned from the words which escape from the brothers in their entreaty that Jacob would allow Benjamin to go into Egypt, as required by Joseph: "The man asked us straitly of our state and of our kindred, saying, Is your father yet alive? have ye another brother?" (Gen 43:7).

At length Jacob consents to Benjamin's going in company with his brothers: "And God Almighty give you mercy before the man, that he may send away your other brother and Benjamin. If I be bereaved of my children, I am bereaved" (Gen 43:14). Thus provided, with a present consisting of balm, honey, spices, and myrrh, nuts and almonds, and with double money in their hands (double, in order that they might repay the  sum which Joseph had caused to be put into each man's sack at their departure, if, as Jacob supposed, "it was an oversight"), they went again down to Egypt and stood before Joseph (Gen 43:15); and there, too, stood Benjamin, Joseph's beloved brother. The required pledge of truthfulness was given. If it is asked why such a pledge was demanded, since the giving of it caused pain to Jacob, the answer may be thus: Joseph knew not how to demean himself towards his family until he ascertained its actual condition. That knowledge he could hardly be certain he had gained from the mere words of men who had spared his life only to sell himself into slavery. How had these wicked men behaved towards his venerable father? His beloved brother Benjamin, was he safe? or had he suffered from their jealousy and malice the worse fate with which he himself had been threatened? Nothing but the sight of Benjamin could answer these questions and resolve these details.

Benjamin had come, and immediately a natural change took place in Joseph's conduct: the brother began to claim his rights in Joseph's bosom. Jacob wag safe, and Benjamin was safe. Joseph's heart melted at the sight of Benjamin: "And he said to the ruler of his house, Bring these men home, and slay and make ready, for these men shall dine with me at noon" (Gen 43:16). But guilt is always the ready parent of fear; accordingly, the brothers expected nothing but being reduced to slavery. When taken to their own brother's house, they imagined they were being entrapped. A colloquy ensued between them and Joseph's steward, whence it appeared that the money put into their sacks, to which they now attributed their peril, was in truth a present from Joseph, designed, after his own brotherly manner, to aid his family in their actual necessities. The steward said," Peace be to you; fear not; your God and the God of your father hath given you the treasure in your sacks. I had your money" (Gen 43:23).

Noon came, and with it Joseph, whose first question regarded home: "He asked them of their welfare, and said, Is your father well, the old man of whom ye spake? is he yet alive? And he lifted up his eves and saw his brother Benjamin, his mother's son, and said, Is this your younger brother? And he said, God be gracious unto thee, my son!"' "And Joseph made haste, for his bowels did yearn upon his brother, and he sought where to weep; and he entered into his chamber, and wept there." Does this look like harshness?  The connection brings into view an Egyptian custom, which is of more than ordinary importance, in consequence of its being adopted in the Jewish polity: "And they set on (food) for him by himself (Joseph), and for them by themselves (the brethren), and for the Egyptians which did eat with them, by themselves: because the Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that is an abomination with the Egyptians" (Gen 43:32). This passage is also interesting, as proving that Joseph had not, in his princely grandeur, become ashamed of his origin, nor consented to receive adoption into a strange nation: he was still a Hebrew, waiting, like Moses after him, for the proper season to use his power for the good of his own people.

Other customs appear in this interesting narrative: "And they (the brothers) sat before him (Joseph), the first born according to his birthright, and the youngest according to his youth." "And he sent messes (delicacies) unto them from before him; but Benjamin's mess was five times so much as any of theirs" (Gen 43:32-33). Fear had now given place to wonder, and wonder at length issued in joy and mirth (comp. Gen 43:18; Gen 43:33-34). The scenes of the Egyptian tombs show us that it was the custom for each person to eat singly, particularly among the great; that guests were placed according to their right of precedence, and that it was usual to drink freely, men and even women being represented as overpowered with wine, probably as an evidence of the liberality of the entertainer. SEE BANQUET.

Joseph, apparently with a view to ascertain how far his brethren were faithful to their father, hit upon a plan which would in its issue serve to show whether they would make any, and what sacrifice, in order to fulfill their solemn promise of restoring Benjamin in safety to Jacob. Accordingly, he orders not only that every man's money (as before) should be put in his sack's mouth, but also that his "silver cup, in which my lord drinketh, and whereby he divineth," should be put in the sack's mouth of the youngest. The brethren leave, but are soon overtaken by Joseph's steward, who charges them with having surreptitiously carried off this costly and highly- valued vessel. They, on their part, vehemently repel the accusation, adding, "with whomsoever of thy servants it be found, both let him die, and we also will be my lord's bondmen." A search is made, and the cup is found in Benjamin's sack. Accordingly they return to the city. And now comes the hour of trial: Would they purchase their own liberation by surrendering Benjamin? After a most touching interview, in which they prove themselves worthy and faithful, Joseph declares himself unable any longer to withstand the appeal of natural affection. On this occasion Judah, who is  the spokesman, shows the deepest regard to his aged father's feelings, and entreats for the liberation of Benjamin even at the price of his own liberty. In the whole of literature we know of nothing more simple, natural, true, and impressive; nor, while passages of this kind stand in the Pentateuch, can we even understand what is meant by terming that collection of writings "the Hebrew national epic," or regarding it as an aggregation of historical legends. If here we have not history, we can in no case be sure that history is before us (Genesis 44).

Most natural and impressive is the scene also which ensues, in which Joseph, after informing his brethren who he was, and inquiring, first of all, "Is my father alive?" expresses feelings free from the slightest taint of revenge, and even shows how, under divine Providence the conduct of his brothers had issued in good — "God sent me before you to preserve a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance." Five years had yet to ensue in which "there would be neither earning nor harvest," and therefore the brethren were directed to return home and bring Jacob down to Egypt with all speed. "And he fell upon his brother Benjamin's neck and wept; and Benjamin wept upon his neck. Moreover, he kissed all his brethren and wept upon them; and after that his brethren talked with him" (Gen 45:14-15).

The news of these striking events was carried to Pharaoh, who, being pleased at Joseph's conduct, gave directions that Jacob and his family should come forthwith into Egypt: "I will give you the good of the land of Egypt, and ye shall eat the fat of the land; regard not your stuff, for the good of all the land is yours." The brethren departed, being well provided for: "And to his father Joseph sent ten asses laden with the good things of Egypt, and ten she asses laden with corn, and bread, and meat for his father by the way." The intelligence which they bore to their father was of such a nature that "Jacob's heart fainted, for he believed them not." When, however, he had recovered from the thus naturally told effects of his surprise, the venerable patriarch said, "Enough; Joseph, my son, is yet alive: I will go and see him before I die" (Gen 45:26; Gen 45:28). Accordingly Jacob and his family, to the number of threescore and ten souls, go down to Egypt, and by the express efforts of Joseph, are allowed to settle in the district of Goshen, where Joseph met his father: "And he fell on his neck, and wept on his neck a good while." There Joseph "nourished his father and his brethren, and all his father's household, with bread, according to their families" (Gen 47:12). B.C. 1874.

5. Joseph had now to pass through the mournful scenes which attend on the death and burial of a father (Gen 1:1-21). B.C. 1856. Having had Jacob embalmed, and seen the rites of mourning fully observed, the faithful and affectionate son — leave being obtained of the monarch — proceeded into the land of Canaan, in order, agreeably to a promise which the patriarch had exacted (Gen 47:29-31), to lay the old man's bones with those of his fathers, in "the field of Ephron the Hittite." Having performed with long and bitter mourning Jacob's funeral rites, Joseph returned into Egypt. The last recorded act of his life forms a most becoming close. After the death of their father, his brethren, unable, like all guilty people, to forget their criminality, and characteristically finding it difficult to think that Joseph had really forgiven them, grew afraid, now they were in his power, that he would take an opportunity of inflicting some punishment on them. They accordingly go into his presence, and in imploring terms and an abject manner entreat his forgiveness. "Fear not" this is his noble reply — "I will nourish you and your little ones."

6. By his Egyptian wife Asenath, daughter of the high priest of Heliopolis, Joseph had two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim (Genesis 42:50 sq.), whom Jacob adopted (Gen 48:5), and who accordingly took their place among the heads of the twelve tribes of Israel.

Joseph lived a hundred and ten years, kind and gentle in his affections to the last; for we are told, "The children of Machir, the son of Manasseh, were brought up upon Joseph's knees" (Gen 50:23). Having obtained a promise from his brethren that when the time came, as he assured them it would come, that God should visit them, and "bring them unto the land which he sware to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob," they would carry up his bones out of Egypt, Joseph at length "died, and they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin" (Gen 50:26). B.C. 1802. This promise was religiously fulfilled. His descendants, after carrying the corpse about with them in their wanderings, at length put it in its final resting place in Shechem, in a parcel of ground that Jacob bought of the sons of Hamor, which became the inheritance of the children of Joseph (Jos 24:32). A tomb which probably represents the same spot is still shown to travelers in the vicinity of Jacob's Well (Hackett's Illustrations, p. 197). It is a flat roofed rectangular building surmounted by a dome, under  which is pointed out the real tomb, in shape like a covered wagon (Wilson, Bible Lands, 2, 60).

The history of Joseph's posterity is given in the articles devoted to the tribes of EPHRAIM and MANASSEH. Sometimes these tribes are spoken of under the name of Joseph (Jos 14:4; Jos 17:14; Jos 17:17; Jos 18:5; Jdg 1:23; Jdg 1:35, etc.), which is even given to the whole Israelitish nation (Psa 80:1; Psa 81:5; Amo 5:15; Amo 6:6). Ephraim is, however, the common name of his descendants, for the division of Manasseh gave almost the whole political weight to the brother tribe (Psa 78:67; Eze 37:16; Eze 37:19; Zec 10:6). That great people seems to have inherited all Joseph's ability with one of his goodness, and the very knowledge of his power in Egypt, instead of stimulating his offspring to follow in his steps, appears only to have constantly drawn them into a hankering after that forbidden land which began when Jeroboam introduced the calves, and ended only when a treasonable alliance laid Samaria in ruins and sent the ten tribes into captivity.

7. The character of Joseph is wholly composed of great materials, and therefore needs not to be minutely portrayed. We trace in it very little of that balance of good and evil, of strength and weakness, that marks most things human, and do not anywhere distinctly discover the results of the conflict of motives that generally occasions such great difficulty in judging men's actions. We have as full an account of Joseph as of Abraham and Jacob, a fuller one than of Isaac; and if we compare their histories, Joseph's character is the least marked by wrong or indecision. His first quality seems to have been the greatest resolution. He not only believed faithfully, but could endure patiently, and could command equally his good and evil passions. Hence his strong sense of duty, his zealous work, his strict justice, his clear discrimination of good and evil. Like all men of vigorous character, he loved power, but when he had gained it he used it with the greatest generosity. He seems to have striven to get men unconditionally in his power that he might be the means of good to them. Generosity in conferring benefits, as well as in forgiving injuries, is one of his distinguishing characteristics. With this strength was united the deepest tenderness. He was easily moved to tears, even weeping at the first sight of his brethren after they had sold him. His love for his father and Benjamin was not enfeebled by years of separation, nor by his great station. The wise man was still the same as the true youth. These great qualities explain his power of governing and administering, and his extraordinary flexibility,  which enabled him to suit himself to each new position in life. The last trait to make up this great character was modesty, the natural result of the others.

In the history of the chosen race Joseph occupies a very high place as an instrument of Providence. He was "sent before" his people, as he himself knew, to preserve them in the terrible famine, and to settle them where they could multiply and prosper in the interval before the iniquity of the Canaanites was full. In the latter days of Joseph's life, he is the leading character among the Hebrews. He makes his father come into Egypt, and directs the settlement. He protects his kinsmen. Dying, he reminds them of the promise, charging them to take his bones with them. Blessed with many revelations, he is throughout a God taught leader of his people. In the N.T. Joseph is only mentioned; yet the striking particulars of the persecution and sale by his brethren, his resisting temptation, his great degradation and — yet greater exaltation, the saving of his people by his hand, and the confounding of his enemies, seem to indicate that he was a type of our Lord. He also connects the patriarchal with the Gospel dispensation, as an instance of the exercise of some of the highest Christian virtues under the less distinct manifestation of the divine will granted to the fathers.

8. For further discussion of the events of Joseph's history, see Wolfenb. Fragment. p. 36; Less, Geschichte der Rel. 1, 267; J.T. Jacobi, Sämmtl. Schrift. part 3; Hess, Gesch. der Patriarch. 2, 324; Niemeyer, Charakt. 2, 340; Allgem. Welthist. 2, 332; Heeren, Ideen, 2, 551; Jablonski, Opusc. 1, 207, Gesenius, Thes. Hebr. p. 1181; Hammer, D. Osman. Reich. 2, 83 Hengstenberg, Mos. und Lqg. p. 30; J.B. Burcardi, in the Ius. Helv. 1, 3, 355; Voigt, in the Brem. und verd. Biblioth. 5, 599; Bauer, Heb. Gesch. 1, 181; Ewald, Isr. Gesch. 1, 464; Doderlein, Theol Biblioth. 4, 717; Rosenmüller, Alterth. 3, 310; Lengerke, Kendan, 1, 263; Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 331; Herbelot, Bibl. Orient. 2, 332; Kitto, Daily Bible Illust.; Kurtz, Hist. of the Old Covenant; Stanley, Hist. of the Jewish Church; Adamson, Joseph and his Brethren (Lond. 1844); Edelman, Sermons on the Hist. of Joseph (Lond. 1839); Leighton, Lectures on Hist. of J. (Lond. 1848); Plumptre, Hist. of Joseph (Lond. 1848); Randall, Lectures on Hist. of J. (Lond. 1852); Wardlaw, Hist. of Joseph (new ed. Lond. 1851); Gibson, Lectures on 1list. of J. (Lond. 1853); Overton, Lectures on Life of Joseph (London. 1866). Treatises on special points are the following: Hoppe, De philosophia Josephi (Helmst. 1706); A Review of the Life and Administration of Joseph (London, 1743); J.B. Burckhard, De criminibus  Josepho inpactis (Basil. 1746); Ansaldus, Josephi religio vindicata (Brix. 1747); Triglalid, De Josepho adorato (L.B. 1750): Winkler, Unters. einiger Schwierigk. vom Jos. (in his Schriftsteller, 3, 1); Heuser, De non inhumaniter Josephumfticisse (Halle, 1773); Kuchler, Quare Josephus patrent non de se certiorem fecerit (Leucop. 1798); Nicolai, De servis Josephi Medicis (Helmst. 1752); Piderib. De nomine Josephi in AEgypto (Marb. 1768-9); Reineccius, De nomine צפנת פענח(Weissenf. 1725); Schröder, De Josephi laudibus (in Schonfeld's Vita Jacobi. Marb. 1713); Von Seelen, De Josepho Egyptiorum rectore (Lub. 1742); T. Smith, Hist. of Joseph in connection with Eg. Antiquities (Lond. 1858); Walter, De Josepho lapide Israelis (Hersf. 1734); Wunschald, De cognomin Josephi AEgyptiaco (Wittenb. 1669). SEE JACOB.

2. The father of Igal, which latter was the Issacharite "spy" to explore Canaan (Num 13:7). B.C. ante 1657.

3. The second named of the sons of Asaph, appointed head of the first division of sacred musicians by David (1Ch 25:2; 1Ch 25:9). B.C. 1014.

4. The son of Jonan, and father of Judah or Adaiah, among Christ's maternal ancestors, but unmentioned in the O.T. (Luk 3:30). B.C. ante 876.

5. Son of Shebaniah, and one of the chief priests contemporary with Jehoiakim (Neh 12:14). B.C. post 536.

6. One of the "sons" of Bani who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:42). B.C. 459.

7. The son of Judah, and father of Semei, maternal ancestors of Jesus (Luk 3:26); probably the same with SCHECHANIAH, the son of Obadiah, and father of Shemaiah (1 Chronicles 3:21, 92). B.C. between 536 and 410.

8. The son of Mattathiah, and father of Janna, maternal ancestors of Christ, unmentioned in the Old Test. (Luk 3:24). B.C. considerably post 406. See on this and Nos. 4 and 7, SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

9. (Ι᾿ωσήφ.) Son of Oziel, and father of On, an ancestor of Judith (Jdt 8:1).

10. A young man of high character, son of Tobias, and nephew of the Jewish high priest Onias II, whose avarice he rebuked. but prevented its evil consequences by propitiating Ptolemy, and becoming the collector of his taxes. His history is given at considerable length by Josephus (Ant. 12, 4, 2 10), including his unintentional marriage with his own niece, by whom he had a son named Hyrcanus.

11. (Ι᾿ώσηφος.) Son of Zacharias, left with Azarias as general of the Jewish troops by Judas Maccabaeus, and defeated by Gorgias, B.C. cir. 164 (1 Macc. 5, 8, 56 60; Josephus, Ant. 12, 8, 6).

12. (Ι᾿ώσηπος.) In 2Ma 8:22; 2Ma 10:19. Joseph is named among, the brethren of Judas Maccabaeus apparently in place of JOHN (Ewald, Gesch. 4:384, note; Grimm, ad 2Ma 8:22). The confusion of Ι᾿ωάννης, Ι᾿ωσήφ, Ι᾿ωσῆς is well seen in the various readings in Mat 13:55. SEE JOSES.

13. Uncle of Herod the Great, who left him in charge when he went to plead his cause before Antony, with injunctions to put Mariarne to death in case he never returned; but this order, being disclosed to Mariarne, led to Joseph's death by command of Herod through suspicion of criminal intercourse with Marianne (Josephus, Ant. 15, 5, 6, 9). He had married Salome, Herod's sister ( War, 1, 22, 4). He seems to be the same elsewhere called Herod's treasurer (ταμίας, Ant. 15, 6, 5).

14. Son of Antipater, and brother of Herod the Great (Josephus, War, 1, 8, 9), was sent by the latter with a large force to subdue the Idumaeans (Ant. 14:15,4), and afterwards left by him in Jerusalem with full powers to act on the defensive against Macheras, neglecting which orders he lost his life in an engagement near Jericho (War, 1, 17, 1-4). He also had a son named Joseph (Ant. 18, 5, 4), who seems to be the one mentioned as cousin (ἀνεψιός.) of Archelaus ( War, 2, 5, 2).

15. Son of Ellemus, a relative of the high priest Matthias, in whose place he officiated for a single day (apparently that of the annual atonement), in consequence of the accidental disqualification of the pontiff (Josephus, Ant. 17, 6, 4).

16. The foster father of our Savior, being "the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ" (Mat 1:16). By Matthew he is said to have been the son of Jacob, whose lineage is traced by the same  writer through David up to Abraham. Luke represents him as being the son of Heli, and traces his origin up to Adam. Luke appears to have had some specific object in view, since he introduces his genealogical line with words of peculiar import: "Jesus being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli" (Luk 3:23) — ὠς ἐνομίζετο, "as was supposed," in other terms, as accounted by law, as enrolled in the family registers; for Joseph being the husband of Mary, became thereby, in law (νόμος), the father of Jesus. SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST. He lived at Nazareth, in Galilee (Luk 2:4), and it is probable that his family had been settled there for some time, since Mary lived there too (Luk 1:26-27).

The statements of Holy Writ in regard to Joseph are few and simple. According to a custom among the Jews, traces of which are still found, such as hand fasting among the Scotch, and betrothing among the Germans, Joseph had pledged his faith to Mary; but before the marriage was consummated she proved to be with child. Grieved at this, Joseph was disposed to break off the connection; but, not wishing to make a public example of one whom he loved, he contemplated a private disruption of their bond. From this step, however, he is deterred by a heavenly messenger, who assures him that Mary has conceived under a divine influence. "And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins" (Mat 1:18 sq.; Luk 1:27). It must have been within a very short time of his taking her to his home that the decree went forth from Augustus Caesar which obliged him to leave Nazareth with his wife and go to Bethlehem. He was there with Mary and her firstborn when the shepherds came to see the babe in the manger, and he went with them to the Temple to present the infant according to the law, and there heard the prophetic words of Simeon as he held him in his arms. When the wise men from the East came to Bethlehem to worship Christ, Joseph was there; and he went down to Egypt with them by night, when warned by an angel of the danger which threatened them; and on a second message he returned with them to the land of Israel, intending to reside at Bethlehem, the city of David; but, being afraid of Archelaus, he took up his abode, as before his marriage, at Nazareth, where he carried on his trade as a carpenter. When Jesus was twelve years old Joseph and Mary took him with them to keep the Passover at Jerusalem, and when they returned to Nazareth he continued to act as a father to the child Jesus, and was always reputed to be so indeed.  Joseph was by trade a carpenter, in which business he probably educated Jesus (Thilo, Apocr. 1, 311). In Mat 13:55, we read, "Is not this the son of the carpenter?" and in Mar 6:3, "Is not this the carpenter, the son of Mary?" The term employed, τέκτων, is of a general character, and may be fitly rendered by the English word artificer or artizan, signifying any one that labors in the fabrication (jaber in Latin) of articles of ordinary use, whatever the material may be out of which they are made. SEE CARPENTER.

Schleusner (in voc.) asserts that the universal testimony of the ancient Church represents our Lord as being a carpenter's son. This is, indeed, the statement of Justin Martyr (Dial. cum Tryphone, § 88), for he explains the term τἐκτων, which he applies to Jesus, by saying that he made ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά, ploughs and yokes; but Origen, in replying to Celsus, who indulged in jokes against the humble employment of our Lord, expressly denied that Jesus was so termed in the Gospels (see the passage cited in Otho's Justin Martyr, 2, 306, Jenoe, 1843) — a declaration which suggests the idea that the copies which Origen read differed from our own; while Hilarius, on Matthew (quoted in Simon's Dictionnaire de la Bible, 1, 691), asserts, in terms which cannot be mistaken, that Jesus was a smith (ferrum igne vincentis, massamque formantis, etc.). Among the ancient Jews all handicrafts were held in so much honor that they were learned and pursued by the first men of the nation. SEE ARTIFICER.

Jewish tradition (Hieros. Shaph. c. 14) names the father of Jesus פנדירא, Pendira, or Penthira (פנתירא, Midrash, Kohel, 10, 5; Πάνθηρ, Thilo, Apocr. 1, 528), and represents him (Orig. c. Cels. 1, 32) as a rough soldier, who became the father of Jesus after Mary was betrothed to Joseph. Another form of the legend sets him forth (Toled. Jeshu, p. 3, ed. Wagenseil; comp. Epiphan. Hoer. 78, 7) under the name of Joseph Pandera (פנדרא יוס). Christian tradition makes Joseph an old man when first espoused to Mary (Epiphan. Hoer. 78, 7), being no less than eighty years of age, and father of four sons and two daughters. Theophylact. on Mat 13:55, says that Jesus Christ had brothers and sisters, all children of Joseph, whom he had by his sister-in-law, wife of his brother Cleophas, who having died without issue, Joseph was obliged by law to marry his widow. Of the sons, James, the brother of the Lord, was, he states, the first bishop of Jerusalem. Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiastes 2, 1) agrees in substance with Theophylact; so also does Epiphanius, adding that Joseph was fourscore years old when he married Mary. Jerome, from  whom it appears that the alleged mother's name was Escha, opposes this tradition, and is of opinion that what are termed the brothers of Jesus were really his cousins. SEE JAMES; SEE MARY.

The painters of Christian antiquity conspire with the writers in representing Joseph as an old man at the period of the birth of our Lord — an evidence which is not to be lightly rejected, though the precise age mentioned may be but an approximation to fact. Another account (Niceph. 2, 3) gives the name of Salome as that of Joseph's first wife, who was related to the family of John the Baptist. The origin of all the earliest stories and assertions of the fathers concerning Joseph, as, e.g., his extreme old age, his having sons by a former wife, his having the custody of Mary given to him by lot, and so on, is to be found in the apocryphal Gospels, of which the earliest is the Protevangelium of St. James, apparently the work of a Christian Jew of the 2d century, quoted by Origen, and referred to by Clement of Alexandria and Justin Martyr (Tischendorf. Proleg. 13). The same stories are repeated in the other apocryphal Gospels. The Monophysite Coptic Christians are said to have first assigned a festival to St. Joseph in the Calendar, viz., on the 20th of July, which is thus inscribed in a Coptic Almanac: "Requies sancti senis justi Josephi fabri lignarii, Deiparae Virginis Mariae sponsi, qui pater Christi vocari promeruit." The apocryphal Historia Josephi fabri lignarii, which now exists in Arabic (ed. Walling, Lips. 1722; in Latin by Fabricius, Pseudepigr. 1, 300; also by Thilo and Tischendorf), is thought by Tischendorf to have been originally written in Coptic, and the festival of Joseph is supposed to have been transferred to the Western churches from the East as late as the year 1399.

The above named history is acknowledged to be quite fabulous, though it belongs probably to the 4th century. It professes to be an account given by our Lord himself to the apostles on the Mount of Olives, and placed by them in the library of Jerusalem. It ascribes 111 years to Joseph's life, and makes him old, and the father of four sons and two daughters before he espoused Mary. It is headed with this sentence: "Benedictiones ejus et preces servant nos omnes, o fratres. Amen." The reader who wishes to know the opinion of the ancients on the obscure subject of Joseph's marriage may consult Jerome's acrimonious tract Contra Helvidium. He will see that Jerome highly disapproves the common opinion (derived from the apocryphal Gospels) of Joseph being twice married, and that he claims the authority of Ignatius, Polycarp, Ireaeus, Justin Martyr, and "many other apostolical men," in favor of his own view, that our Lord's brethren were his cousins only, or, at all events, against the opinion of Helvidius, which had been  held by Ebion, Theodotus of Byzantium, and Valentine, that they were the children of Joseph and Mary. Those who held this opinion were called Antidicomarianitoe, as enemies of the Virgin. (Epiphanius, Adv. Hoeres. l. 3, t. 2; Hoeres. 78, also Hoer. 41. See also Pearson, On the Creed, art. Virgin Mary; Mill, On the Brethren of the Lord; Calmet, De St. Joseph. St. Mar. Virg. conjuge; and, for an able statement of the opposite view, Alford's note on Mat 13:55.) SEE GOSPELS, SPURIOUS.

It is not easy to determine when Joseph died. That event may have taken place before Jesus entered on his public ministry. This has been argued from the fact that his mother only appeared at the feast at Cana in Galilee. The premises, however, hardly bear out the inference. With more force of argument, it has been alleged (Simon, Dict. de. la Bible) that Joseph must have been dead before the crucifixion of Jesus, else he would in all probability have appeared with Mary at the cross. Certainly the absence of Joseph from the public life of Christ, and the failure of reference to him in the discourses and history, while "Mary" and "his brethren" not unfrequently appear, afford evidence not only of Joseph's death, but of the inferior part which, as the legal father only of our Lord, Joseph might have been expected to sustain. So far as our scanty materials enable us to form an opinion, Joseph appears to have been a good, kind, simple-minded man, who, while he afforded aid in protecting and sustaining the family, would leave Mary unrestrained to use all the impressive and formative influence of her gentle, affectionate, pious, and thoughtful soul. B.C. cir. 45 to A.D. cir. 25.

Further discussion of the above points may be seen in Meyer, Num Jos. tempore nativ. C. fuerit senex decrepitus (Lips. 1762); comp. Reay, Narratio de Jos. e s. codice desumpta (Oxon. 1823); Walther, Dass Jos. d. wahre Vater Christi sei (Berlin, 1791); Oertel, Antijosephismus (1792); Hasse, Jos. verum Jesu patrers non fuisse (Regiom. 1792); Ludewig, Hist. Krit. Unters. (Wolferb. 1831). The traditions respecting Joseph are collected in Act. Sanct. 3, 4 sq.; there is a Life of Joseph written in Italian by Affaitati (Mail. 1716). See also Volbeding, Index, p. 8; Hase, Leben Jesu (4th ed. 1854), p. 56. SEE JESUS CHRIST.

17. Surnamed CAIAPHAS SEE CAIAPHAS (q.v.), Jewish high priest in the time of our Lord's ministry.

18. A native (not resident, as in Michaelis, Begräbniss- und Auferstehungsgesch. Christi, p. 44) of Arimathaea (Mat 27:57; Mat 27:59;  Mar 15:43; Mar 15:45; Luk 23:50; Joh 19:38), a city, probably the Ramah of the O.T., in the territory of Benjamin, on the mountain range of Ephraim, at no great distance south of Jerusalem (Jos 18:25; Jdg 4:5), not far from Gibeah (Jdg 19:13; Isa 10:29; Hos 5:8). SEE ARIMATHEA.

Joseph was a secret disciple of Jesus — "an honorable counsellor (βουλευτης), who waited for the kingdom of God" (Mar 15:43), and who, on learning the death of our. Lord, "came and went in boldly unto Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus." Pilate, having learned from the centurion who commanded at the execution that Jesus was actually dead, gave the body to Joseph, who took it down and wrapped his deceased Lord in fine linen which he had purchased for the purpose; after which he laid the corpse in a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone against the door of the sepulchre (Mar 15:43 sq.). From the parallel passages in Mat 27:58 sq., Luk 23:50 sq., and Joh 19:38 sq., it appears that the body was previously embalmed at the cost of another secret disciple, Nicodemus, and that the sepulchre was new, "wherein never man before was laid" (thus fulfilling Isa 53:9); also that it lay in a garden, and was the property of Joseph himself (comp. Origen, c. Cels. 2, p. 103, ed. Spenc.; Walch, Observ. in Matthew ex inscript. p. 84). This garden was "in the place where Jesus was crucified." A.D. 29. SEE GOLGOTHA.

Luke describes the character of Joseph as "a good man and a just," adding that "he had not assented to the counsel and deed of them," i.e. of the Jewish authorities. From this remark it is clear that Joseph was a member of the Sanhedrim: a conclusion which is corroborated by the epithet "counsellor," applied to him by both Luke and Mark. Whether Joseph was a priest, as Lightfoot (Hor. Iseb. p. 669) thought, there is not evidence to determine. Various opinions as to his social condition may be found in Thiess (Krit. Comment. 2, 149). Tradition represents Joseph as having been one of the Seventy (Ittig, Diss. de Pat. Apostol. § 13; Assemani, Biblioth. Orient. 3, 1, 319 sq.); and that Joseph, being sent to Great Britain by the apostle Philip about the year 63, settled with his brother disciples at Glastonbury, in Somersetshire, and there erected of wicker twigs the first Christian oratory in England, the parent of the majestic abbey which was afterwards founded on the same site. The local guides to this day show the miraculous thorn (said to bud and blossom every Christmas day) that sprung from the staff which Joseph stuck in the ground as he stopped to rest himself on the hill top. (See  Dugdale's Monasticon, 1, 1; and Hearne, Hist. and Antiq. of Glastonbury). Other traditional notices May be seen in the Evang. Nicod. c. 12 sq.; Acta sanctor. Mart. 2, 507 sq.; comp. the dissertations De Josepho Arimath of Bromel [Teutzel] (Viteb. 1683) and Björnland (Aboa, 1729). SEE JESUS CHRIST.

19. Surnamed BARSABAS SEE BARSABAS (q.v.), one of the two persons whom the primitive Church, immediately after the resurrection of Christ, nominated, praying that the Holy Spirit would show which of them should enter the apostolic band in place of the wretched Judas. On the lots being cast, it proved that not Joseph, but Matthias, was chosen (Act 1:23). A.D. 29.

Joseph also bore the honorable surname of Justus (q.v.), which was not improbably given him on account of his well known probity. He was one of those who had "companied with the apostles all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among them, beginning from the baptism of John," until the ascension (Act 1:15 sq.). Tradition also accounted him one of the Seventy (Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 1, 12). The same historian relates (3, 39), on the authority of Papias, that Joseph the Just "drank deadly poison, and by the grace of God sustained no harm." It has been maintained that he is the same as Joses, surnamed Barnabas, mentioned in Act 4:36; but the manner in which the latter is characterized seems to point to a different person (Heinrichs, On Acts, 1:23; Ullmann, in the Theolog. Stud. u. Kritik. 1, 377; Alynster, ibid. 1829, 2, 326). He is also to be distinguished from Judas Barsabas (Act 15:22).

20. Son of Camus or Camydus, appointed Jewish high priest in place of Cantheras by Herod, brother of Agrippa I, who had obtained temporary control over the Temple from Claudius Caesar during the presidency of Longinus and the procuratorship of Fadus, A.D. 46. 8 (Josephus, Ant. 20, 1,3). He was removed by the same authority in favor of Ananias, son of Nebedaeus, during the procuratorship of Tiberius Alexander, A.D. 48 (ib. 5, 2).

21. Surnamed Cabi, son of Simon, a former high priest of the Jews, and himself appointed to that office by Agrippa during the procuratorship of Festus (A.D. 62), but shortly afterwards removed by the same authority on the arrival of Albinus (A.D. 62), in favor of Ananus, son of Ananus (Josephus, Ant. 20, 8, 11; 9, 1). SEE HIGH PRIEST.

22. Son of a female physician (ἰατρίνηΙ), who excited a sedition at Gamala near the close of the Jewish independence (Josephus, Life, 37).

23. Son of Daleeus, an eminent Jew, who threw himself into the flames of the Temple rather than surrender to the Romans (Josephus, War, 6, 5, 1).

## Joseph (St.) The Hymnologist[[@Headword:Joseph (St.) The Hymnologist]]

             (Josephus hymnographus, a native of Sicily, fled from that island to Africa and then to Greece. He entered a convent at Thessalonica, where he became eminent for his ascetic practices, and for the fluency and gracefulness of his utterance, "so that he easily," says his biographer, "threw the fabled sirens into the shade." Having been ordained presbyter, he went to Constantinople with Gregory of Decapolis, who there became one of the leaders of the "orthodox" party in their struggle with the iconoclastic emperor, Leo the Armenian, which began in A.D. 814. From Constantinople Joseph repaired, at the desire of this Gregory, to Rome, to solicit the support of the pope, but, falling into the hands of pirates, was by them carried away to Crete. Here he remained till the death of Leo the Armenian (A.D. 820), when he was, as his biographer asserts, miraculously delivered, and conveyed to Constantinople. On his return he found his friend and leader Gregory dead, and attached himself to another leader,  John, on whose death he caused his body, together with that of Gregory, to be transferred to the deserted church of St. John Chrysostom, in connection with which he established a monastery, that was soon, by the attractiveness of his eloquence, filled with inmates. After this he was, for his strenuous defense of image worship, banished to Chersonae, apparently by the emperor Theophilus, who reigned from A.D. 829 to 842; but, on the death of the emperor, was recalled from exile by the empress Theodora, and obtained, through the favor of the patriarch Ignatius, the office of scenophylax, or keeper of the sacred vessels in the great church of Constantinople. Joseph was equally acceptable to Ignatius and to his competitor and successor Photius. He died at an advanced age in A.D. 883. Joseph is chiefly celebrated as a writer of canones or hymni, of which several are extant in MS., but there is some difficulty in distinguishing his compositions from those of Joseph of Thessalonica. His Canones in omnia Beatoe Virginis Marioe festa, and his Theotocia, hymns in honor of the Virgin, scattered through the ecclesiastical books of the Greeks were published, with a learned commentary and a life of Joseph, translated from the Greek of John the Deacon, by Hippolito Maracci, under the title of Mariale S. Josephi Hymnographi (Rome, 1661). The version of the life of Joseph was by Luigi Maracci, of Lucea, the brother of Ippolito. Another Latin version of the same life, but less exact, by the Jesuit Floritus, was published among the Vitoe Sanctorum Soeclorum of Octavius Cajetanus (Ottavio Gaetano), 2, 43 (Palermo. 1657, folio), and reprinted in the Acta Sanctorum (see below). Some writers suppose that there was another Joseph, a writer of hymns, mentioned in the title of a MS. typicon at Rome as of the monastery of St. Nicolaus Casularum (τῶν Κασούλων). See Vita S. Josephi Hymnographi, in the Acta Sanctorum, s. d. 3 Aprilis, 2, 269, etc., with the commentary of Praevius of Papebroche, and Appendix, p. 24; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 11, 79; Menologium Groecorum, jussu Basilii, Imperatoris editum, s.d. 3 Aprilis (Urbino, 1727, folio). — Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. 3, 929.

## Joseph Ben-Joshua ben-Meir[[@Headword:Joseph Ben-Joshua ben-Meir]]

             (surnamed Ha-Sefardi, i.e. "the Spaniard"), was born in 1496 at Avignon, whither his father had retired on leaving: Spain. He is the author of a historical work, entitled דַּבְרֵי הִיָּמַי, Chronicles of the Kings of France and the Ottoman Sovereigns, in two parts, the first from the creation till 1520, and the second of transactions from Athat time till 1553 (Venice, 1554; Amsterdam, 1733). Disinterested, and contemporary with those events, he must be regarded as an impartial historian. This work has been translated in part into Latin by Louis Ferrand, Synopsis sive Conspectus Libri Hebraici, etc. (Paris, 1670). An English translation of the whole, by C.H. Bialloblotzky, has made this interesting work accessible nito English- readers, The Chronicles of R. Joseph ben Joshua Meir, the Sephardi (Lond. 1836, 2 volumes). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:115; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebr. Lit. page 453; Lindo, History of the Jews of Spain and Portugal, page 451; Jost, Geschichte des Judenthuns, 3:124. (B.P.)

## Joseph Taitatzak[[@Headword:Joseph Taitatzak]]

             SEE TAITATZAK.

## Joseph ben-Chija[[@Headword:Joseph ben-Chija]]

             (in the Talmud simply styled Rabbi Joseph), one of the greatest of Israel's Rabbis, was born in Babylon about A.D. 270. Rabbi Joseph was a disciple of Jehudah ben-Jecheskel, the founder and president of the college at Pumbadita, and a fellow student and intimate lifelong friend of the celebrated Rabba ben-Nachmani, commonly called Rabba, the reputed author of the Midrash Rabba, or the traditional commentary on Genesis,  whom he succeeded in the presidency at Pumbadita about A.D. 330. He died, however, only three years after (about A.D. 333). Joseph deserves our notice not so much from his connection with the school at Pumbadita, which, though brief, was yet of marked benefit to the development of Biblical scholarship at that center of Jewish learning, as for his Chaldee versions of the Hebrew Scriptures (i.e. the Psalms, Proverbs, and Job), particularly of the Hagiographa, of which alone the authorship can be ascribed to him with any certainty (comp. the Rabbinic Bibles). Some Jewish critics credit him with a version of the whole O. Test.; and, indeed, from passages quoted in the Talmud (comp. Moed Kafon, 26. a; Pesachim, 68, a; Menachoth, 110, a; Jama, 32, b; 77, b; Aboda Sara, 44, a; Kiddushin, 13, a; 72, b; Nedarim, 38, a; Baba Kanma, 3, b; Berachoth, 28, a) from a paraphrase with which he is accredited, it would appear that he translated Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hoses, Amos, Obadiah, Zephaniah, and Zechariah, since these passages, are from these books, and are distinctly cited with the declaration כדמתיגםרב יוס, "as R. Joseph has rendered it into Chaldee."

These renderings are, however, almost exactly those given in the Targum of Jonathan ben-Uzziel (a fact which has led some to suppose that this Targum ascribed to Jonathan is in reality Joseph's); and he himself even declared on several occasions, when discussing the meaning of a difficult passage in the Scriptures, "If we had not the Targum on this passage we should not know what it means" (see Sanhedrim, 94, a; Moed Katon, 28, b; Megilla, 3, a). It is therefore unreasonable to suppose him to have himself actually rendered into Chaldee more than the Hagiographa contained (with a Latin version) in the Polyglots of Antwerp (1572), Paris (1645), London (1657), etc. In his day, Joseph b.-Chija must have enjoyed a very enviable reputation for erudition. His knowledge of traditional lore is said to have been so extensive that he was surnamed, both in Palestine and Babylon, Joseph of Sinai, i.e. one acquainted with all the traditions in succession since the giving of the law on Sinai (Horajoth, 14, a; Sanhedrim, 42, a). One of his favorite studies was the Cabalistic Theosophy, the mysteries of which, being contained in the vision of Ezekiel respecting the throne of God (מעשה מרכבה), he endeavored to propound (Chagiga, 18, a). See Bartolocci, Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica, 3, 814; Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebroea, 2, 1171 sq.; Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden, p. 65, etc.; Fürst, Kultur und Literaturgesch. der Juden in Asien, p. 144-155; Grätz, Gesch. der Juden, 4, 408 sq., 553 sq.; Ersch u. Gruber's Allgemeine Encoyklopaidie, sec. 2,  vol. 31, p. 75; Etheridge, Introd. to Heb. Lit. p. 165 sq.; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. s.v.

Joseph ben-Gikatilla.

SEE MOSES (HA-KOHEN) BEN-SAMUEL.

## Joseph ben-Gorion[[@Headword:Joseph ben-Gorion]]

             (also called Josippon), is the name of the reputed author of the celebrated Hebrew chronicle סֵפֶר יוֹסַיפוֹן, the book of Josippon, or הָעַבֵרַי יוֹסַיפוֹן, the Hebrew Josippon, a work which, by the statement of the author, is placed in the sera of Christ, for he says of himself that he is "the priest of Jerusalem" (and this can refer only to the celebrated Jewish historian Flavius Josephus [q.v.]), and furthermore that he was appointed governor of the whole Jewish nation by Titus; and from the days of Saadia (A.D. 950) up to our own time it was quoted both by Jewish and Christian writers as a genuine work of Josephus. Of late, however, critical inquiry has determined the work to be a production of the Middle Ages. The conjecture is that the author was a Jew, and that he flourished about the 9th or 10th century. Zunz, in the Zeitschrift. f. Wissenschaft. d. Judenth. (Berl. 1822, p. 300 sq.), asserted that Joseph ben-Gorion flourished in the 9th century, and that his work must since his day have undergone frequent emendations and alterations. Later Zunz (in his notes on Benjamin of Tudela, ed. Asher, 1841, 2, 246) changed his opinion somewhat, and regarded Joseph as "the [Hebrew] translator and editor of Josephus," and assigns him to "the middle of the latter half of the 10th century," and says of him that his accounts of several nations of his time are as important as his orthography of Italian towns is remarkable." To the same period Steinschneider (Jewish Liter., London, 1857, p. 77) also assigns the work, but he believes the author to have been a native. of Northern Italy, and considers the chronicle "the Hebrew edition of the Latin Hegesippus," and "an offshoot from the fully developed Midrash of Arabian and Latin literature." A still more modern critic, the celebrated Jewish historian Grätz (Gesch. d. Juden, 5, 281, and note 4 in the Appendix of the same volume), holds that the Jewish book, which he also assigns to the 10th century, is simply a translation of an Arabic book of Maccabees, entitled History of the Maccabees of Joseph ben-Gorion (of which parts were published in the Polyglots, Paris, 1645; Lend. 1657) under the title of the Arabic book of Maccabees, and which is extant in two MSS. in the Bodleian library (Uri  Catalogue, Nos. 782, 829), made by a skilful Italian Jew, who enriched it with many original additions. His reason for assigning it to the earlier part of the 10th century is that Danash b.-Tanaim (who flourished about 955) knew the work and spoke of parts of it (comp. Milman's Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, 2, 6, note).

But as to the chronicle itself. It consists of six books. It begins its record with Adam; explains the genealogical table in Genesis 11; then passes on to the history of Rome, Babylon, Cyrus, and the fall of Babylon; resumes again the history of the Jews; describes the times of Daniel, Zerubbabel, Esther, etc.; gives an account of Alexander the Great, his connection, his exploits, and expeditions of his successors; and then continues the history of the Jews; of Heliodorus's assault on the Temple; the translation of the O.T. into Greek; the deeds of the Maccabees; the events of the Herodians; and the last war which terminated in the destruction of the Temple by Titus. The authorities quoted in this remarkable book are:

1. Nicolaus the Damascene;

2. Strabo of Cappadocia;

3. Titus Livius;

4. Togthas of Jerusalem;

5. Porophius of Rome;

6. The history of Alexander, written in the year of his death by Magi;

7. The book of the antediluvian patriarch Cainan b.-Enos;

8. Books of the Greeks, Medians, Persians, and Macedonians;

9. Epistle of Alexander to Aristotle about the wonders of India;

10. Treaties of alliance of the Romans:

11. Cicero, who was in the Holy of Holies of the Temple during the reign of Pompey;

12. The intercalary years of Julius Caesar, composed for the Nazarites and Greeks; 13. The chronicles of the Roman emperors; 14. The constitutional diploma which Vespasian venerated so highly that he kissed every page of it;

15. The Alexandrian Library with its 995 volumes;

16. Jewish histories which are lost;. and,

17. The national traditions which have been translated orally.

The first printed edition of this work appeared in Mantua, 1476-1479, with a preface by Abraham ben-Salmon Conato. A reprint of this edition (the text vitiated), with a Latin version by Münster, was published at Basle, 1541. There appeared an edition from a MS. containing a somewhat different version of the work, and divided into ninety-seven chapters, edited by Tam Ibn-Jachja ben-David (Constantinople, 1510). New editions of it were published in Venice, 1544; Cracow, 1589; Frankfort-on-the- Main, 1689; Amsterdam, 1723; Prague, 1784; Zolkiew, 1805; Vilna, 1819. It was partly translated into Arabic by Zechariah ben-Said el-Temeni about 1223, and into English by Peter Morwyng (Lond. 1558, 1561, 1575, 1579, 1602). There are two other Latin translations, besides the one by Münster, 1541; one was made by the learned English Orientalist, John Gagnier (Oxford, 1716), and one by Breithaupt; the last has also the Hebrew text and elaborate notes, and will always continue to be the student's edition. There are German translations by Michael Adam (Zurich, 1546), Moses b.- Bezaliel (Prague, 1607), Abraham ben-Mordecai Cohen (Amsterdam, 1661), and Seligmann Reis (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1707). Compare, besides the authorities already cited, Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden (Berlin, 1832), p. 146-154; Delitzsch, Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie (Leipzig, 1836), p. 37-40; Carmoly in Jost's Annalen (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1839), 1. 149 sq.; Milman, Hist. of the Jews, 3, 131; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 2, 111-114; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Uebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, 1547-1552; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclopoedia, s.v.

Joseph ben-Isaac Kimchi.

SEE KIZCHI.

Joseph ben-Satia.

SEE SAADIA.

## Joseph ben-Shemtob[[@Headword:Joseph ben-Shemtob]]

             a noted Jewish philosopher, polemic, and commentator, flourished in the middle of the 15th century in Castile, and was in high office at the court of Juan II. He was especially noted in his day as a philosopher, and wrote many philosophical works which form important contributions to the history of Jewish philosophy. He was especially rigid in defense of Judaism as a religious system, in opposition to the Christian, and in that line freely  used Profiat Duran's writings, upon which he commented. SEE PROFIAT. In his later days he lost his position at court through the machinations of the papists and the so called converts from Judaism, and finally died the death of martyrdom about, 1460. His works of especial interest to us are:

(1) Commentary on the celebrated Epistle of Profiat Duran against Christianity (Constantinople, 1577); contained also in Geiger's,ויכוחי קובוֹ(Breslau, 1844): —

(2) Course of Homilies delivered in the synagogue on different Sabbaths on various portions of the Bible, entitled עין הקורא, The Eye of the Reader (still in MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, Codex Michael, 581): —

(3) Commentary on Lamentations, composed at Medina del Campo in the year 1441 (MS. by De Rossi, No. 177): —

(4) Commentary on Genesis 1 :l-6:8, being the Sabbatic lesson which commences the Jewish year SEE HAPHTARAH: — and

(5) Exposition of Deu 15:11. Comp. Steinschneider, in Ersch und Gruber's Allgemeine Encyklop. sec. 2, vol. 31, p. 87-93; Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 1529; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 8:179 sq.; also note 4 in the Appendix; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. s.v.

## Joseph, Joel[[@Headword:Joseph, Joel]]

             SEE WITZENHAUSEN.

## Joseph, Patriarch Of Constantinople[[@Headword:Joseph, Patriarch Of Constantinople]]

             from A.D. 1416 to 1439, is one of the distinguished characters in the history of the Council of Florence. He was for a long time one of the most radical opponents to a union of the Eastern and Western churches, but the cunning Romanists at last ensnared the hoary patriarch, and he was induced, at a time when Rome itself was divided, to throw his influence in favor of the politic Eugenius IV, and actually attended the Council of Florence, there and then argued for union, and finally signed articles of agreement to effect this end. No sooner, however, had he assented than deep remorse for his action, forced upon him mainly by the unfortunate condition of his country, then greatly harassed by the invading Turks, brought him to a sick bed, and he died eight days after signing the instrument, June 10, 1439, leaving the Greek emperor, John Palaeologus, the only support of the Greek Council. See Milman's Latin Christianity, 8, 13 sq.; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. book 3, cent. 15, pt. 2, ch. 2, § 13, 23, note 57. For further details, see the articles SEE BASLE, COUNCIL OF; SEE FLORENCE, COUNCILS OF; SEE GREEK CHURCH. (J.H.W.)

## Josephinism[[@Headword:Josephinism]]

             Under this term we generally understand those ecclesiastical reforms which were introduced by Joseph II, German emperor from 1780 to 1790. It was Joseph's object to form a national Austrian Church, congruent with the territory of the state, closely connected with the strongly centralized secular government, and as far as possible independent of Rome. As, on many points along the boundaries, Austrian dominions ranged under the authority of foreign bishops, a new circumscription of the dioceses was necessary, and it was carried out with little ceremony. A new oath of subjection to the temporal ruler was demanded of the bishops. All imperial decrees were sent to the bishops, and again by them to the pastors, who had to make them known to their flocks from the pulpit. On the other hand, no papal bulls or briefs could be published in the country without an imperial "placet." Connected with this movement was the education of the clergy. The theological students were forbidden to visit the "Collegium Germanico-Hungaricum" in Rome, which institute was replaced by the "Collegium Germanicum et Hungaricum" at Pavia. The philological and theological schools in the monasteries were closed, and diocesan seminaries were opened under the superintendence of an imperial  committee. For the divine services the use of the German language was prescribed, and the Latin was abolished. Pilgrimages outside of the country were forbidden. Rules were given in respect to the luxurious ornamentation of the churches, the magnificent processions, the brilliant illuminations.

All religious orders not engaged in preaching, teaching, or nursing the sick, were dissolved. Between 1770 and 1786 the number of monasteries sank from 2136 to 1425, and that of monks and nuns from 64,890 to 44, 280. On October 13, 1781, an edict of religious toleration was promulgated, according to which the Evangelicals of the Augsburg and Helvetic confessions obtained a limited freedom of worship. Civil disqualifications arising from denominational differences were abolished. Even the position of the Jews was improved. Previous to that edict of toleration, on May 4, an imperial decree had enacted that the oath of obedience to the pope, and the "Professio fidei Tridentinte," usual at the distribution of degrees, were abrogated, and that the bulls "In ccena Domini" and "Unigenitus" were to be torn out of the books of the liturgy. The Roman curia became, of course, greatly alarmed at these proceedings, and in January 1782, pope Pius VI went in person to Vienna. He was politely received without effecting any change, and the more so since the emperor had the support of the most influential prelates of Austro- Hungaria. Joseph, however, died February 20, 1790, and his early death prevented his reforms from taking root. During his immediate successors the old order was again revived. See his biographies by Geissler (Halle, 1783,15 volumes); Meusel (Leipsic, 1790); Perzl (Vienna, eod.); Huber (ibid. 1792); Heyne (Leipsic, 1848, 3 volumes); Ramshorn (ibid. 1861); Meynert (Vienna, 1862); Riehl und Reinohl, Kaiser Josef II als Reform. auf kirchlich. Gebiete (ibid. 1881); Frank, Das Toleranz-Patent Kaiser Josef's II (ibid. 1882); Schmidt, Kaiser Josef II (Berlin, 1875); Leistner, Kaiser Josef's II unvergessliche Gedanken, Ausspriiche und Bestrebungen (Vienna, 1878); Beer, Joseph II (in the Neuen Plutarch, Leipsic, 1842, volume 9); also Ranke, Die deutschen Mdachte und der Furstenbund (Leipsic, 1871, volume 1); Plitt, Herzog, Real-Encyklop, s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. Joseph II. (B.P.)

## Josephites[[@Headword:Josephites]]

             is the name of a congregation of missionary priests of St. Joseph, organized at Lyons in 1656, by a certain Cretenet, a native of Champlitte, in Burgundy, and a surgeon by profession, who consecrated himself to the service at the hospital in Lyons. The first object of these priests was to act as missionaries in the country, and then to engage in charitable works in the different colleges.

There exists also an organization of females, known as "Sisters of St. Joseph," which was instituted by the bishop of Puy in 1650. These sisters, besides doing charitable works, have to care for the hospitals, govern the houses of refuge, and are charged with the instruction of orphans and little children in the schools, and with visiting the sick. Their vows are very simple, and they can always be relieved from them by the bishop in whose diocese they live. See Holyot, Hist. des Ordres Monast. 8:186 sq.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Josephs Tomb[[@Headword:Josephs Tomb]]

             (Kabr Yusef) is briefly described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (2:194), and more popularly in Lieut. Conder's Tent Work (2:74) as follows:

"About six hundred yards north of the well [of Jacob] is the traditional tomb of Joseph, venerated by the members of every religious community in Palestine. The building stands east of the road from Balata to 'Askar, at the end of a row of fine fig-trees. The enclosure is square and roofless, the walls whitewashed and in good repair, for, as an inscription on the south wall, in English, informs the visitor, it was rebuilt by consul Rogers, the friend of the Samaritans, in 1868; it is about twenty-five feet square, and on the north is another building of equal size, but older and partly ruinous, surmounted by a little dome. The tomb itself resembles most of the Moslem cenotaphs a long block, with an arched or vaulted roof having a pointed cross section. It is rudely plastered, and some seven feet long and three feet high. It is placed askew, and nearest to the west wall of the court. A stone bench is built into the east wall, on which three Jews were seated at the time of our second  visit, book in hand, swinging backwards and forwards as they crooned out a nasal chant — a prayer, no doubt, appropriate to the place.

"The most curious point to notice is, however, the existence of two short pillars, one at the bead, and the other at the foot of the tomb, having shallow cup-shaped hollows at their tops. These hollows are blackened by fire, for the Jews have the custom of burning sacrifices on them, small articles, such as handkerchiefs, gold lace, or shawls, being consumed. Whether this practice is also observed by the Samaritans is doubtful.

"The tomb points approximately north and south, thus being at right angles to the direction of Moslem tombs north of Mecca. How the Mohammedans explain this disregard of orientation in so respected a prophet as 'our Lord Joseph,' I have never heard; perhaps the rule is held to be only established since the time of Mohammed. The veneration in which the shrine is held by the Moslem peasantry is, at all events, not diminished by this fact."

## Josephus[[@Headword:Josephus]]

             (Ant. 12, 4, 11) mentions the bedchambers in the Arabian palace of Hyrcanus. The ordinary furniture of a bedchamber in private life is given in 2Ki 4:10. The “bedchamber” in the Temple where Joash was hidden was probably a store-chamber for keeping beds, not a mere bedroom, and thus better adapted to conceal the fugitives (2Ki 11:2; 2Ch 22:11). The position of the bedchamber in the most remote and secret parts of the palace seems marked in Exo 8:3; 2Ki 6:12. SEE BED.

## Josephus (2)[[@Headword:Josephus (2)]]

             (Ι᾿ώσηφος v.r. Φόσηπος), the Graeco-Latin form (1Es 9:34) of the Heb. name JOSEPH SEE JOSEPH (q.v.) 6 (Ezr 10:42).

## Josephus, Flavius[[@Headword:Josephus, Flavius]]

             the celebrated Jewish historian, was born at Jerusalem A.D. 37. His father's name was Mattathias, and in his autobiography (the only source left us to write his history, as the works of his rival, Justus of Tiberias, are unhappily  lost) he lays claim to royal and sacerdotal lineage, and alludes to the renown he enjoyed while yet a youth (Life, 1, 1). His early years seem to have been spent in close study of the Jewish traditions and the O.T. writings. Dissatisfied with all of the three principal Jewish sects, while yet a young man he spent three years as the follower of one Banus, an eremite, in the desert, but at last joined the sect of the Pharisees. He was only 19 when he left Banus, and he joined the Pharisees between 19 and 26, when he went to Rome. Soon afterwards, the imprisonment of some Jewish priests by the procurator Felix afforded him an opportunity of pleading his people's cause before the emperor himself at the Roman capital, whither these men had been sent. On the way he was shipwrecked (some have unwarrantably imagined that he was Paul's companion in that disastrous voyage), but, being rescued by a Cyrenian vessel, he made his way to Rome. He there not only secured the object of his mission, but also ingratiated himself in the favor of the empress, and at length returned home loaded with presents. He found the mass of his countrymen determined oh a revolt from the empire, and he anxiously sought to dissuade them from so rash a course.

The Jews, however, refused to listen to his advice; and the only alternatives for him were either to follow the popular will, and thus perhaps make himself the leader of his people, or to return to Rome, and there receive the rewards of treachery. In his description of the Jewish insurrection he has given us a graphic account of the numerous plots and perils in which he became entangled during this period of his life. After the disastrous retreat of Cestius Gallus from Jerusalem. and the barbarous massacre of the Jews at Sepphoris (q.v.) and the Syrian cities, the most peacefully inclined of the Jews joined the zealots, and Josephus no longer hesitated as to the best course to be pursued. With great ostentation of patriotism and self devotion, he declared in favor of war '"a outrance," and he soon secured for himself the appointment as general. Together with Joazar and Judas he was sent to Galilee, "the province on which the storm would first break." His two colleagues, however, devoted themselves to their priestly functions, and Josephus became the sole commander (Life, 4- 7; War, 2, 20, 4). Finding the Galilean Jews divided among themselves, SEE JOHN OF GISCHALA, and fearing that his command was too weak to meet the army of the approaching Vespasian, he retired to the Jewish stronghold Jotapata, and there awaited the attack of the Romans. For forty-seven days. he encouraged his soldiers to deeds that immortalized his name. (For an interesting description of this siege, see Weber and Holtzmann, Gesch. d. Volkes Israel, 2, 475 sq.; Milman, Hist. of the Jews  [Middleton's edition], 2, 252 sq.) Yet some writers, among them Raphall and Grätz, accuse him even here of treachery and cowardice, alleging that he endeavored to get away from Jotapata on the pretence of desiring to raise an army for its relief, although he could not have left "without either falling into the hands of the Romans or voluntarily joining them." Even after the fall of that fortress he did not surrender to the Romans, but hid himself with forty companions in a cave, and refused to come forth, when his place of refuge was betrayed, until his life was guaranteed him. (See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. 2, 611, Colossians 1; Raphall, Post-Bibl. Hist. Jews, p. 427 sq.) After his surrender to Vespasian he was put in chains, with a view to being sent to Rome for trial before Nero. He evaded this danger by predicting (he distinctly claims the gift of prophecy, War, 3, 8, 9) to Vespasian his future elevation to the imperial throne, but was still held in confinement for three years, until, on the realization of his prediction, his chains were cut from him, as a sign that he had been unjustly bound (War, 4, 10, 7).

Vespasian had been declared emperor by the Roman soldiers in the East, and he immediately set out for the West, leaving Titus in command, with orders to hasten the conclusion of the war still raging in Palestine. In this expedition on Jerusalem Josephus accompanied Titus. Titus had supposed this task, with the assistance of the "renegade" (so Milman calls him), an easy one; but the Jews braved the attack of the Romans much more obstinately than the latter had expected, and, finally, Josephus was induced to go forth and urge his countrymen to capitulate, and thus to save the place from certain and total destruction. The people, by his account. were touched and ready to yield, but the leaders remained obstinate; but the fact is that they were naturally disinclined to listen to the counsels of a man who had quitted them in the hour of their greatest need. They even sought to kill him, and continued the defense to the last extremity. On the downfall of the city, the most intimate friends and relatives. of Josephus were spared at his request, and, in return for his aid and counsel in the siege, a valuable estate in Judaea was assigned him as a residence. Well aware, however, that among his countrymen he would hardly find a safe refuge, he returned with Titus to Rome to enjoy the honors which Vespasian might bestow upon him. He was received with great kindness by the emperor; but, although the privileges of Roman citizenship were conferred upon him and an annual pension awarded him, he was detested by the Romans no less than by the Jews. It is supposed that his death occurred in the early years of Trajan's reign, perhaps A.D. 103. For other facts of a more directly personal  character, such as his three marriages, the names of his sons, etc., see the seventy-six chapters of his life, and the following other passages of his other works: Apion, 1, 9, 10; War, 1; 2, 20, 3 sq.; 21, 2 sq.; 3, 7, 13 sq.; 8, 1 sq.; 9; 6:5; Ant. ed. Havercamp, 1, 5, 228, 536, 545, 682, 982; Suidas, s.v. Ι᾿ώσηπος.

The character of Josephus has been very differently delineated by different writers. From his own works, especially his books against Apion, i t is evident that, though he dealt rather treacherously with his people, he yet felt a pride in the antiquity of the nation and in its ancient glories; and in the description of the misfortunes of the Jews he is by no means wanting in sympathy for them. Thus his account of the miserable fate of Jerusalem is altogether free from that tone of revolting coldness which shocks us in Xenophon's account of the downfall of Athens (Hell. 2, 2, § 3 sq.). Yet the mildest interpretation that his conduct can receive certainly is that he despaired (as earnest patriots never do) of his country, and that he deserted his countrymen in their greatest extremity. Indeed, from the very beginning, he appears to have looked on the national cause as hopeless, and to have cherished the intention of making peace with Rome whenever he could. Thus he told some of the chief men of Tiberias that he was well aware of the invincibility of the Romans, though he thought it safer to dissemble his conviction; and he advised them to do the same, and to wait for a convenient season — περιμένουσι καιρόν (Life, 35; compare War, 3, 5); and we find him again, in his attack on Justus the historian (Life, 65), earnestly defending himself from the charge of having in any way caused the war with Rome. Had this feeling originated in a religious conviction that the Jewish nation had forfeited God's favor, the case, of course, would have been different; but such a spirit of living, practical faith we do not discover in Josephus. Holding in the main the abstract doctrines of a Pharisee, but with the principles and temper of a Herodian, he strove to accommodate his religion to heathen tastes and prejudices; and this by actual commissions (Ottius, Proetermissa a Josepho, appended to his Spicilegium), no less than by a rationalistic system of modification (Smith, Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog. 2, 612). A more favorable opinion is sometimes expressed of Josephus, as by a writer in the Evangelical Quart. Review, 1870, p. 420. Prof. F.W. Farrat (in Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Literature, s.v.) has perhaps best summed up the religious character of Josephus as that of "a strange mixture of the bigoted Pharisee and the time serving  Herodian," and as "mingling the national pride of the patriot with the apostasy of a traitor."

Very different is the opinion of all on the writings of Josephus. Even in his day he was greatly lauded for his literary abilities. Though a Jew by birth, he had so ably acquired the Greek that he could be counted among the classic writers in that language. St. Jerome designates him as the "Graecus Livius" (Epist. sad Eustach.); and, to come nearer our own days, Niebuhr. pronounces him a Greek writer of singular purity (Anc. Hist. 3, 455). But, withal, he is hardly deserving of the epithet. φιλαλήθης, so often bestowed on him (Suid. s.v. Ι᾿ώσηπος; Isidor Pelusiot. 4, Ep. 75: "diligentissimus et φιλαληθέστατος," Jos. Scaliger, De Emend, Temp. Proef., etc.). It is true, he understood the duty and importance of veracity in the historian (Ant. 14, 1, 1; War, 1, 1; c. Apion, 1, 19); nevertheless, "he is," says Niebuhr (Lect. Rom. Hist. 1. c.), "often untrue, and his archaeology abounds in distortions of historical facts, and in falsifications which arise from his inordinate national pride; and wherever he deals in numbers, he shows his Oriental love of exaggeration" (this charge is, in a measure, refuted, however, in Stud. u. Krit. 1853, p. 48). But, even though Josephus may not in all things be implicitly relied upon, his writings are to the theologian especially invaluable, and we may well say, with Casaubon and Farrar, that it is by a singular providence that his works, which throw such a flood of light on Jewish affairs, have been preserved to us. They are of immense service in the entire Biblical department, as may be seen from the frequent references that have been made to his writings throughout this Cyclopaedia, in the elucidation of the history, geography, and archaeology of Scripture. Yet by this it must by no means be inferred that we detract in the least from our former statement, that Josephus was not a man who believed in the inspiration of the Biblical writings. "In spite of his constant assertions (Ant. 10, 11)," says Farrar (in Kitto), "he can have had no real respect for the writings which he so largely illustrates. If he had felt, as a Jew, any deep or religious appreciation of the O.T. history, which he professes to follow (οὐδὲν προθεὶς οὐθ αυ παραλιπών, Ant. 1, procem.), he would not have tampered with it as he does, mixing it with pseudo-philosophical fancies (Apion, 1, 10), with groundless Jewish Hagadcoth or traditions (such as the three years' war of Moses with the Ethiopians, the love of Tharbis for him, etc. Ant. 2, 10, 2), and with quotations from heathen writers of very doubtful authority (Ant. 8, 5, 3, etc.; see Van Dale, De Aristea, p. 211). The worst charge, however,  against him is his constant attempt, by alterations and suppressions (and especially by a rationalistic method of dealing with miracles, which contrasts strangely with his credulous fancies), to make Jewish history palatable to Greeks and Romans, to such an extent that J. Ludolfus calls him 'fabulator saepius quam historicus' (Hist. Ethiop. p. 230). Thus he omits all the most important Messianic prophecies; he manipulates the book of Daniel in a most unsatisfactory manner (Ant. 9, 11); he speaks in a very loose way about Moses and Abraham (Ant. 1, 8, 1; Apion, 2, 15); and, though he can swallow the romance of the pseudo-Aristeas, he rationalizes the account of the Exodus and Jonah's whale (Ant. 2, 16, 5; 9, 10, 2)." On the whole subject of his credibility as a writer, his omissions, his variations, and his panderings to Gentile taste, comp. J.A. Fabricius, De Joseph. et ejus Scriptu, in Hudson's ed.; Van Dale, De Aistecd, 10, 11; De Idololatria, 7; Brinch, Examen list. Flav. Josephi, in Havercamp, 2, 309 sq.; Ottius, Spicilegium ex Josepho; Ittigius, Prolegomena; Usher, Epist. ad Lud. Cappelluin, p. 42; Whiston's Dissertations, etc.

Of still greater interest, perhaps to our readers must be the relation which Josephus, living as he did in the age of Christ himself, sustained towards Christianity. Some have gone so far as to assert not only the authenticity of passages in his writings alluding to Christ, etc. (see below), but have even made out of Josephus an Ebionite Christian (Whiston, Dissert. 1). if not a true follower of Jesus the Christ. Prof. Farrar (in Kitto), speaking on this point, says: "Nothing is more certain than that Josephus was no Christian (ἀπιστῶν τῷ Ιησοῦ ὡς Χριστιῷ, Orig. c. Cels. 1, 35); the whole tone of his mind was alien from the noble simplicity of Christian belief, and, as we have seen already, he was not even a good Jew. Whatever, therefore, may be thought about the passages alluding to John the Baptist (Ant. 18, 5, 2), and James, the Lord's brother (ibid. 20, 9, 1), which may possibly be genuine, there can be no reasonable doubt that the famous allusion to Christ (Ant. 18, 3, 3) is either absolutely spurious or largely interpolated. The silence [partial or total] of Josephus on a subject of such importance, and with which he must have been so thoroughly acquainted, is easily explicable; and it is intrinsically much more probable that he should have passed over the subject altogether (as is done also by his contemporary, Justus of Tiberias, Phot. Cod. Bibl. 33) than that he should only have devoted to it a few utterly inadequate lines. Even if he had been induced to do this by some vague hope of getting something by it from Christians like Flavius Clemens, he certainly would not have expressed himself in  language so strong (ειγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρή), and still less would he have vouched for the Messiahship, the miracles, or the resurrection of Jesus. Justin, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Origen, and even Photius, knew nothing of the passage, nor does it appear till the time of Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiastes 1, 2, Den. Evang. 3, 5), a man for whom Niebuhr can find no better name than 'a detestable falsifier,' and one whose historical credibility is well nigh given up. Whether Eusebius forged it himself or borrowed it from the marginalia of some Christian reader cannot be determined, but that Josephus did not write it [at least in its present form] may be regarded as settled. Nay, the very next sentence (Ant. 17, 3, 4) is a disgusting story, wholly irrelevant to the tenor of the narrative, and introduced in all probability for the sole purpose of a blasphemous parody on the miraculous conception, such as was attempted by various Rabbinical writers (e.g. in the Sepher Toledoth Jeshua; see Wagenseil, Tela Ignea Satanoe; SEE JESUS CHRIST ). That Josephus intended obliquely to discredit some of the chief Christian doctrines by representing them as having been anticipated by the Essenes seems by no means improbable (comp. De Quincey's Works, vol. 9, The Essenes)." For a compendium of the abundant literature on these questions, see Gieseler, Eccl. Hist. sec. 34. The chief treatises are, Daubuz, Pro testimonio Fl. Jos. de Jesu Christ (London, 1706); reprinted in Havercamp; Bohmert, Ueber des Fl. Jos. Zeugniss von Christo (Lpz. 1823); Le Moyne, Var. Sacr. 2, 931 Heinichen, Excurs. 1, ad Euseb. H.E. 3, 331; comp. also Langen, Judenthum in Palastina (Freib. 1866), p. 440 sq.; Stud. u. Krit. 1856, 840 sq.

It remains for us only to add a list of the works of Josephus (here we mainly follow Smith [Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.]), which are,

1. A History of the Jewish War, (περὶ τοῦ Ι᾿ουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου ἣ Ιουδαικῆςἱστορίας περί ἁλώσεως), in seven books. Josephus tells us that he wrote it first in his own language (the Syro-Chaldee), and then translated it into Greek, for the information of European readers (War, 1, 1). The original is no longer extant. The Greek was published about A.D. 75, under the patronage and with the especial recommendation of Titus. Agrippa II, also, in no fewer than sixty-two letters to Josephus, bore testimony to the care and fidelity displayed in it. It was admitted into the Palatine library, and its author was honored with a statue at Rome. It commences with the capture of Jerusalem by Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 170; runs rapidly over the events before Josephus's own time, and gives a detailed account of the fatal war with Rome (Josephus, Life, p. 65;  Eusebius. Hist. Ecclesiastes 3, 9; Jerome, Catal. Script. Eccl. p. 13; Ittigius, Prolegomena; Fabricius, Bibl. Groec. 5, 4; Vossius, De Hist. Groec. p. 239, ed. Westermann): —

2. Jewish Antiquities (Ι᾿ουδαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία), in twenty books, completed about A.D. 93, and addressed to Epaphroditus. The title, as well as the number of books, may have been suggested by the ῾Ρωμαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The work extends from the creation of the world to A.D. 66, the 12th year of Nero, in which the Jews were goaded to rebellion by Gessius Florus. It embraces, therefore, but more in detail, much of the matter of the first and second books on the Jewish War. Both these histories are said to have been translated into Hebrew, of which version, however,. there are no traces, though some have erroneously identified it with the works of the PseudoJosephus. SEE JOSEPH BEN-GORION: —

3. His Life, in one book. This is an autobiography appended to the Antiquities, and is addressed to the same Epaphroditus. It cannot, however, have been written earlier than A.D. 97, since Agrippa II is mentioned in it as no longer living (65): —

4. Κατὰ Α᾿πίωνος (a treatise against Apion), in two books, also addressed to Epaphroditus. It is in answer to such as impugned the antiquity of the Jewish nation on the ground of the silence of Greek writers respecting it. The title, "against Apion," is rather a misnomer, and is applicable only to a portion of the second book (1-13). It exhibits considerable learning, and is highly commended by Jerome. The Greek text is deficient at 2:5-9: —

5. The Fourth of Maccabees (εἰς Μακκαβαίους, ἣ περὶ αὐτοκράτορος λογισμοῦ), in one book. The genuineness of this treatise has been called in question by many (see Cave, Hist. Lit. Script. Eccles. p. 22), but it is attributed to Josephus by Eusebius, Jerome, Philostorgius, and others (see Fabricius, Bibl. Groec. 5, 7; Ittigius, Prolegomena). Certainly, however, it does not read like his works. It is an extremely declamatory account of the martyrdom of Eleazar (an aged priest), and of seven youths and their mother, in the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes; and this is prefaced by a discussion on the supremacy which reason possesses de jure over pleasure and pain. Its title has reference to the zeal for God's law displayed by the sufferers in the spirit of the Maccabees. There is a paraphrase of it by Erasmus, and in some Greek copies of the Bible it was inserted as the  fourth book of the Maccabees (Fabricius, 1. c.). There are, besides these, also attributed to him: —

6. The treatise Περὶ τοῦ παντός, which was certainly not written by Josephus. For an account of it, see Photius, Cod. 48; Fabricius, Bibl. Grec. 5, 8; Ittigius, Prolegomena, ad fin.

7. Jerome (Proef. ad Lib. 11 Comm. ad Esaiam) speaks of a work of one Josephus on Daniel's vision of the seventy weeks, but he probably refers to some other Josephus: —

8. At the end of his Antiquities Josephus mentions his intention of writing a work in four books on the Jewish notions of God and his essence, and on the rationale of the Mosaic laws. but this task he never accomplished. At any rate, the works have not come down to us. (See Whistolo's note, Ant. ad fin.; Fabricius, Bibl. Grec. 5, 9.)

The writings of Josephus first appeared in print in a Latin translation, with no notice of the place or date of publication: the edition seems to have contained only a portion of the Antiquities. These, with the seven books of the Jewish War, were reprinted by Schusler (Augsb. 1470) in Latin; and there were many editions in the same language of the whole works, and of portions of them, before the editio princeps of the Greek text appeared at Basel, 1544, edited by Arlenius. Since then the works of Josephus have frequently been printed, both in the Greek and in many other languages. One of the most valuable editions is that by Hudson (Oxf. 1720, 2 vols. fol.). The text is founded on a most careful and extensive collation of MSS., and the edition is further enriched by notes and indices. The principal English versions are those of Lodge (Lond. 1602); one from the French of D'Andilly (Oxford, 1676, reprinted at London, 1683); that of L'Estrange (Lond. 1702), and that of Whiston (London, 1737). The two last mentioned versions have frequently been reprinted in various shapes. See, besides the authorities already noticed, Grätz, Geschichte d. Juden, 3, 399 sq.; Weber and Holtzmann, Gesch. d. Judenth. 2, 467 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten, 1, 225, 319, 444; De Wette, Hebr. jud. Archaologie, p. 9; Ewald, Gesch. Christus (1855), p. 104 sq.; Milman, Hist. of the Jews. vol. 2 (see Index in vol. 3); Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 2, 117 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Joses[[@Headword:Joses]]

             (Ι᾿ωσῆς, perhaps for Joseph, which is sometimes thus written in the Talmud, יוֹסֵיfor יוֹסֵ; see Lightfoot on Act 1:23; and, indeed, Ι᾿ωσήφ actually appears in some codices for Ι᾿ωσῆς in Matthew, Mark 15, and Acts; but better MSS. have Ι᾿ωάννης in Matthew 13; others have Ι᾿ησοῦς in Luke), the name of two or three persons in the New Testament.

1. Erroneously in the A.V. (Luk 3:29) JOSE SEE JOSE (q.v.).

2. The son of Mary and Cleopas, and brother of James the Less, of Simon, and of Jude, and, consequently, one of those who are called "the brethren" of our Lord (Mat 13:55; Mat 27:56; Mar 6:3; Mar 15:40; Mar 15:47). SEE JAMES; SEE JUDE. He was the only one of these brethren who was not an apostle – a circumstance which has given occasion to some unsatisfactory conjecture. It is, perhaps, more remarkable that three of them were apostles than that the fourth was not. A.D. 28. — Kitto. SEE JESUS CHRIST.

3. (Act 4:36.) SEE BARNABAS.

## Joshah[[@Headword:Joshah]]

             (Heb. Yoshah', יוֹשָׁה, prob. establisher; Sept. Ι᾿ωσίας, v.r. Ι᾿ωσία; Vulg. Josa), son of Amaziah, and one of the chief Simeonites. the increase of whose family induced them to migrate to the valley of Gedor, whence they expelled the aboriginal Hamites (1Ch 4:34). B.C. cir. 711.

## Joshaphat[[@Headword:Joshaphat]]

             (1Ch 11:43). SEE JEHOSHAPHAT, 1.

## Joshaviah[[@Headword:Joshaviah]]

             (Heb. Yoshavyah', יוֹשִׁוְיָה, Jehovah is sufficient, otherwise i.q. Josibiah; Sept. Ι᾿ωσία; Vulg. Josaja), son of Elnaam, and (with his brother Jeribai) one of David's famous bodyguard (1Ch 11:46). B.C. 1046.

## Joshbekashah[[@Headword:Joshbekashah]]

             (Heb. Yoshbekashah', יָשְׁבְּקָשָׁה, prob. for ישֶׁב בְּקָשָׁה, seat in hardness; Sept. Σεβακαιτάν and Ι᾿εσβακατάν v.r. Ι᾿εσβασακά; Vulg. Jesbacas. sa), one of the sons of Heman, and leader of the seventeenth division of Temple musicians (1Ch 25:4-24). B.C. 1014.

## Josheb-bassebeth[[@Headword:Josheb-bassebeth]]

             (Heb. Yosheb'-bash-She'beth, ישֶׁב בִּשֶּׂבֶתsitting in the session, i.e. council; Sept. Ι᾿εβοσθέ; Vulg. sedens in cathedra; Auth. Vers. "that sat in the seat"), the chief of David's three principal heroes (2Sa 23:8); called in the parallel passage (1Ch 11:11) JASHOBEAM SEE JASHOBEAM (q.v.).

## Joshua[[@Headword:Joshua]]

             (Heb. Yehoshu'a, יַהוֹשׁוּע, Jehovah is his help, or Jehovah the Savior, according to Pearson, On the Creed, art. 2, p. 89, ed. 1843:; Sept., N.T., and Josephus Ι᾿ησοῦς; Auth. Vers. "Jehoshua" in Num 13:16, and "Jehoshuah" in 1Ch 7:27; "Jesus" in Act 7:45; Heb 4:8, SEE JESHUA; SEE JESUS ), the name of several men.

I. The son of Nun, of the tribe of Ephraim, the assistant and successor of Moses, whose history is chiefly contained in the book that bears his name. His name was originally HOSHEA (הוֹשֵׁע, salvation, Num 13:8), and it seems that the subsequent alteration of it by Moses (Num 13:16) was significant, and proceeded on the same principle as that of Abram into Abraham (Gen 17:5), and of Sarai into Sarah (Gen 17:15). In Neh 8:17, he is called by the equivalent name JESHUA (יֵשׁוּע, salvation). SEE JESUS.

1. Personal History. — According to the Tsemach David, Joshua was born in Egypt, in the year of the Jewish era 2406 (B.C. 1037); but as he was probably about the age of Caleb, with whom he was associated, we may assign his birth to B.C. cir. 1698 (or, as below, 1693). The future captain of invading hosts grew up a slave in the brick fields of Egypt. Born about the time when Moses fled into Midian, he was a man of some forty years when he saw the ten plagues and shared in the hurried triumph of the Exodus. The keen eye of the aged Lawgiver soon discerned in Hoshea  those qualities which might be required in a colleague or successor to himself. In the Bible he is first mentioned as being the victorious commander of the Israelites in their battle against the Amalekites at Rephidim (Exo 17:8-16 B.C. 1658. When Moses ascended Mount Sinai to receive for the first time (compare Exo 24:13; Exo 33:11) the two Tables, Joshua, who is called his minister or servant, accompanied him part of the way, and was the first to accost him in his descent (Exo 32:17). Soon afterwards he was one of the twelve chiefs who were sent (Num 13:17) to explore the land of Canaan, and one of the two (14:6) who gave an encouraging report of their journey. B.C. 1657. The forty years of wandering were almost passed, and Joshua was one of the few survivors, when Moses, shortly before his death, was directed (Num 27:18) to invest Joshua solemnly and publicly with definite authority, in connection with Eleazar the priest, over the people (Deu 3:28). After this, God himself gave Joshua a charge by the mouth of the dying Lawgiver (Deu 31:14; Deu 31:23). B.C. 1618. Under the direction of God again renewed (Joshua 1, 1), Joshua, now in his 85th year (Josephus, Ant. 5, 1, 29), assumed the command of the people at Shittim, sent spies into Jericho, crossed the Jordan, fortified a camp at Gilgal, circumcised the people, kept the Passover, and was visited by the captain of the Lord's host. (See below.) A miracle made the fall of Jericho more terrible to the Canaanites. A miraculous repulse in the first assault on Ai impressed upon the invaders the warning that they were the instruments of a holy and jealous God. Ai fell; and the law was inscribed on Mount Ebal, and read by their leader in the presence of all Israel. The treaty which the fear stricken Gibeonites obtained deceitfully was generously respected by Joshua. It stimulated and brought to a point the hostile movements of the five confederate chiefs of the Amorites. Joshua, aided by an unprecedented hail storm and a miraculous prolongation of the day (see below), obtained a decisive victory over them at Makkedah, and proceeded at once to subjugate the south country as far as Kadesh-barnea and Gaza. He returned to the camp at Gilgal master of half of Palestine.

In another campaign he marched to the waters of Merom, where he met and overthrew a confederacy of the Canaanitish chiefs in the north, under Jabin, king of Hazor; and in the course of a protracted war he led his victorious soldiers to the gates of Zidon and into the valley of Lebanon under Hermon. In six years, six nations, with thirty-one kings, swell the roll of his conquests; amongst others the Anakim — the old terror of Israel —  are specially recorded as destroyed everywhere except in Philistia. It must be borne in mind that the extensive conquests of Joshua were not intended to achieve, and did not achieve the complete extirpation of the Canaanites, many of whom continued to occupy isolated strongholds throughout the land. (See below.)

Joshua, now stricken in years, proceeded, in conjunction with Eleazar and the heads of the tribes, to complete the division of the conquered land; and when all was allotted, Timnath-serah in Mount Ephraim was assigned by the people as Joshua's peculiar inheritance. The tabernacle of the congregation was established at Shiloh, six cities of refuge were appointed, forty-eight cities assigned to the Levites, and the warriors of the trans- Jordanic tribes dismissed in peace to their homes.

After an interval of rest, Joshua convoked an assembly from all Israel. He delivered two solemn addresses reminding them of the marvelous fulfilment of God's promises to their fathers, and warned them of the conditions on which their prosperity depended; and, lastly, he caused them to renew their covenant with God at Shechem, a place already famous in connection with Jacob (Gen 35:4) and Joseph (Jos 24:32). He died at the age of 110 years, and was buried in his own city, Timnath-serah (Joshua 24). B.C. 1593. According to Schwarz (Palest. p. 147), his grave, ornamented with a handsome monument, is still pointed out at Kefar Charas.

2. His Character. — Joshua's life has been noted as one of the very few which are recorded in history with some fullness of detail, yet without any stain upon them. In his character have been traced, under an Oriental garb, such features as chiefly kindled the imagination of Western chroniclers and poets in the Middle Ages: the character of a devout warrior, blameless and fearless, who has been taught by serving as a youth how to command as a man; who earns by manly vigor a quiet, honored old age; who combines strength with gentleness, ever looking up for and obeying the divine impulse with the simplicity of a child, while he wields great power and directs it calmly, and without swerving, to the accomplishment of a high, unselfish purpose.

All that part of the book of Joshua which relates his personal history seems to be written with the unconscious, vivid power of an eyewitness. We are not merely taught to look with a distant reverence upon the first man who bears the name which is above every name. We stand by the side of one who is admitted to hear the words of God, and see the vision of the  Almighty. The image of the armed warrior is before us as when in the sight of two armies he lifted up his spear over unguarded Ai. We see the majestic presence which inspired all Israel (Jos 4:14) with awe; the mild father who remonstrated with Achan; the calm, dignified judge who pronounced his sentence; the devoted worshipper prostrating himself before the captain of the Lord's host. We see the lonely man in the height of his power, separate from those about him, the last survivor, save one, of a famous generation; the honored old man of many deeds and many sufferings, gathering his dying energy for an attempt to bind his people more closely to the service of God whom he had so long served and worshipped, and whom he was ever learning to know more and more.

The great work of Joshua's life was more exciting but less hopeful than that of Moses. He gathered the first fruits of the autumn harvest where his predecessor had sown the seed in spring. It was a high and inspiring task to watch beside the cradle of a mighty nation, and to train its early footsteps in laws which should last for centuries; and it was a fit end to a life of expectation to gaze with longing eyes from Pisgah upon the Land of Promise. But no such brightness gleamed upon the calm close of Joshua's life. Solemn words, and dark with foreboding, fell from him as he sat "under the oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord in Shechem." The excitement of his battles was past; and there had grown up in the mind of the pious leader a consciousness that it is the tendency of prosperity and success to make a people wanton and worldly minded, idolaters in spirit if not in act, and to alienate them from God.

Holy Scripture itself suggests (Heb 4:8) the consideration of Joshua as a type of Christ. Many of the Christian fathers have enlarged upon this view; and Bishop Pearson, who has collected their opinions (On the Creed, art. 2, p. 87-90, and 94-96, ed. 1843), points out the following and many other typical resemblances:

(1.) the name common to both;

(2.) Joshua brings the people of God into the land of promise, and divides the land among the tribes; Jesus brings his people into the presence of God, and assigns to them their mansions;

(3.) as Joshua succeeded Moses and completed his work, so the Gospel of Christ succeeding the law, announced One by whom all that believe  are justified from all things from which we could not be justified by the Law of Moses (Act 13:39);

(4.) as Joshua, the minister of Moses, renewed the rite of circumcision, so Jesus, the minister of the circumcision, brought in the circumcision of the heart (Rom 2:29; Rom 15:8).

3. Difficulties in his Narrative. — It has been questioned whether the captain of the Lord's host (Joshua 5, 13-15) was a created being or not. Dr. W.H. Mill discusses this point at full length and with great learning, and decides in favor of the former alternative (On the Historical Character of St. Luke's First Chapter. Camb. 1841. p. 92). But J.G. Abicht (De Duce Exercitus, etc., ap. Nov. Thes. Theologico-philolog. 1, 503) is of opinion that he was the uncreated angel, the Son of God. Compare also Pfeiffer, Dif. Script. Loc. p. 173. SEE ANGEL.

The treatment of the Canaanites by their Jewish conquerors is fully discussed by Dean Graves, On the Pentateuch, pt. 3, lect. 1. He concludes that the extermination of the Canaanites was justified by their crimes, and that the employment of the Jews in such extermination was quite consistent with God's method of governing the world. Professor Fairbairn (Typology of Scripture, bk. 3, ch. 4, § 1, ed. 1854) argues with great force and candor in favor of the complete agreement of the principles on which the war was carried on by Joshua with the principles of the Christian dispensation. SEE CANAANITES.

Among the supernatural occurrences in the life of Joshua, — none has led to so much discussion as the prolongation of the day of the battle of Makkedah (10, 51, 14). No great difficulty is found, in deciding as Pfeiffer has done (Diff. Script. loc. p. 175) between the lengths of this day and that of Hezekiah (2Ki 20:11), and in connecting both days with the Egyptian tradition mentioned by Herodotus, 2, 142. But since modern science revealed the stupendous character of this miracle, modern criticism has made several attempts to explain it away. It is regarded by Le Clerc, Dathe, and others as no miracle, but an optical illusion, by Rosenmüller, following Ilgen, as a mistake of the time of day; by Winer and many recent German critics, with whom Dr. Davidson (Introd. to O.T. p. 644) seems to agree, as a mistake of the meaning or the authority of a poetical contributor to the book of Jasher. So Ewald (Gesch. Isr. 2, 326) traces in the latter part of 2Ki 20:13 an interpolation by the hand of that anonymous Jew whom he supposes to have written the book of Deuteronomy, and  here to have misunderstood the vivid conception of an old poet; and he cites numerous similar conceptions from the old poetry of Greece, Rome, Arabia, and Peru. But the literal and natural interpretation of the text, as intended to describe a miracle, is sufficiently vindicated by Deyling, Observ. Sacr. 1, § 19, p. 100; and J.G. Abicht, De statione Solis ap. Nov. Thes. Theol.-philol. 1, 516; and is forcibly stated by Bishop Watson in the fourth letter in his Apology for the Bible. Barzillai (Josua und die Sonne, from the Italian, Trieste, 1869) understands the word,דּוֹ, "stand still" (lit. be dumb), to signify merely cease to shine, and the expression "hasted not to go down a whole day" as equivalent to withheld its full light! — in other words, there was an eclipse: how this could be of service to the Hebrews does not appear. SEE GIBEON; SEE JASHER.

4. Length of his Administration. — According to Josephus (Ant. 5, 1, 29), Joshua commanded the Jews twenty-five years, but, according to other Jewish chronologers, twenty-seven years. The Tsemach David, on the years of the Jewish era 2489 and 2496, remarks: "It is written in the Seder Olam that Joshua judged Israel twenty-five years, commencing from the year 2488, immediately from the death of Moses, to the year 2516. This, however, would not be known to us but for cabalistic tradition, but in some degree also by reasoning," etc. Hottinger (Smegma, p. 469) says: "According to the Midrash, Rahab was ten years old when the Israelites left Egypt; she played the harlot during the forty years in which the Israelites were in the desert. She became the wife of Joshua, and eight prophets descended from her, viz. Jeremiah, Mahasia, Hanamael, Shallum, Baruch, Ezekiel. Some say also that Huldah the prophetess was her descendant." Some chronologers have endeavored to reduce the rule of Joshua to seventeen, and others to twenty-one years. There is no good reason for departing from the number assigned by Josephus (see Meth. Quar. Rev. 1856, p. 450). SEE CHRONOLOGY.

5. Other Traditionary Notices. — Lightfoot (Hor. Heb. in Mat 1:5, and Chronogr. Lucoe proemis. 4, § 3) quotes Jewish traditions likewise to the effect that the sepulchre of Joshua was adorned with an image of the sun in memory of the miracle of Ajalon. The Sept. and the Arab. Ver. add to Jos 24:30 the statement that in his sepulchre were deposited the flint knives which were used for the circumcision at Gilgal (Jos 5:2).  There also occur some vestiges of the deeds of Joshua in other historians besides those of his own country. Procopius mentions a Phoenician inscription near the city of Tingis in Mauritania, the sense of which was: "We are those who fled before the face of Joshua the robber, the son of Nun" (De Bell. Vandal. 2, 10). Suidas (sub voce Χαναάν): "We are the Canaanites whom Joshua the robber persecuted." Compare Fabricii Codex Pseudepigraphus Veteris Testamenti, 1, 889 sq., and the doubts respecting this statement in Dale, De Origine et Progressu Idolatrioe, p. 749 sq. Ewald (Gesch. Isr. 2, 297, 298) gives sound reasons for forbearing to use this story as authentic history. It is, however, accepted by Rawlinson (Bampton Lecture for 1859, 3, 91). A letter of Shaubech, byש, king of Armenia Minor, in the Samaritan book of Joshua (ch. 26), styles Joshua אכֹדיב אלקאתול, lupus percussor, "the murderous wolf;" or, according to another reading in the book Juchasin (p. 154, f. 1), and in the Shalsheleth Rakkabbalah (p. 96), זאב ערבות, lupus vespertinus, "the evening wolf" (comp. Hab 1:8; Hottinger, Historia Orientalis, Tiguri, 1651, p. 40 sq.; Buddeus, Hist. Eccles. p. 964 sq.). A comparison of Hercules, according to the Phoenician and Greek mythology, with Joshua has been attempted by Hercklitz (Quod Hercules idem sit ac Josua, Lipsiae, 1706; comp. Anton. Commpar. libror. sac. V.T., et scrpt. profan. 4, 5, Gorlic. 1817).

6. Additional Literature on Joshua personally, and his Exploits. — The principal occurrences in the life of Joshua are reviewed by Bishop Hall in his Contemplations on the O.T. bks. 7, 8, and 9. –See also T. Smith, Hist. of Joshua (Lond. 1862); Overton, Life of Joshua (Lond. 1866); Hess, Gesch. Josuas (Zur. 1759); Masius, Josuoe historia (Antw. 1754); Plumptre, Hist. of Joshua (Lond. 1848).

## Joshua (Or Jeshua) Ben-Jehudah[[@Headword:Joshua (Or Jeshua) Ben-Jehudah]]

             (called in Arabic Abulfarag Forkan Ibn-Assad), quoted by Aben-Ezra as R. Joshua (ר יושועה), a distinguished Jewish philosopher, grammarian, and commentator of the Karaite sect, flourished in the 11th century. From his great piety and extensive knowledge, he obtained the honorable appellation of the aged or presbyter (Ha-Saken, A-Sheikh). His expositions, which  cover the whole of the Old Test., are still in MS. The only fragments printed are given by Aben-Ezra on Gen 28:12; Gen 49:27; Exo 3:2; Exo 3:13; Exo 4:4; Exo 6:3; Exo 6:13; Exo 7:3; Exo 7:12; Exo 8:22; Exo 10:6; Exo 12:5; Exo 15:4; Exo 17:16; Exo 22:7; Exo 35:5; Lev 16:1; Hos 5:7; Joe 3:1; Amo 9:10; Oba 1:17; Jon 3:3; Mic 2:7; Mic 7:12; Hab 2:7; Zep 3:1; Hag 2:10; Mal 2:6; Dan 1:3; Dan 2:4; Dan 4:17; Dan 7:9; Dan 12:2; Psa 88:1; Psa 109:8; Psa 110:3; Psa 119:160; Psa 122:1; Psa 149:6. Compare Delitzsch, in Aaron ben-Elias, עִוֹ חיי (Leipzig, 1844), p. 315 sq.; Pinsker, Lickute Kadmoniot (Vienna, 1860), text, p. 117; Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, 6, 94 sq.; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. s.v.

## Joshua Narboni[[@Headword:Joshua Narboni]]

             SEE VIDAL.

## Joshua, Book Of[[@Headword:Joshua, Book Of]]

             the first in order of the,רַאשׁוֹנַיםנְבַיאי, or Former. Prophets in the Hebrew Canon. SEE BIBLE.

It is so called from the personage who occupies the principal place in the narration of events contained therein, and may be considered as a continuation of the Pentateuch, since it commences with "vav continuative" in the word יִיְהַי, which may be rendered thereupon it happened.  I. Contents. — This book gives an account of the fortunes of the Israelites from the death of Moses to that of Joshua, the son of Nun. Beginning with the appointment of Joshua to succeed Moses as the leader of the people, it proceeds to describe the arrangements made by Joshua in prospect of passing over Jordan (3); the crossing of the river, and the setting up of a memorial on the further side at Gilgal (3-4); the dismay which this occasioned to the Canaanites (Jos 5:1); the circumcision of the males among the people. that rite having been neglected in the wilderness; the observance of the Passover by them in the camp at Gilgal; the ceasing of the manna on the day after they had entered Canaan (Jos 5:2-12); the encouragement given to Joshua to proceed on his enterprise by the appearance of an angel to him (Jos 5:13-15); the siege and capture of Jericho (6); the defeat of the Israelites at Ai (7); the taking of Ai (Jos 8:1-29); the writing of the law on tables of stone, and the solemn repetition from Ebal and Gerizim of the blessings and the curses which Moses had written in the book of the law (Jos 8:30-35); the confederation of the kings of Northern Canaan against the Israelites; the cunning device by which the Gibeonites secured themselves from being destroyed by the Israelites; the indignation of the other Canaanites against the Gibeonites, and the confederation of the kings around Jerusalem against Joshua, with their signal defeat by him (9, 10); the overthrow at the waters of Megiddo of the great northern confederacy, with the destruction of the Anakim (11); the list of kings whose country the Israelites had taken under Moses and Joshua (12); the division of the country, both the parts conquered and those yet remaining under the power of the Canaanites, among the different tribes, chiefly by lot; the setting up of the tabernacle in Shiloh; the appointment of cities of refuge and of cities for the Levites; the return of the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh, to their possessions on the east of the Jordan, after the settlement of their brethren in Canaan (13-22); and the farewell addresses of Joshua to the people, his death and burial (23-24). The book naturally divides itself into two parts; the former (1-12) containing an account of the conquest of the land; the latter (8-24) of the division of it among the tribes. These are frequently cited distinctively as the historical and the geographical portions of the book.

a. The first twelve chapters form a continuous narrative, which seems never to halt or flag. The description is frequently so minute as to show the hand not merely of a contemporary, but of an eyewitness. An awful sense  of the divine Presence reigns throughout. We are called out from the din and tumult of each battle field to listen to the still small voice. The progress of events is clearly foreshadowed in the first chapter (Jos 1:5-6). Step by step we are led on through the solemn preparation, the arduous struggle, the crowning triumph. Moving everything around, yet himself moved by an unseen power, the Jewish leader rises high and calm amid all.

b. The second part of the book (ch. 13-21) has been aptly compared to the Domesday book of the Norman conquerors of England. The documents of which it consists were doubtless the abstracts of such reports as were supplied by the men whom Joshua sent out (Jos 18:8) to describe the land. In the course of time it is probable that changes were introduced into their reports whether kept separately among the national archives, or embodied in the contents of a book — by transcribers adapting them to the actual state of the country in later times when political divisions were modified, new towns sprung up, and old ones disappeared (comp. the two lists of Levitical towns, Joshua 21 and 1Ch 6:54, etc.).

II. Design. — The object of the book is manifestly to furnish a continuation of the history of the Israelites from the point at which it is left in the closing book of the Pentateuch, and at the same time to illustrate the faithfulness of Jehovah to his word of promise, and his grace in aiding his people by miraculous interference to obtain possession of the land promised to Abraham. The ground idea of the book, as Maurer (Comment. p. 3) observes, is furnished by God's declaration to Joshua, recorded 1, 5, 6, that the work which Moses commenced he should finish by subduing and dividing to the tribes of Israel the Promised Land. The book, therefore, may be regarded as setting forth historically the grounds on which the claims of Israel to the proprietorship of the land rested; and as possessing, consequently, not merely a historical, but also a constitutional and legal worth. As illustrating God's grace and power in dealing with his people, it possesses also a religious and spiritual interest.

III. Unity. — On this head a variety of opinions have been entertained. It has been asserted,

1. That the book is a collection of fragments from different hands, put together at different times, and the whole revised and enlarged by a later writer. Some make the number of sources whence these fragments have been derived ten (Herwerden, Disp. de Libro Jos. Groning. 1826); others  five, including the reviser (Knobel, Exeget. Hbk. pt. 13; Ewald, Gesch. der Israel. 1, 73 sq.); while others content themselves with three (Bleek, Einleit. ins. A.T. p. 325).

2. That it is a complete and uniform composition, interspersed with glosses and additions more or less extensive.

3. That the first part is the composition of one author; but the second betrays indications of being a compilation from various sources (Hävernick Einleit. 2, 1, 34).

4. That the book is complete and uniform throughout, and, as a whole, is the composition of one writer. It is impossible here to enter into all the details of this discussion. The reader will find these fully presented by De Wette, Einleit. ins. A.T., 4th and subsequent editions; Havernick, Einleit. 1, 1, 1; König, Alt-testamentl. Studien, 1, 4; Maurer, Comment.; Keil, Comment. E. T. p. 3; Bleek, Einleit. ins. A.T., p. 311; Knobel, in the Exeget. Handbuch, pt. 13; and Davidson, Introd. to the O.T. 1, 412.

a. Events alleged to be twice narrated in this. book are. Joshua's decease, ch. 23 and 24; the command to appoint twelve men, one out of each tribe, in connection with the passing over Jordan (Jos 3:12; Jos 4:3); the stoning of Achan and his dependents (Jos 7:25); the setting of an ambush for the taking of Ai (Jos 8:9; Jos 8:12); the rest from war of the land (Jos 11:23; Jos 14:15); the command to Joshua concerning dividing the land (Jos 13:6); and the granting of Hebron to Caleb (Jos 14:13; Jos 15:13). This list we have transcribed from Knobel (Exeget. Hdbk. 13, 498). Is it incredible that Joshua should have twice assembled the representatives of the people to address them before his decease? May he not have felt that, spared beyond his expectation, it behooved him to avail himself of the opportunity thus afforded to address once more to the people words of counsel and admonition? In the case of the grant to Caleb of Hebron there is undoubtedly a repetition of the same fact, but it is such a repetition as might proceed from the same pen; for the two statements are made in different connections, the one in connection with Caleb's personal merits, the other in connection with the boundaries and occupation allotted to Judah. The taking of Ai will be considered further on. As for the other in. stances, we leave them to the judgment of our readers.

b. Of the alleged discrepancies, one on which much stress has been laid is, that in various parts of the book Joshua is said to have subdued the whole  land and destroyed the Canaanites (Jos 11:10; Jos 12:7 sq.; Jos 21:43; Jos 22:4), whereas in others it is stated that large portions of the land were not conquered by Joshua (Jos 13:1 sq.; Jos 17:14 sq.; Jos 18:3 sq.; Jos 23:5-12). It is worthy of note, however, in the outset, that this is a discrepancy which pervades the book, and on which, consequently, no argument for diversity of authorship, as between the first and the second parts of it, can be built. Again, a discrepancy of this sort is of a kind so obvious, that it is exactly such as a compiler, coolly surveying the materials he is putting together, would at once detect and eliminate; whereas an original writer might write so as to give the appearance of it from looking at the same object from different points of view in the course of his writing. Viewed in relation to purpose and effect, the land was conquered and appropriated;. Israel was settled in it as master and proprietor, the power of the Canaanites was broken, and God's covenant to his people was fulfilled. But through various causes, chiefly the people's own fault, the work was not literally completed; and therefore, viewed in relation to what ought to have been done and what might have been done, the historian could not but record that there yet remained some enemies to be conquered, and some portions of the land to be appropriated. It was intended (Exo 23:28; Exo 23:30) (Exo 23:28; Exo 23:30) that the people should occupy the land little by little. In like manner, it can not be allowed that the general statement (Jos 11:23) that Joshua gave the land unto all Israel according to their divisions by their tribes is inconsistent with the fact (Jos 18:1; Jos 19:51) that many subsequent years passed before the process of division was completed and the allotments finally adjusted.

The boundaries of the different tribes, it is said, are stated sometimes with greater, sometimes with less exactness. Now this may be a fault of the surveyors employed by Joshua; but it is scarcely an inconsistency to be charged on the writer of the book who transcribed their descriptions. Again, the divine promise that the coast of Israel shall extend to the Euphrates (Jos 1:4) is not inconsistent with the fact that the country which Joshua was commanded to divide (Jos 13:16) does not extend so far. Again, the statement (Jos 13:3) that Ekron, etc., remained yet to be possessed is not inconsistent with the subsequent statement (Jos 15:45) that it was assigned to Judah. Dr. Davidson gives no proof either of his assertion that the former text is in fact subsequent to the latter, or of his supposition that Ekron was in the possession of Judah at the time of its assignment.  Another apparent discrepancy has been found between Jos 22:2; Jos 24:14; Jos 24:23. How, it is asked, could there be "gross idolatry" amongst a people who had in all things conformed to the law of God given by Moses? This difficulty is dealt with by Augustine (Quoest. in Jos. qu. 29), who solves it by understanding the injunction of Joshua to refer to alienation of heart on the part of the people from God. This explanation is followed in substance by Calvin and others, and it is apparently the true one. Had Joshua known that "gross idolatry" was practiced by the people, he would have taken vigorous measures before this to extirpate it. But against secret and heart idolatry he could use only words of warning and counsel.

Another discrepancy is thus set forth by Dr. Davidson (Introd. 1, p. 415): "It is related that the people assembled at Sichem, 'under an oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord,' and 'they presented themselves before God,' implying that the tabernacle and ark were there. But we know from 18:1 that the tabernacle had been removed from its former place at Gilgal to Shiloh, where it remained for a long period after Joshua's death" (1Sa 3:21; 1Sa 4:3). Here are several mistakes. The phrase "before God" (לַפְנֵי הָאֵֹּלהַים) does not necessarily mean "before the ark of the Lord" (comp. Gen 27:7; Jdg 11:11; Jdg 20:1; 1Ki 17:1, etc.; Hengstenberg, Beitr. 3, 43); and it is not related that "the people assembled under an oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord," but that Joshua "took a great stone and set it up there under the oak that was within the sanctuary of the Lord" (24:26). The oak referred to was probably a well known one that stood within the spot which had been the first sanctuary of the Lord in Canaan (Gen 12:6-7), and where the nation had been convened by Joshua, on first entering the Promised Land, to listen to the words of the law (Jos 8:30-35). No place more fitting as the site of a memorial stone such as Joshua is here said to have set up could be found.

These are the only discrepancies that have even the appearance of seriously affecting the claim of the book to be regarded as the work of one author throughout. The others, which have been discovered and urged by some recent critics in Germany, are such that it seems unnecessary to take up space by noticing them. The reader will find them noted and accounted for in the Introduction to Keil's Commentary on Joshua, p. 9 sq. The treatment of the Canaanites which is sanctioned in this book has been denounced for its severity by Eichhorn and earlier writers. But there is nothing in it inconsistent with the divine attribute of justice, or with God's ordinary way of governing the world. SEE JOSHUA; also SEE CANAANITES.  Therefore the sanction which is given to it does not impair the authority of this book. Critical ingenuity has searched it in vain for any incident or sentiment inconsistent with what we know of the character of the age, or irreconcilable with other parts of canonical Scripture.

c. The alleged differences of phraseology and style in different parts of the book might deserve more extended notice were it not for the very unsatisfactory state in which this method of inquiry as yet is. Without doubt, it is true that, if it can be shown that these differences are such as to indicate diversity of authorship, the argument must be admitted as legitimate, and the conclusion as valid; but before dealing with such questions, it would be well if it were settled on some scientific basis what is the competent test in such a case, what kind and amount of difference in phraseology and style are sufficient to prove a diversity of authorship. On this head critics seem wholly at sea; they have no common standard to which to appeal; and hence their conclusions are frequently determined by purely personal leanings and subjective affections, and hardly any two of them agree in the judgment at which they arrive. This is remarkably the case with the instances which have been adduced from the book before us. Of these, some are of such a kind as to render an argument from them against the unity of the book little better than puerile. Thus we are told that in some places the word שֶׁבֶט is used for a tribe, while in others מִטֶּה is used, and this is employed as a test to distinguish one fragment from another. Accordingly, for instance, in Jos 18:2; Jos 18:4; Jos 18:7 are pronounced to belong to one writer, and Jos 18:11 to another; which is just as if an author, in giving an account of the rebellion of 1745, should speak in the same chapter first of a body of Highlanders as a clan, and then of the same as a sect, and some critic were to come after him and say, "This could not have been written by one author, for he would not have called the same body by different names." Could it be shown that either שֶׁבֶט or מִטֶּה is a word introduced into the language for the first time at a date much later than the age of Joshua, while the other word had then become obsolete, an argument of some weight, and such as a scholar like Bentley might have employed, would have been advanced; but to attempt to assign parts of the same chapter to different authors and to different epochs simply because synonymous appellations of the same object are employed, is nothing better than sheer trifling. Again, it is said that "the historical parts have the rare word מִחְלְקֹת, inheritance [rather, divisions] (Jos 11:23; Jos 12:7; Jos 18:10), which does not appear in the geographical sections" (Davidson, 1,  417). Is chap. 18, then, not in the geographical part of the book? or does a part become geographical or historical as suits the caprice or the preconceived theory of the critic? "Similarly. the geographical portion has

יִרְדֵן יְרַיהוֹ, Jordan by Jericho, 13:32; 16:1; 20:8; a mode of expression wanting in the historical" (ibid.). True; but suppose there was no occasion to use the phrase in the historical portions, what then? Are they, therefore, from a different pen from that which produced the geographical? "Again, in the historical parts occur the words, כֹהֲנַי[הִכּהֲנים],הִלְּוַיַּ, the priests, the Levites (Jos 3:3; Jos 8:33); or simply,כֹּחֲנַי, priests (3:6, 15; 6:4, 6, etc.); but in the geographical sections the same persons are termed sons of Aaron (Jos 21:4; Jos 21:10; Jos 21:13; Jos 21:19)" (ibid.). Is there not, however, a reason for this in the fact that, as it was in virtue of their being descended from Aaron, and not in virtue of their being priests, that the Kohathites received their portion, it was more proper to designate them "children of Aaron, of the Levites," than "priests," or "the priests the Levites." Davidson scouts this explanation as one which "only betrays the weakness of the cause." We confess ourselves unable to see this; the explanation is, in our judgment, perfectly valid in itself, and sufficient for the end for which it is adduced; and he has made no attempt to show that it is otherwise. All he says is. "The former is a Deuteronomistic expression; the latter Elohistic." What this is meant to convey we are at a loss to determine, for the only places in which the phrase "sons of Aaron" occurs is in connection with the names of Nadab and Abihu, who were sons of Aaron by immediate descent, and must have been so described by any writer, whether Deuteronomist or Elohist.

A number of other words are adduced by the opponents of the unity of the book of Joshua for the purpose of showing that it includes fragments from different authors. On these we do not linger. There are two considerations which seem to us entirely to destroy their force as evidences for that which they are adduced to prove. The one of these is that, according to Ewald, "the later historians imitated the words and phraseology of those who preceded them, and, moreover, that they frequently altered the phrases which they found in the earlier documents." On this Keil (from whom we borrow the statement) remarks with great force, "If that be the case, we can no longer think of peculiarities of style as characteristic signs by which the different sources may be distinguished. His entire theory is therefore built on sand" (Comment. on Joshua Introd. p. 9, E.T.). The other observation we would make is, that supposing it made out by indubitable  marks that the book of Joshua has undergone a careful revision by a later editor, who has altered expressions and interpolated brief statements that would not seriously impeach the unity of the book, it would still remain substantially the work of one author. We cannot forbear adding that, in all such inquiries, more faith is to be placed on a sound literary perception and taste than on those minutiae of expression and phraseology on which so much stress has of late been laid by some of the scholars of Germany and their followers in this country. The impression undoubtedly left on the mind of the reader is, that this book contains a continuous and uniform narrative; and its claims in this respect can be brought into doubt only by the application to it of a species of criticism which would produce the same result were it applied to the histories of Livy, the commentaries of Caesar, or any other ancient work of narrative.

IV. Date of Composition. — This can only be approximately determined. Of great value for this purpose is the frequent use of the phrase "until this day" by the writer, in reference to the duration of certain objects of which he writes. The use of such a phrase indicates indubitably that the narrative was written while the object referred to was still existing. It is a phrase, also, which may be used with reference to a very limited period; as, for instance, when Joshua uses it of the period up to which the two tribes and a half had continued with their brethren (Jos 22:3), or when he uses it of the period up to which the Israelites had been suffering for the iniquity of Peor (Jos 22:17); comp. also Jos 23:8-9. Now we find this phrase used by the historian in cases where the reference is undoubtedly to a period either within the lifetime of Joshua, or not long after his death. Thus it is used with reference to the stones which Joshua set up in the midst of Jordan, in the place where the priests had stood as the people passed over (Jos 4:9), and which we cannot suppose remained in that position for a very long time; it is used also of Rahab's dwelling in the midst of Israel (Jos 6:25), which must have ceased, at the furthest, very soon after Joshua's death; also of Caleb's personal possession of Hebron (Jos 14:14), which of course terminated soon after the time of Joshua. From these notices we infer that the book may have been written during Joshua's lifetime, and cannot have been written long after. With this falls in the use of the first person in the reference to the crossing of the Jordan (Jos 5:1), where one who was present on the occasion is evidently the writer. To the same effect is the fact that no allusion is  anywhere made to anything that is known to have been long posterior to the time of Joshua.

Several words occurring in this book have been adduced as belonging to the later Hebrew, and as, consequently, indicating a later date of composition for the book than the age of Joshua, or that immediately succeeding. But it strikingly shows the precarious basis on which all such reasoning rests, that words are pronounced archaic or late just as it suits the purpose of the inquirer; what De Wette calls late being declared to be ancient by Hävernick and Keil, and what Hävernick and Keil call ancient being again pronounced late by Knobel and Davidson, and with equal absence of any show of reason on both sides. One thing of importance, however, is, that whether the writer has used what modern scholars, judging a priori, call later forms or not, he has undoubtedly made no allusions to later facts, and so has given evidence of antiquity which common sense inquirers can appreciate.

V. Author. — Assuming that the book is the production of one writer, and that it was written about the time above suggested, the question arises, To whom is it to be ascribed? That it is the work of Joshua himself is the tradition of the Jews (Baba Bathra, cap. 1, fol. 14, B); and this has been embraced by several Christian writers, and among others, in recent times, by König, and, as respects the first half of the book, by Hävernick. That this might have been the case as respects all but the concluding section of the book cannot be denied, but the reasons which have been adduced in support of it have not appeared sufficient to the great majority of critics. These may be thus briefly stated:

(a) It is evident (Jos 24:26) that Joshua could and did write some account of at least one transaction which is related in this book;

(b) the numerous accounts of Joshua's intercourse with God (Jos 1:1; Jos 3:7; Jos 4:2; Jos 5:2; Jos 5:9; Jos 6:2; Jos 7:10; Jos 8:1; Jos 10:8; Jos 11:6; Jos 13:1-2; Jos 20:1; Jos 24:2), and with the captain of the Lord's host (Jos 24:13), must have emanated from himself,

(c) no one is more likely than the speaker himself to have committed to writing the two addresses which were Joshua's legacy to his people (23 and 24);

(d) no one was so well qualified by his position to describe the events related, and to collect the documents contained in the book;

(e) the example of his predecessor and master, Moses, would have suggested to him such a record of his acts.;

(f) one verse (Jos 6:25) must have been written by some person who lived in the time of Joshua; and two other verses, 5, 1 and 6 — assuming the common reading of the former to be correct — are most fairly interpreted as written by actors in the scene.

No one would deny that some additions to the book might be made after the death of Joshua without detracting from the possible fact that the book was substantially his composition. The last verses (Jos 24:29-33) were obviously added by some later hand. If, as is possible, though not certain, some subordinate events, as the capture of Hebron, of Debir (Jos 15:13-19, and Jdg 1:10-15), and of Leshem (Jos 19:47; and Jdg 18:7), and the joint occupation of Jerusalem (Jos 15:63, and Jdg 1:21) did not occur till after Joshua's death, they may have been inserted in the book of Joshua by a late transcriber. The passages Jos 13:2-6; Jos 16:10; Jos 17:11, which also are subsequently repeated in the book of Judges, may doubtless describe accurately the same state of things existing at two distinct periods.

Other authors have been conjectured, as Phinehas by Lightfoot; Eleazar by Calvin; Samuel by Van Til; Jeremiah by Henry; one of the elders who survived Joshua by Keil. Von Lengerke thinks it was written by some one in the time of Josiah: Davidson by someone in the time of Saul, or somewhat later; Masius, Le Clerc, Maurer, and others, by some one who lived after the Babylonian captivity.

VI. Credibility. — That the narrative contained in this book is to be accepted as a trustworthy account of the transactions it records is proved alike by the esteem in which it was always held by the Jews; by the references to events recorded in it in the national sacred songs (comp. Psa 44:2-4; Psa 78:54-55; Psa 68:13-15; Psa 114:1-8; Hab 3:8-13), and in other parts of Scripture (comp. Jdg 18:31; 1Sa 1:3; 1Sa 1:9; 1Sa 1:24; 1Sa 3:21, Isa 28:21; Act 7:45; Heb 4:8; Heb 11:30-32, Jam 2:25); by the traces which, both in the historical and in the geographical portions, may be found of the use by the writer of contemporary documents; by the, minuteness of the details which the  author furnishes, and which indicates familiar acquaintance with what he records; by the accuracy of his geographical delineations, an accuracy which the results of modern investigation are increasingly demonstrating; by the fact that the tribes never had any dispute as to the boundaries of their respective territories, but adhered to the arrangements specified in this book; and by the general fidelity to historical consistency and probability which the book displays (Hävernick, Einl. sec. 148 sq.). Some of the narratives, it is true, are of a miraculous kind, but such are wholly in keeping with the avowed relation to the Almighty of the people whose history the book records, and they can be regarded as unhistorical only on the assumption that all miracles are incredible — a question we cannot stop to discuss here. SEE MIRACLES.

In the list of such miraculous interpositions we do not include the standing still of the sun, and the staying of the moon, recorded in Jos 10:12-13. That passage is apparently wholly a quotation from the book of Jasher, and is probably a fragment of a poem composed by some Israelite on the occasion; it records in highly poetical language the gracious help which God granted to Joshua by the retarding of the approach of darkness long enough to enable him to complete the destruction of his enemies, and is no more to be taken literally than is such a passage as Psa 114:4-6, where the Red Sea is described as being frightened and fleeing, and the mountains as skipping like rams. SEE JASHER, BOOK OF.

That God interposed on this occasion to help his people we do not doubt; but that he interposed by the working of such a miracle as the words taken literally would indicate, we see no reason to believe.

The account given, Jos 8:1 sq., of the taking of Ai has been much dwelt upon as presenting a narrative which is unhistorical. It is incredible that Joshua sent two bodies of men, one comprising 30,000 soldiers, the other 5000, to lie in ambush against the city, while he himself advanced on it with the main body of his army; and yet this seems to be what the narrative states. What increases the improbability here is that the larger body is never mentioned as having come into action at all, for the whole exploit was accomplished by the 5000 and those who were with Joshua. If the case were stated thus: That Joshua took 30,000 of his warriors, and of these sent away 5000 to lie in ambush, while he, with the remaining 25,000, advanced against the city, the narrative would be perfectly simple and credible. The suggestion that Jos 8:12-13 are a marginal gloss which has been supposed to creep into the text, leaves the narrative  burdened with the improbable statement that 30,000 men could advance on Ai in daylight, and lie concealed in its immediate neighborhood for several hours without their presence being suspected by the inhabitants. Still less probable seems the suggestion that in these verses we have a fragment of an older record. Keil labors to show that from the peculiar style of Shemitic narrative it is competent to supply, in Jos 8:3, in thought, from the subsequent narrative, that from the 30,000 whom Joshua took he selected 5000, whom he sent away by night. But, whatever may be the difficulties in this text, it would be unreasonable on this account to relinquish our confidence on the general credibility of the book.

VII. Relation to the Pentateuch. — The Pentateuch brings down the history of the Israelites to the death of Moses, at which it naturally terminates. The book of Joshua takes up the history at this point, and continues it to the death of Joshua, which furnishes another natural pause. From resemblances between the language and forms of expression used by the author of the book of Joshua and those found in Deuteronomy, it has been supposed that both are to be ascribed, in part at least, to the same writer. This, of course, proceeds on the supposition that the book of Deuteronomy is not the composition of Moses; a question on which it would be out of place to enter here. SEE DEUTERONOMY; SEE PENTATEUCH. It may suffice to observe, that while it is natural to expect that many similarities of phraseology and language would be apparent in works so nearly contemporaneous as that of Deuteronomy and that of Joshua, there are yet such differences between them as may seem to indicate that they are not the production of the same writer. Thus, in the Pentateuch, we have the word Jericho always spelled יְרֵחוֹ, while in Joshua it is always יְרַיחוֹ; in Deuteronomy we have אֵל קִנָּא (Deu 4:24; Deu 5:9; Deu 6:15), in Joshua אֵל קִנּוֹא (Jos 24:19); in Deuteronomy the inf. of יָרֵא, to fear, is יַרְאָה (Deu 4:10; Deu 5:26; Deu 6:24, etc.), in Joshua it is יְרא (Jos 22:25); in Deuteronomy we have warriors described as בְּנּוֹיּ ץִיַּלּ (Deu 3:18), while in Joshua they are called גַּבּוֹרֵי הִחִיַל; (Jos 1:14; Jos 6:2, etc.). We have also in Joshua the peculiar formula דָּמוֹ בֵראֹשּׁוֹ, which nowhere occurs in the Pentateuch, but only דָּמוֹ בוֹ (Lev 20:9; Lev 20:11-12, etc.); the expression אֲדוֹן כֹּל הָאִרֶוֹ. (Jos 3:11; Jos 3:13), which occurs again only in Zec 6:5; the phrase, "the heart melted" (Zec 2:11; Zec 5:1; Zec 7:5); etc. In the Pentateuch, also, we find the usage with respect to the third personal  pronoun feminine fluctuating between הַיאand הוּא; in the book of Joshua the usage is fixed down to היאwhich became the permanent usage of the language. We find, also, that in the Pentateuch the demonstrative pronoun, with the article, sometimes appears in the form הִאֵל, while in Joshua and elsewhere it is always הִאֵלֶּה. The evidence here is the same in effect as would accrue in the case of Latin writers from the use of ipsus and ipse, ollus and ille. That the author of the book of Joshua derived part of his information from the Pentateuch is evident, if we compare Deu 18:1-2, and Num 18:20, with Jos 13:14; Jos 13:33; Jos 14:4. Even the unusual form אשׁרis repeated in Joshua. Compare also Num 31:8, with Jos 13:21-22. The author of the book of Joshua frequently repeats the statements of the Pentateuch in a more detailed form, and mentions the changes which had taken place since the Pentateuch was. written. Compare Num 34:13-14, with Jos 13:7 sq.; Num 32:37, with Jos 13:17 sq.; Numbers 35 with Joshua 21.

There is also considerable similarity between the following passages in the books of Joshua and Judges; Jos 13:4, Jdg 3:3; Jos 15:13 sq., Jdg 1:1; Jdg 1:20; Jos 15:15-19, Jdg 1:11-15; Jos 15:62, Jdg 1:21; Jos 16:10, Jdg 1:29 Jos 17:12, Jdg 1:27; Jos 19:47, Judges 18.

VIII. Commentaries. — The exegetical helps expressly on the whole book of Joshua exclusively are the following, of which we designate the most important by an asterisk prefixed: Origen, Selecta (in Opp. 2, 393) also Homilioe (ib. 2, 397); also Scholia (in Bibl. Patr. Gallandii, 14); Ephraem Syrus, Explanatio (in Opp. 4, 292); Procopius, Notoe (in his Octateucham); Theodoret, Quoestiones (in Opp. 1, 1) Isidore, Commentaria (in Opp.); Bede, Quoestiones (in Opp. p. 8); Rabanus, in Jos. (in Opp. ed. Martene et Durand, p. 668); Rupert, In Jos. (in Opp. 1, 321); Tostatus, In Jos. (in Opp.); Rashi or Jarchi, Commentarius (from the Heb. [found in the Rabbinical Bibles] by Breithaupt., Goth. 1710, 4to); Rabbi. Esaia, פֵּירוּשׁ (ed. with Lat. notes by Abicht, Lips. 1712, 4to; also in the Thes. Nov. Theol.-Phil. L.B. 1732, 1, 474 sq.); Borrhäus or Cellarius, Commentarii [includ. Ruth, Samuel, and Kings] (Basil. 1557, fol.); Lavater, Homilioe (Tigur. 1565, 4to); Calvin, Commentarius (in Opp. 1; in French, Genev. 1565; 8vo; transl. in Engl. by W.F., Lond. 1578, 4to; by Beveridge, Edinb. 1854, 8vo); Brentius, Commentarii (in Opp. 2);  Karweus, Excerpta (in Ugolini Thesaur. 20, 497); Strigel, Scholia (Lips. 1570, 1575, 8vo); Ferus, Enarrationes [includ. Exodus. etc.] (Colon. 1571, 1574, 8vo); \*Masius [Rom. Cath.], Illustratio (Antw. 1574, fol.; also in Walton's Polyglot, 6, and in the Critici Sacri, 2); Chytraeus, Proelectiones (Rost. 1577, 8vo); Montanus, Commentarius (Antwerp, 1583, 4to); Heidenreich, Predigten (Leipz. 1589; Stet. 1604, 4to); Heling, Periocha [includ. Ruth, Samuel, and Kings] (Norib. 1593-4, 2 vols. 8vo); Laniado, כְּלַי יָקָר (Venice, 1603, fol.); Ibn-Chajim, לֵב אִהֲרֹן [including Judges] (Venice, 1609, fol.; also in Frankfurter's Rabbinical Bible); Serarius, Commentarius (Mogunt. 160910, 2 vols. fol.; Par. 1610, fol.), Magalianus, Commentarius (Turnon. 1612, 2 vols. fol.); Hänicken, Reisepredigten (Leipz. 1613, 4to); Drusius, Commentarius [including. Judges and Samuel] (Franeck. 1618,4to); Baldwin, Predigten (Wittenb. 1621,4to); Stocken, Predigten (Cassel, 1648, 4to); De Naxera, Commentarii (vol. 1, Antw. 1650; 2, Lugd. 1652, fol.); a Lapide, In Jos. [and other books] (Antw. 1658, fol.); Cocceius, Note (in Opp. 1, 309; 11, 47); Bonfrere, Commentarius [includ. Judges and Ruth] (Paris, 1659, fol.); Marcellius, Commentarius (Herbip. 1661,4to); Hannecken, Adnotata (Giss. 1665, 8vo); Osiander, Commentarius (Tübing. 1681, fol.); Ising, Exercitationes (Regiom. 1683, 4to); \*Schmidt, Proelectiones [with Isaiah] (Hamb. 1693, 1695, 1703, 4to); Heidegger, Exegetica [includ. Matthew, etc.] (Tigur. 1700,4to); Uhlemann, Commentarius (ed. Martin, Dresd. 1701, 4to); Felibien, Commentarii [includ. Judges, Ruth, and Kings] (Paris, 1704, 4to); Le Clerc, Commentarius (Amst. 1708; Tübing. 1733, fol.); Moldenhauer, Erläuterung [includ. Judges, etc.] (Quedlinb. 1774, 4to); Obornik,תִּרְגּוּ. etc. (in the Hebrew Commentary, Vienna, 1792,8vo, pt. 156); Lightfoot, Annotationes (in Woorks, 10); Horsley, Notes (in Bibl. Crit. 1); Meyer, Bestandtheile, etc. (in Ammon and Berthold's Krit. Journ. 1815, 4to, 2, 337 sq.); Kley, Ueberstz. (Leipz. 1817, 8vo); Paulus, Blicke, etc. (in his Theol.-Exeg. Conserv. Heldeb. 1822, 2, 149 sq.); Herdwerden, Disputatio, etc. (Groningen, 1826, 8vo); Maurer, Commentar (Stuttg. 1831. 8vo); \*Rosenmüller, Scholia (Lips. 1833, 8vo); \*Keil, Commentar (Erlangen, 1847, 8vo; transl. in Clarke's Lib. Edinb. 1857, 8vo; different from that in Keil and Delitzsch's Commentary); \*Bush, Notes (N.Y. 1852, 12mo); Miller Lectures (Lond. 1852, 12mo); Cumming, Readings (London, 1857, 8vo); \*Knobel, Erklärung [including Numbers and Deuteronomy] (in the Kurzgef. Exeg. Hdbch. Leipz. 1861, 8vo); Anon., Gospel in Joshua (Lond. 1867, 8vo). SEE COMMENTARY.

## Joshua, Spurious Writings Of[[@Headword:Joshua, Spurious Writings Of]]

             The Samaritans, who for dogmatical purposes endeavored to depreciate the authority of persons mentioned in the latter books of the Old Testament such as Eli, Samuel, Zerubbabel, and others, had no such interest in attacking the person of Joshua. Eulogius, according to Photii Codex, p. 230, states: "The Samaritan multitude believes that Joshua, the son of Nun, is the person concerning whom Moses said, 'The Lord will raise us up a prophet,'" etc. (Compare Lampe, Comment. in Evangelium Johannis, 1, 748.) The Samaritans even endeavored to exalt the memory of Joshua by making him the nucleus of many strange legends which they embodied into their Arabic book of Joshua, a work which seems to have been compiled in the Middle Ages, and is quoted by the Rabbinical chroniclers of that period, Sepher Juchasin, R. Samuel, Shullam (f. 154), Shalsheleth (Hakabbalah, p. 96), Hottinger (Historia Orientalis, p. 40 sq.), Zunz (Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden, p. 140). Reland supposed that this book was written at an earlier period, and augmented in the Middle Ages; but it is more likely that the whole is a late compilation. (Compare Hottinger Smegma, p. 468.)

The so called book of Joshua of the Samaritans consists of compilations from the Pentateuch, our book of Joshua, the books of Judges and of Samuel, intermixed with many Jewish legends. Its compiler pretends that it is translated from the Hebrew into Arabic, but it was probably originally written in Arabic, and manifestly after the promulgation of the Koran, which exercised a perceptible influence upon it (comp. Reland, De Samaritanism, Dissertationes Miscellaneoe, 2, 12 and 68; Rodiger, in the Hall. Allg. Lit. Zeit. for 1848, No. 217). The author of this compilation endeavors to prove that the Samaritans are Israelites, and he claims for them the celebrity of the Jews. He attempts to turn the traditions of Jewish history in favor of the Samaritans. By his account Joshua built the temple on Mount Gerizim, and there established public worship; the schism between Jews and Samaritans commenced under Eli, who, as well as Samuel, was an apostate and sorcerer; after the return from the Babylonian exile, the Samaritan form of worship was declared to be the legitimate form; Zerubbabel and his sacred books, which were corrupted, were authoritatively rejected; Alexander the Great expressed his veneration, not for the Jews, but for the Samaritans; these were oppressed under the emperor Adrian, but again obtained permission to worship publicly on Mount Gerizim. The whole book consists of a mixture of Biblical history  and legends, the manifest aim being to falsify facts for dogmatical purposes. This book terminates with the history of the Jewish war under Adrian. The only known copy of this book is that of Jos. Scaliger, which is now in the library at Leyden. Although the language is Arabic, it is written in Samaritan characters. Even the Samaritans themselves seem to have lost it. Huntington, in his Epistoloe (Lond. 1704, p. 48), mentions that he could not find it at Nabulus, nor have subsequent inquiries led to its discovery there. An edition, from the only MS. extant, appeared in 1848 at Leyden, with the title "Liber Josuoe: Chronicum Samaritanum; edidit, Latine vertit, etc., T.G.J. Juynboll." It seems never to have been recognized by the Samaritans themselves (De Wette, Einl. sec. 171).

Besides this adulterated version of the history of Joshua, there exists still another in the Samaritan chronicles of Abul Phetach. See Acta Eruditorum. Lips., anno 1691, p. 167; Schnurrer's Samaritanischer Briefwechsel, in Eichhorn's Repertorium, 9, 54; a specimen by Schnurrer, in Paulus's Neues Repertorium, 1, 117 sq.

The mention of the book of Jasher has given rise to some spurious compilations under that name, as well in Hebrew as in English. SEE JASHER.

2. A native of Beth-shemesh, an Israelite, the owner bf the field into which the cart came which bore the ark on its return from the land of the Philistines; upon a great stone in the midst of the field the Beth-shemites sacrificed the cows that drew the cart, in honor of its arrival (1Sa 6:14; 1Sa 6:18). B.C. 1124.

3. The governor of Jerusalem at the time of the reformation by Josiah; the entrance to his palace was situated near one of the idolatrous erections at the city gates (2Ki 23:8). B.C. 628.

4. The son of Josedech (Hag 1:1; Hag 1:12; Hag 1:14; Zec 3:1; Zec 3:3; Zec 3:9; Zec 6:11), a high priest in the time of Haggai and Zechariah; better known by the name of JESHUA SEE JESHUA (q.v.).

Joshua ben-Hananja,

one of the most honored masters in Israel, flourished in the second century of the Christian era. He was a mechanic by trade, and earned his livelihood by continuing to work at his trade even when teacher of the Rabbinical school at Bekiin, wither he had removed from Jerusalem after its downfall.  He was a disciple of the celebrated Rabbi ben-Zachai, and did honor to his master as a teacher in Israel. His controversies with Gamaliel and Eliezer ben-Hyrcanos, which are celebrated in the Mishna and the Talmud, evince that he was a very formidable antagonist on account of the force of his reasoning powers and the pungency of his wit. In after life Joshua went with Gamaliel and Akiba to Rome, to plead with Trajan on behalf of his oppressed countrymen, and was received by the emperor with unusual courtesy and respect. It is even reported (though not on any certain authority) that Trajan's daughter, the princess Imra, honored the Jewish Rabbi with her friendship; and that on one occasion, looking at the homely garb in which so much wisdom was encased, she said to him, "Thou art the beauty of wisdom in an abject dress." "good wine." Joshua complacently replied, "is not kept in gold or silver vases, but in vessels of earthenware." When we consider that about this time Judaism numbered many proselytes among the patrician ladies of Rome, to whose aching hearts the herd of old and disreputable deities presented no ground of comfort or hope at all comparable with that afforded by the Hebrew's purer worship — the worship of the one true God — we need not hesitate to credit the truth of this story, and the belief of some that Imra even was a Jewish convert. It is also related that Trajan, in a bantering way, begged the old Rabbi to show him his God, whom he had affirmed to be every where present. After some conversation, Trajan still adhering to his demand to see the God of the Hebrews, Joshua said, "Well, let us first look at one of his ambassadors;" and, taking the emperor into the open air, he desired him to gaze at the sun in his full meridian power. "I cannot," replied Trajan; "the light dazzles me." "Canst thou, then," said the Rabbi, "expect to behold the glory of the Creator, when thou art unable to endure the light of one of his creatures?" In such anecdotes attributed to Joshua ben-Hananja the Talmud abounds, and it is evident that in his day Joshua figured as the most able of all the Rabbins. See Etheridge, Introd. to Jewish Lit. p. 61; Grätz, Gesch. der Juden, 4, 56 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Joshuas Tomb[[@Headword:Joshuas Tomb]]

             Lieut. Conder gives the local traditions on the subject as follows (Tent Work, 1:78):

"The 'Holy King Joshua' is said by the Samaritans to have been buried at Kefr Haris, which they identify with Timuath Heres. This village is nine miles south of Nablus.

"The Jewish pilgrim, rabbi Jacob of Paris, visited Caphar Cheres- presumably Kefr Haris-in A.D. 1258, and mentions the tombs of Joshua, Nult, and Caleb. The Samaritans also hold that Caleb was buried with Joshua, and thus we have the curious result that Jews and Samaritans agree as to the site of these tombs, both placing them within the bounds of Samaria. The crusading writers point to the same site for Joshua's tomb, and the place is marked on the map of Marino Sanuto (A.D. 1322) in the irelative position of Kefr Hlris.

"The modern village has three sacred places: one of Neby Nun, the second Neby Ltsh'a, the third Neby Kifi. In the first two we recognize Nun and Joshua; Neby Kifl was a historic character, but  his shrine possibly occupies the place of the mediaeval tomb of Caleb.

"The site of Joshua's tomb seems therefore to be preserved by an indigenous tradition. at least as authentic as that of Joseph's tomb. It has been supposed that Jerome indicates a different site, but a careful reading of his account of St. Paula's journey seems to show that he also refers to the tombs at Kefr Haris."

For another traditional site of Joshua's tomb SEE TIMNATH-HERES.

## Josiah[[@Headword:Josiah]]

             (Heb. Yoshiyah', יאשַׁיָּה, healed by Jehovah, Zec 6:10, elsewhere in the paragogic form Yoshiya'hu, יאֹשַׁיָּהוּ, and in the text of Jer 27:1, יאֹושַׁיָּהוּ; Sept., N.T., and Josephus Ι᾿ωσίας, "Josias." Mat 1:10-11), the name of two men.

I. The sixteenth king of Judah after its separation from the kingdom of Israel, the son (by Jedidah) and, at the early age of eight years, B.C. 640, the successor of Amon (2Ki 22:1; 2Ch 33:1). His history is contained in 2 Kings 22:1-24:30; 2 Chronicles 34:35; and the first twelve chapters of Jeremiah throw much light upon the general character of the Jews in his days. Avoiding the example of his immediate predecessors, he "did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, and walked in all the ways of David his father, and turned not aside to the right hand or to the left" (2Ki 22:2; 2Ch 34:2).

1. So early as the sixteenth year of his age (B.C. 633) he began to manifest that enmity to idolatry in all its forms which distinguished his character and reign; and he was not quite twenty years old (B.C. 628) when he proclaimed open war against it, although more or less favored by many men of rank and influence in the kingdom (2Ch 34:3). He then commenced a thorough purification of the land from all taint of idolatry. by going about and superintending in person the operations of the men who were employed in breaking down idolatrous altars and images, and cutting  down the groves which had been consecrated to idol worship (see Bertholdt, De purgatione per Josiam, Erl. 1817). His detestation of idolatry could not have been more strongly expressed than by ransacking the sepulchres of the idolatrous priests of former days, and consuming their bones upon the idol altars before they were overturned. Yet this operation, although unexampled in Jewish history, was foretold 345 years before Josiah was born by the prophet who was commissioned to denounce to Jeroboam the future punishment of his sin. He even named Josiah as the person by whom this act was to be performed, and said that it should be performed in Beth-el, which was then a part of the kingdom of Israel (1Ki 13:2). All this seemed much beyond the range of human probabilities; but it was performed to the letter, for Josiah did not confine his proceedings to his own kingdom, but went over a considerable part of the neighboring kingdom of Israel, which then lay comparatively desolate, with the same object in view; and at Beth-el, in particular, executed all that the prophet had foretold (2Ki 22:1-19; 2Ch 34:3-7; 2Ch 34:32). In these proceedings Josiah seems to have been actuated by an absolute hatred of idolatry, such as no other king since David had manifested, and which David had scarcely occasion to manifest in the same degree. So important was this reformation of the public cultus under Josiah that it forms an epoch whence Jeremiah dates many of his prophecies (Jer 25:3; Jer 25:11; Jer 25:29).

2. In the eighteenth year of his reign and the twenty-sixth of his age (B.C. 623), when the land had been thoroughly purified from idolatry and all that belonged to it, Josiah proceeded to repair and beautify the Temple of the Lord (2Ki 22:3; 2Ki 23:23). In the course of this pious labor the high priest Hilkiah discovered in the sanctuary a volume, which proved to contain the books of Moses, and which, from the terms employed, seems to have been considered the original of the law as written by Moses. On this point there has been much anxious discussion and some rash assertion. Some writers of the German school allege that there is no external evidence — that is, evidence besides the law itself — that the book of the law existed till it was thus produced by Hilkiah. This assertion it is the less necessary to answer here, as it will be noticed in the article PENTATEUCH SEE PENTATEUCH. (See also De Wette, Beitr. 1, 168 sq.; Bertholdt, Progr. de eo quod in purgatione sacror. Jud. per Josiam fucta omnium, maxim contigerit memorabile, Erl. 1817; also in his Opusc. p. 32 sq.) But it may be observed that it is founded very much on the fact  that the king was greatly astonished when some parts of the law were read to him.

It is indeed perfectly manifest that he had previously been entirely ignorant of much that he then heard; and he rent his clothes in consternation when he found that, with the best intentions to serve the Lord, he and all his people had been living in the neglect of duties which the law declared to be of vital importance. It is certainly difficult to account for this ignorance. Some suppose that all the copies of the law had perished, and that the king had never seen one. But this is very unlikely; for. however scarce complete copies may have been, the pious king was likely to have been the possessor of one. The probability seems to be that the passages read were those awful denunciations against disobedience with which the book of Deuteronomy concludes, and which, for some cause or other, the king had never before read, or which had never before produced on his mind the same strong conviction of the imminent dangers under which the nation lay, as now when read to him from a volume invested with a character so venerable, and brought with such interesting circumstances under his notice. We should bear in mind that it is very difficult for us in this age and country to estimate the scantiness of the opportunities which were then open to laymen of acquiring literary knowledge connected with religion. The special commission sent forth by Jehoshaphat (2Ch 17:7) is a proof that even under such kings as Asa and his son the Levites were insufficient for the religious instruction of the people. What, then, must have been the amount of information accessible to a generation which had grown up in the reigns of Manasseh and Amon? We do not know that the law was read as a stated part of any ordinary public service in the Temple of Solomon (unless the injunction Deu 31:10 was obeyed once in seven years), though God was worshipped there with daily sacrifice, psalmody, and prayer.

The king, in his alarm, sent to Huldah "the prophetess" for her counsel in this emergency, SEE HULDAH: her answer assured him that, although the dread penalties threatened by the law had been incurred and would be inflicted, he should be gathered in peace to his fathers before the days of punishment and sorrow came.

It was perhaps not without some hope of averting this doom that the king immediately called the people together at Jerusalem, and engaged them in a solemn renewal of the ancient covenant with God. When this had been done, the Passover was celebrated with careful attention to the directions given in the law, and on a scale of unexampled magnificence. (On the  public importance of this era, see Eze 1:1-2.) But all was too late; the hour of mercy had passed; for "the Lord turned not from the fierceness of his great wrath, wherewith his anger was kindled against Judah" (2Ki 22:3-20; 2Ki 23:21-27; 2Ch 34:8-33; 2Ch 35:1-19).

3. That removal from the world which had been promised to Josiah as a blessing was not long delayed, and was brought about in a way which he probably had not expected. Pharaoh-necho, king of Egypt, sought a passage through his territories on an expedition against the Chaldaeans; but Josiah refused to allow the march of the Egyptian army through his dominions, and prepared to resist the attempt by force of arms. His reason for this opposition has usually been assumed to have been a high sense of loyalty to the Assyrian monarch, whose tributary he is supposed to have been. Such is at least the conjecture of Prideaux (Connection, anno 610) and of Milman (History of the Jews, 1, 313). But the Bible ascribes no such chivalrous motive to Josiah; and it does not occur to Josephus, who attributes (Ant. 10, 5, 1) Josiah's resistance merely to Fate urging him to destruction; nor to the author of 1Es 1:28, who describes him as acting willfully against Jeremiah's advice; nor to Ewald, who (Gesch. Isr. 3, 707) conjectures that it may have been the constant aim of Josiah to restore not only the ritual, but also the kingdom of David in its full extent and independence, and that he attacked Necho as an invader of what he considered as his northern dominions. This conjecture, if equally probable with the former, is equally without adequate support in the Bible, and is somewhat derogatory to the character of Josiah. Necho was very unwilling to engage in hostilities with Josiah: the appearance of the Hebrew army at Megiddo (comp. Herod. 2, 159), however, brought on a battle, in which the king of Judah, although disguised for security, was so desperately wounded by a random arrow that his attendants removed him from the war chariot and placed him in another, in which he was taken to Jerusalem, where he died, after a reign of thirty-one years. B.C. 609. (See J.R. Kiesling's Essay on this subject, Lips. 1754.) No king that reigned in Israel was ever more deeply lamented by all his subjects than Josiah; and we are told that the prophet Jeremiah composed on the occasion an elegiac ode, which was long preserved among the people (2Ki 23:29-37, 2Ch 35:20-27). SEE LAMENTATIONS.

Compare the narrative in 2Ch 35:25 with the allusions in Jer 22:10; Jer 22:18, and Zec 12:11, and with Jackson, On the Creed, bk. 8, ch. 23. p. 878. The prediction of Huldah that he should "be gathered into the grave in  peace" must be interpreted in accordance with the explanation of that phrase given in Jer 34:5. Some excellent remarks on it may be found in Jackson, On the Creed, bk. 11, ch. 36, p. 664. Josiah's reformation and his death are commented on by bishop Hall, Contemplations on the O.T., bk. 20. See also Howard, History of Josiah (London, 1842).

4. It was in the reign of Josiah that a nomadic horde of Scythians overran Asia (Herod. 1, 104-106). A detachment of them went towards Egypt by the way of Philistia: somewhere southwards of Ascalon they were met by messengers from Psammetichus and induced to turn back. They are not mentioned in the historical accounts of Josiah's reign; but Ewald (Die Psalmen, p. 165) conjectures that the 59th Psalm was composed by king Josiah during a siege of Jerusalem by these Scythians. The town Bethshan is said to derive its Greek name Scythopolis (Reland, Palest. p. 992; Lightfoot, Chor. Marc. 7, § 2) from these invaders. The facility with which Josiah appears to have extended his authority in the land of Israel is adduced as an indication that the Assyrian conquerors of that land were themselves at this time under the restraining fear of some enemy. The prophecy of Zephaniah is considered to have been written amid the terror caused by their approach. The same people are described at a later period by Ezekiel (28). See Ewald, Gesch. Isr. 3, 689. Abarbanel (ap. Eisenmenger, Ent. Jud. 1, 858) records an oral tradition of the Jews to the effect that the ark of the covenant, which Solomon deposited in the Temple (1Ki 6:19), was removed and hidden by Josiah in expectation of the destruction of the Temple, and that it will not be brought again to light until the coming of Messiah.

II. Son of Zephaniah, and a resident of Jerusalem after the captivity, in whose house the prophet was directed to crown the high priest Jeshua as a type of the Messiah (Zec 6:10). B.C. prob. 520. "It has been conjectured that Josiah was either a goldsmith, or treasurer of the Temple, or one of the keepers of the Temple, who received the money offered by the worshippers, but nothing is known of him. Possibly he was a descendant of Zephaniah, the priest mentioned in Jer 21:1; Jer 37:3; and if Hen in Zec 6:15 be a proper name, which is doubtful, it probably refers to the same person, elsewhere called Josiah"

## Josias[[@Headword:Josias]]

             a Graecized form of the name of

(a) (Ι᾿εσίας, Vulg. Josias) JOSIAH SEE JOSIAH (q.v.), king of Judah (1Es 1:1; 1Es 1:7; 1Es 1:18; 1Es 1:21-23; 1Es 1:25; 1Es 1:28-29; 1Es 1:32-34; Sir 49:1; Sir 49:4; Bar 1:8; Mat 1:10-11);

(b) (Ι᾿εσίας v.r. Ι᾿εσσίας, Vulg. Maasias), JESHAIAH SEE JESHAIAH (q.v.), the son of Athaliah (1Es 8:33; comp. Ezr 8:7).

## Josibiah[[@Headword:Josibiah]]

             (Heb. Yoshibyah', יוֹשַׁבְיָה, dweller with Jehovah; Sept. Ι᾿σαβία v.r. Α᾿σαβία), son of Seraiah and father of Jehu, which last was one of the Simeonites who migrated to Gedor (1Ch 4:35). B.C. ante 711.

## Josiphiah[[@Headword:Josiphiah]]

             (Heb. Yosiphyah', יוֹסַפַיָה, increased by Jehovah; Sept. Ι᾿ωσεφία), one of the "sons" of Shelomith (as the Heb. text now stands), a chief Israelite, whose son (Ben-Josiphiah) returned with a company of 160 males under Ezra to Jerusalem (Ezr 8:10). B.C. 459. A word, however, has evidently fallen out of the Hebrew text in the beginning of the verse, and is supplied by the Sept. and the author of 1Es 8:36, as well as (less correctly) in the Syriac; namely, Βαανί (Βανίδ), i.e. בָּני, omitted from similarity to בְּנֵיpreceding; thus making Bani (q.v.) the son of Shelomith, and the leader of the party of returned exiles.

Josippon.

SEE JOSEPH BEN-GORION.

## Joso, Torial[[@Headword:Joso, Torial]]

             one of Whitefield's preachers, a native of Scotland, was a sea captain by profession. He had a vigorous mind, had been fond of the Bible from his youth, and had acquired a good degree of education by industrious study alone. He was converted by the preaching of Mr. Wesley at Robin Hood's Bay, and soon after began to preach to and exhort his sailors with much effect, who were converted and did likewise. After various reverses in his business, he was constrained by Whitefield to give himself wholly to the  ministry, and in 1766 he became his colleague at the Tabernacle and Tottenham Court. His preaching in London had from the first drawn great throngs and been very useful, and his popularity was only second to that of Whitefield, whose associate he was for thirty years in the Calvinistic Methodist societies of London, usually itinerating in England and Wales four or five months annually. See Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 1, 450. (G.L.T.)

## Jost, Isaac Marcus[[@Headword:Jost, Isaac Marcus]]

             one of the most celebrated writers of modern Jews, the first of his people since the days of Josephus to write a complete history of the Jews, was born at Bernburg, Germany, Feb. 22, 1793. His father, a poor blind man, the head of a family of twelve children, was obliged to depend mainly upon Marcus, the only boy, for support, and great and severe were the struggles which he had to endure until, in 1803, his father died, and the youth removed to Wolfenbüttel, where his grandfather resided. He was now admitted to a Jewish orphan asylum, where one of his most intimate associates was the celebrated Jewish savant Leopold Zunz, and together these two boys pursued, under great disadvantages and deprivations, ay, sufferings, the studies necessary to admit them to the higher classes of the gymnasium. "Whole nights," he touchingly records, "have we labored by the tapers which we made ourselves from the wax that ran down the big wax candles in the synagogue. By hard study we succeeded in bringing it so far in the course of the six months terminating with April, 1809, that we, Zunz in Wolfenbüttel and I in Brunswick, were put in the senior class (prima) in the gymnasium" (Pascheles, Sippurim, 3d col., Prague, 1855, p. 141 sq.). After four years of hard study he removed to the University of Göttingen, where for one year and a half he pursued with great earnestness studies in history, philology, philosophy, and theology, and then continued his investigations at Berlin University. In the capital of Prussia Jost soon won the hearts of many of his people, and, though comparatively a youth, yet succeeded in the management of a first class school, to which flocked the children of Jew and Gentile. In 1835 he accepted the headmastership of the Jewish high school at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and in that capacity spent the remainder of his days. He died November 20, 1860, at Frankfort-on- the-Main. While at Berlin he published:

(1) The gigantic historical work entitled Geschichte der Israeliten seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsere Tage (Berlin, 1820-28, 9 vols.): —

(2) Allgemeine Geschichte des Israelitischen Volkes, etc. (Berlin, 1831-32, 2 vols. 8vo), being an abridgment, with corrections, of the former work: — and

(3) ששה סדרי משנה, the Mishna, with the Hebrew text and vowel- points, accompanied by a German translation, a Rabbinic commentary, and German annotations (Berlin, 1832-34, 6 vols.), besides various efforts of a philosophical nature, and numberless contributions to Jewish periodicals of all grades and descriptions. In Frankfort the same literary activity continued. In 1839 he started a weekly journal for Jewish history, literature, etc., of which three volumes appeared, entitled Israelitische Annalen (Frankft. a. M. 1839-41), which boasted of the names of some of the ablest of Jewish writers as contributors, and which furnished articles whose value every true Biblical student will not fail to recognize, in fact, for many items of information there contained we would look elsewhere in vain. To reawaken an interest in the study of Hebrew, he started in 1841 (when the Annalen were discontinued), in conjunction with the distinguished Jewish writer Creizenach, a periodical in Hebrew, of which two volumes appeared, entitled ציון, Ephemerides Hebraicoe s. collectio dissertationum maxime theologicarum, variorumque Hebraicorum scriptorum, ad ordinem mensium lunarium disposita (Frankfort a. M. 1841-42). Like the former journal, it constitutes a very important contribution to Biblical and Jewish literature, and will always be read with great pleasure by the lover of the sacred language. owing to the beautiful Hebrew style in which in is written. At the same time, however, Jost was also laboring at his grand history of the Jews, of which he published (6), in 1846-47, three more parts, under the title Neuere Geschichte der Israeliten, etc., being a continuation. and forming a tenth volume, of his great historical work; and in 1857-59 he finally gave to the world, as the result of his life long historical and critical researches, the Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten, a work which may fitly make the top stone of the great historical edifice he had reared so perfectly from the very outset. He found no preparatory work, as did Grätz, Munk, Zunz, and Herzfeld; he was obliged to collect himself all the material needful for his great undertaking, and he spared no pains to do his work well. Jost deserves our notice also as a philanthropist: not only did he serve the literary world, and daily work for the advancement of Jewish interests everywhere, but he also founded an asylum for Jewish female orphans in the city which enjoyed his ripest scholarship. See Jahrbuch ur die Gesch.  der Juden (Lpzg. 1861, 12mo), vol. 2, p. 7 sq.; Jud. Athenoeum (Grimma and Lpz. 1851, 18mo), p. 117; Ehrentheil, Jud. Charakterbilder (Pesth, 1867, 8vo), No. 1, p. 67 sq.; Vapereau, Dictionnaire des Contemporains, s.v.

## Jot[[@Headword:Jot]]

             or, rather, IOTA (Ι᾿ῶτα), the smallest letter of the Greek alphabet (ι), derived from the Hebrew yod (י), and answering to the i (j) or y of European languages. Its name was employed metaphorically to express the minutest trifle. It is in fact, one of several metaphors derived from the alphabet, as when alpha, the first letter, and omega, the last, are employed to express the beginning and the end. We are not to suppose, however, that this proverb was exclusively apposite in the Greek language. The same practical allusion equally existed in Hebrew, some curious examples of which may be seen in Wetstein and Lightfoot. One of these may here suffice: In the Talmud (Sanhed. 20, 2) it is fabled that the book of Deuteronomy came and prostrated itself before God, and said, "O Lord of the universe, thou hast written in me thy law, but now a testament defective in some parts is defective in all. Behold, Solomon endeavors to root the letter jod out of me" (i.e. in the text,לאֹ ירְבֶּה נָשׁי, "he shall not multiply wives," Deu 17:17). "The holy, blessed God answered Solomon, and a thousand such as he, shall perish, but the least word shall not perish out of thee." This is, in fact, a parallel not only to the usage, but the sentiment, as conveyed in Mat 5:18, "One jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law." — Kitto. The propriety of the use of this letter for such a proverb is especially evident from the fact that it is the smallest letter of the Heb. alphabet likewise, being, in fact, often dispensed with as a mater lectionis, and very liable to be omitted in writing or mistaken for a part of some other letter. SEE TITTLE.

Jotapata.

SEE JIPHTHAH-EL.

## Jotbah[[@Headword:Jotbah]]

             (Heb. Yotbah', יָטְבָה, goodness; Sept. Ι᾿τέβα v.r. Ι᾿εταχά, Josephus Ι᾿ταβάτη, Ant. 10, 3, 2), a town, probably of Judah, the residence of Haruz, whose daughter Meshullemeth became the wife of king Manasseh and  mother of Amon (2Ki 21:19). M. de Saulcy (Narrat. 1, 94, note) suggests its identity with Yitma, a village almost in ruins on the north side of the valley (wady Ribah), north of Lebonah and south of Nablus (Robinson's Researches, 2, 92); but this would lie within the precincts of the late kingdom of Israel It is usually identified with Jotbath or Jotbatha of the Exode (Numbers 23:33, 34; Deu 10:7), as the names are essentially the same in the Heb.; but the latter is spoken of only as a region, not an inhabited town, and is out of the bounds of the Jewish monarchy. "The Arabic equivalent for Jotbah is et-Taiyib, or et-Taiyibeh, and no less than three sites of this name are met with in modern Palestine. One is considerably south of Hebron (Robinson, Bib. Res. 2, 472); another to the west of that city (ib. p. 427-429); and the third is north of Jerusalem, in the country of Benjamin. This last is most likely to answer to Jotbah, for the two first named places are very insignificant, and never can have been of much importance; whereas this is described by Dr. Robinson as crowning a conspicuous hill, skirted by fertile basins of some breadth,... full of gardens of olives and fig trees. The remarkable position (he adds) would not probably have been left unoccupied in ancient times (Biblic. Res. 2, 121, 124). In a subsequent visit to the place he was struck both with the depth and quality of the soil, which were more than one would anticipate ill so rocky a region (Later Bib. Res. p. 290). These extracts explain while they justify the signification 'goodness,' which belongs both to Jotbah and Taivibeh" Against this identification, however, there lie two not very strong objections, namely, its distance from Jerusalem, and the fact of the probable coincidence of this site with that of Ophrah. (q.v.).

## Jotbath[[@Headword:Jotbath]]

             (Deu 10:7). SEE JOTBATHAH.

## Jotbathah[[@Headword:Jotbathah]]

             [some Jotba'thah] (Heb. Yotba'thah, יָטְבָתָה, goodness, i.e. pleasantness, compare Agathopolis [the name is the same with יָטְבָה, Jotbah, with הparagogic appended]; Sept. Ι᾿ετεβαθά v.r. Ταιβαθά,a etc. Auth. Vers. in Deu 10:7, "Jotbath"), the thirty-fourth station of the Israelites during their wandering in the desert, situated between Hor-hagidgad and Ebronah (Num 33:33-34), and again their forty-first station, between Gudgodah and the Red Sea (Deu 10:7). described in the latter passage as "a land of rivers (נִחֲלַים, winter-brooks) of waters."  The locality thus indicated is probably the expanded valley near the confluence of wady Jerafeh in its southern part with wady Mukutta el- Tuwarik and others (Robinson's Researches, 1, 261), especially wady el- Adbeh, which nearly approaches the Heb. name (Jour. Sac. Lit. April, 1860, p. 47-49). This is generally a region answering to the description of fertility (Bonar's Desert of Sinai, p. 295). Schwarz (Palestine, p. 213), however, thinks wady Tuba, nearer the Akabah, is meant. SEE EXODE.

## Jotes[[@Headword:Jotes]]

             in Norse mythology. These forms of Scandinavian deities seem to have a historic background. They were probably the aborigines of the north of Europe, who were driven from their possessions by the companions of Odin; hence the undying enmity between the Jotes and the Asas. Fable makes the Jotes to be monstrous giants and magicians, living in dark caves and grottos. Theyand the Thusses seem to have been derived from one family.

## Jotham[[@Headword:Jotham]]

             (Heb. Yotham',יוֹתָ, Jehovah is upright; Sept. and N. Test. Ι᾿ωάθαμ, but Ι᾿ωαθάμ in 1Ch 2:47 Ι᾿ωνάθαν v.r. Ι᾿ωαθαν in 1Ch 3:12; v.r. Ι᾿ωθάμ in 1Ch 5:17; v.r. Ι᾿ωάθαν in 2Ch 26:21; v.r. Ι᾿ωνάθαν in 2Ch 26:23; Josephus Ι᾿ωάθαμος, Ant. 5, 7, 2; 9,11, 2 sq. Vulg. Joathan and Joatham; Auth. Vers. "Joatham," Mat 1:9), the name of several men.

1. The second named of the six sons of Jahdai, of the family of Caleb the Hezronite (l Chronicles 2:47). B.C. post 1612.

2. The youngest of Gideon's seventy legitimate sons, and the only one who escaped when the rest were massacred by the order of Abimelech (Jdg 9:5). B.C. 1322. When the fratricide was made King by the people of Shechem, the young Jotham was so daring as to make his appearance on Mount Gerizim for the purpose of lifting up a protesting voice, and of giving vent to his feelings (see Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 210). This he did in a beautiful parable, wherein the trees are represented as making choice of a king, and bestowing on the bramble the honor which the cedar, the olive. and the vine would not accept. SEE FABLE. The obvious application, which, indeed, Jotham failed not himself to point out, must have been highly exasperating to Abimelech and his friends; but the speaker fled, as soon as he had delivered his parable, to the town of Beer and remained there out of his brother's reach (Jdg 9:7-21). We hear no more of him; but three years after, if then living, he saw the accomplishment of the malediction he had pronounced (Jdg 9:57);

3. A person named by Josephus (Ι᾿ωάθαμος, Ant. 8, 1, 3) as the son of Bukki and father of Meraioth, in the regular line of Phinehas's descendants, although he (incorrectly) states that these lived privately; he seems to refer to ZERAHIAH SEE ZERAHIAH (q.v.) of the scriptural list (1Ch 6:5). SEE HIGH PRIEST.

4. The eleventh king of the separate kingdom of Judah, and son of Uzziah (by Jerusha, daughter of Zadok), whom he succeeded B.C. 756; he reigned sixteen years (comp. the synchronism in 1Ch 5:17). His father having during his last years been excluded by leprosy from public life, the government was administered by his son, at that time twenty-five years of age (2Ch 26:21; 2Ki 15:33). B.C. 781. SEE UZZIAH.

For the chronological difficulties of his reign (see Crusius, De oera Jothamica, Lips. 1756; Winer's Realwörterb. s.v.), SEE CHRONOLOGY.

Jotham profited by the experience which the reign of his father, and of the kings who preceded him, afforded, and he ruled in the fear of God, although he was unable to correct all the corrupt practices into which the people had fallen. His sincere intentions were rewarded with a prosperous reign. He was successful in his wars. The Ammonites, who had "given gifts" as a sort of tribute to Uzziah, but had ceased to do so after his leprosy had incapacitated him from governing, were constrained by Jotham, but not till several years after he had become settled as sole monarch, to pay, for the three remaining years of his reign, a heavy tribute in silver, wheat, and barley (2Ch 26:8; 2Ch 27:5-6). Many important public works were also undertaken and accomplished by Jotham. The principal gate of the Temple was rebuilt by him on a more magnificent scale; the quarter of Ophel, in Jerusalem, was strengthened by new fortifications; various towns were built or rebuilt in the mountains of Judah; and castles and towers of defense were erected in the wilderness. Jotham died greatly lamented by his people, and was buried in the sepulchre of the kings (2Ki 15:38; 2Ch 17:3; 2Ch 17:9). B.C. 740. His reign was favored with the ministrations of the prophets Isaiah, Hosea, and Micah (Isa 1:1; Isa 7:1; Hos 1:1; Mic 1:1). SEE JUDAH.

5. A high priest named by Josephus (Ι᾿ωάθσμος, Ant. 10, 8, 6) as son of Joel and father of Urijah in the regular incumbency; probably the AMARIAH SEE AMARIAH (q.v.) of 1Ch 6:11). SEE HIGH PRIEST.

## Joubert, Francis[[@Headword:Joubert, Francis]]

             a noted French ecclesiastical writer, born at Montpellier Oct. 12, 1689, entered the service of the Romish Church in 1728. In 1730 he was imprisoned in the Bastille as a Jansenist, and afterwards exiled to Montpellier. He subsequently returned to Paris, and there died, Dec. 23,  1763. He wrote extensively, especially in the department of exegetical theology. Among his best works we reckon Explication de I'Hist. de Joseph (Paris, 1728, 12mo): — Eclaircissement sur les Discours de Job (12mo): — Traite du Caractere essentiel a tous les Prophetes (12mo): — Observations sur Joel (Avignon, 1733, 12mo): — Lettres sur l'Interpretation des Ecritures (Paris, 1744, 12mo): — Concordance et Explication des principales Propheties de Jeremie, d'Ezechiel et de Daniel (Paris, 1745,4to): — Explication des principales propheties, etc. (Avignon [Paris], 1749, 5 vols.): — Commentaires sur les Douze petits Prophetes (Avignon, 17,54, 6 vols. 12mo): — Commentaire sur l'Apocalypse (Avignon [Paris], 1762, 2 vols. 12mo); etc. See Chaudon et Delandine, Dict. Univ. Histor. Crit. et Bibliogr.; Querard, La France Litteraire; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, 27, 18. (J.N.P.)

## Jouffroi (Lat. Jo.f-edus), Jean De[[@Headword:Jouffroi (Lat. Jo.f-edus), Jean De]]

             a French prelate, was born at Luxueil (Franche-Comte) about 1412. He studied at Dol, Cologne, and Pavia, and taught three years in the last- named place. He assisted at the Council of Ferrara in 1438, and was engaged in several important religious and diplomatic missions. In 1430 he became bishop of Arras, and in 1461 cardinal. He died November 24, 1473. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Jouffroy, Francois Gaspard De[[@Headword:Jouffroy, Francois Gaspard De]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1723 at the castle of Gonsans, near Besancon. He became canon of St. Claude, then bishop of Gap in 1774, and of Mans in 1778. Being elected a deputy of the states-general in 1789, he protested against the decrees of the assembly, and went into exile in 1792. He was received by the chapter of Paderborn (Westphalia), and given a revenue of six thousand two hundred florins. He died there in 1797. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Jouffroy, Theodore Simon[[@Headword:Jouffroy, Theodore Simon]]

             a noted modern French eclectic philosopher, was born at Pontets in 1796. In 1832 he became professor of philosophy at the College of France, and continued in this relation until 1837. He died in 1842. He was by far the most celebrated pupil of Cousin, and very popular as a writer of great elegance of style and terseness of diction. He first became known to the public at large through the medium of a translation of Dugald Stewart's Moral Philosophy. To this translation he prefixed an essay or preface, in which he vindicates the study of intellectual science against the attacks of those who would banish all except natural philosophy, out of the domain of human investigation. "Nothing," says Morell (Hist. of Mod. Phil. p. 662), "can exceed the clearness, and even the beauty, with which he establishes in this little production the fundamental principles of intellectual philosophy." To a careful observer it is evident that he had deeply imbibed the principles and the spirit of the Scottish metaphysicians, while, at the same time, he would generally rise to those more expansive views of philosophical truth which were inculcated in the lectures of his illustrious instructor. In the Melanges Philosophiques (Paris, 1833; 2d edit. 1838- 43), the second work to which we desire to call attention. "we see," says Morell, "the zealous pupil and successor of Cousin, the genuine modern eclectic, touching more or less upon all points within the range of intellectual philosophy, and pouring light derived from all directions upon them. We feel ourselves in company with a master mind, one who does not servilely follow in the track pointed out by others, but yet who knows how to appreciate the labors of all true hearted thinkers, and to make their  results tell upon the elucidation of his own system." We have not space here to elucidate his system, and refer our readers to Morell. His works were published entire in 6 octavo vols. in 1836. See Caro, in the Revue de deux Mondes, March 15, 1865.

## Joulouka[[@Headword:Joulouka]]

             in the mythology of the Antilles nations, is the monstrous spirit whose feathered head may be seen in the rainbow. SEE JULUKA.

## Journal, Or Diurnal[[@Headword:Journal, Or Diurnal]]

             is the ancient name of the day hours contained in the Breviary (q.v.). By it was also known in monasteries the diary of daily expenses.

## Journey[[@Headword:Journey]]

             (prop. נָסִע, to pull up the stakes of one's tent preparatory to removal; πορεύομαι) properly refers to travel by land. SEE TRAVELING. In the East, a day's journey is reckoned about sixteen or twenty miles. To this distance around the Hebrew camp were the quails scattered for food for the people (Num 11:31). Shaw computes the eleven days' journey from Sinai to Kadesh Barnea (Deu 1:2) to be about one hundred and ten miles. The first day's journey (Luk 2:44) is usually a short one (Hackett's Illustra. of Script. p. 12). SEE DAYS JOURNEY.

A Sabbath day's journey (Act 1:12) is reckoned by the Hebrews at about seven furlongs, or a little less than one mile, and it is said that if any Jew traveled above this from the city on the Sabbath he was beaten. SEE SABBATH-DAYS JOURNEY.

Jove.

SEE JUPITER.

## Jouvenci Or Jouvency, Joseph De[[@Headword:Jouvenci Or Jouvency, Joseph De]]

             an eminent Jesuit, was born at Paris Sept. 14, 1643. He taught rhetoric with uncommon reputation at Caen, La Fleche, and Paris, and at length was invited to Rome, in order to continue the "History of the Jesuits" with more freedom than he could have enjoyed at Paris. His other principal works are two volumes of speeches, a small tract entitled De Ratione Discendi et Docendi, and notes on different classical writers. In his history of the Jesuits he attempts to justify father Guignard the Jesuit, who was executed for encouraging the bigoted assassin Chatel in his attempt on the life of Henry IV. In France Parliament prohibited the publication or circulation of the work on that account. See Gorton, Biogr. Dict. s.v.

## Jouvenet, Jean[[@Headword:Jouvenet, Jean]]

             an eminent French painter, was born at Rouen, August 21, 1647. At the age of seventeen he went to Paris and studied with Nicholas Poussin, and at twenty-seven produced his celebrated picture of Christ Curing the Paralytic, in the Church of Notre Dame. Soon after he painted, in the Hospital of the Invalides, between the windows of the dome, The Twelve Apostles, with Angels. In 1665 he was admitted a member of the Academy, and painted for his reception the picture of Queen Esther before Ahasuerus — one of the finest works in the halls of the Academy. About this time he executed four pictures for the Church of St. Martin aux Champs, representing Mary Magdalene at the Feet of our Saviour, in the House of Simon the Pharisee; Christ Driving the Money-changers from the Tenmple; The Miraculous Draught of Fishes; The Raising of Lazarus. His most famous work is the Deposition from the Cross, painted for the Church of the Capuchins, at Paris, where he died, April 5, 1717. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Jovian[[@Headword:Jovian]]

             (sometimes, but erroneously, called Jovinian), fully FLAVIUS CLAUDIUS JOVIANUS. Roman emperor from A.D. 363 to 364. His predecessor Julian was slain on the field of battle, in his unhappy campaign against the Persians, June 26, A.D. 363. Jovianus, finding the continuation of the unfortunate struggle useless, sought its termination, and secured quite honorable terms from the Persians, and, once free from the attacks of foreign enemies, he at once initiated measures to establish his authority in the West, and hereafter his time was mainly devoted to administrative and legislative business. Immediately after his election to the imperial dignity Jovianus had professed himself to be a Christian, and one of his first measures when peace was restored to his dominions was the celebrated edict by which he placed the Christian religion on a legal basis, and thus put an end to the persecutions to which the Christians had been exposed during the short reign of Julian. The heathens were, however, equally protected, and no superiority was allowed to the one over the other. The different sectaries assailed him with petitions to help them against each other, but he declined interfering, and referred them to the decision of a general council; and the Arians showing themselves most troublesome, he gave them to understand that impartiality was the first duty of an emperor. His friend Athanasius was restored to his see at Alexandria. He died suddenly on his way home from the Orient, A.D. 34. It is possible, though not probable, that he died a violent death, to which Ammianus Marcellinus (25:5-10) seems to allude when he compares his death with that of Emilianus Scipio. See De la Bleterie, Histoire de Jovien (Amsterdam, 1740), the best work on the subject. — Smith, Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog. 2, 615.

## Jovinian[[@Headword:Jovinian]]

             emperor, SEE JOVIAN.

## Jovinian (2)[[@Headword:Jovinian (2)]]

             one of the early opponents of monachism, and, in a measure, one of the earliest reformers before the Reformation, flourished near the end of the 4th century. He was an Italian, but whether a native of Rome or Milan is not known. He taught in both cities, and gained a number of adherents. His real opinions, freed from the misrepresentations of his opponents, it is hardly possible to ascertain; it is apparent, however, that he opposed  asceticism, which we find so generally and strenuously advocated in the writings of the Church fathers of the 4th century. He evidently maintained "that there is but one divine element of life, which all believers share in common; but one fellowship with Christ, which proceeds from faith in him; but one new birth. All who possess this in common with each other — all, therefore, who are Christians in the true sense, not barely in outward profession — have the same calling, the same dignity, the same heavenly blessings the diversity of outward circumstances creating no difference in this respect, that all persons whatsoever, if they keep the vows they make to Christ in baptism and live godly lives, have an equal title to the rewards of heaven, and, consequently, that those who spend their lives in celibacy or macerate their bodies by fasting are no more acceptable to God than those who live in wedlock, and nourish their bodies with moderation and sobriety."

He also held that Mary ceased to be a virgin by bringing forth Christ; that the degrees of future blessedness do not depend on the meritoriousness of our good works; and that a truly converted Christian, so long as he is such, cannot sin willfully, but will resist and overcome the temptations of the devil. Yet, while upholding all these views, Jovinian himself remained single, and lived like all other monks, and his enemies even admit that the tenor of his life was always blameless. He first advocated his opinions at Milan, but, being there denied by the stern Ambrose all liberty of speech, he went to Rome, which, as appears from the evidence of Jerome, was one of the last places to entertain the ascetic fanaticism, nor was it until after monasteries had darkened all parts of the East, as well as many of the West, that these establishments were seen in that city.

There, according to the report of pope Syricius and others, the doctrine of the Milanese monk had made many converts, so that the Church, "torn by dogs" in a manner heretofore unheard of, doubted whereto so unlooked for an assault might proceed. Not a few of the laity, if not of the clergy, had listened to Jovinian; and eight persons are named as his supporters, who, with him, were, by a unanimous decision of the Romish clergy, condemned and excommunicated in a council held at Milan in 390, as the authors of a "'new heresy, and of blasphemy and they were forever expelled from the Church. "Pilate and Herod" were at one in this instance. Pope Syricius confirmed the condemnation, the emperor Honorius enacted penal laws against the Jovinians, and Jovinian himself was banished to the desolate island of Boa, off the coast of Illyria, and there died before A.D. 406. But Jovinian\ had also written, as well as preached, in support of his opinions, which continued to spread on all  sides, notwithstanding the terrors of Church authority. At Rome, although none dared openly to profess Jovinian's heresy, it was nevertheless covertly taught, and was whispered about, even to such an extent that certain nuns fell into matrimony in consequence of its prevalence. In this emergency, and m aid of the endeavors of the Romish Church to crush the "monstrous doctrine," the good Augustine, a tool of bad men, came forth in defense of the "orthodox" practices and principles of the ascetics; and in his treatise De bono conjugali, and in others of a similar kind, he. labors hard, by wily sophistry, to reconcile the prevailing absurdities with reason and Scripture. The mild, pious, and honest Augustine, however, was not the men to be the Church's thorough going champion on this notable occasion: she had a better man at hand; "one who, by various learning, by a voluble pen, as well as by rancor of temper, and boundless arrogance, and a blind devotion to whatever 'the Church' had sanctioned, was well qualified to do the necessary work of cajoling the simple, of inflaming the fanatical, of frightening the timid, of calumniating the innocent, and, in a word, of quashing, if it could be quashed, all inquiry concerning 'authorized' errors and abuses. The Church, right or wrong; was to be justified; the objector, innocent or guilty, was to be crushed; and Jerome would scruple nothing could he but accomplish so desirable an object. SEE JEROME.

But, notwithstanding these attacks by the Church's three greatest doctors — Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome, whose great irritation and anxiety or the cause of the Church is sufficiently betrayed by their determination to oppose Jovinians jointly, though living at points quite remote from each other the "heresy," instead of dying out, spread, and was favorably thought of and accepted in different parts of Christendom, and no doubt made easier the task of Vigilantius and of Luther. Neander does not hesitate to rank the services of Jovinian so high as to consider him worthy of a place by the side of Luther. See Neander, Ch. Hist. 2, 265 sq., Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2, 226 sq.; Ambrosius, Epist. 42; Augustine, De Hoeres. c. 82; Baronius, Annales Eccl. p. 390, 412; Walch, Ketzerhistorie, 3, 635 sq.; Baur, Christl. Kirche (4th to 6th century), p. 311 sq.; Lindner, De Joviniano et Vigilantio purioris doctrinoe antesignanis (Lpz. 1839).

## Jowett, Joseph, LL.D[[@Headword:Jowett, Joseph, LL.D]]

             a learned English clergyman, was born about 1750; admitted in 1769 to Trinity College; in 1773 removed to Trinity Hall, where he became assistant tutor, then fellow and principal tutor, and afterwards regius professor of the civil law, which office he retained till his death, Nov. 13, 1813. In addition to his professorship he held the living of Wethersfield, in Essex. Dr. Jowett was a scholarly man, a humble Christian, and a devoted friend of the Bible Society and kindred associations. See (Lond.) Christian Observer, December 1813, page 820.

## Jowett, William[[@Headword:Jowett, William]]

             a Church of England divine, was born in 1789. He graduated at St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1810, and was the first clergyman of the Church of England who volunteered, in 1813, for the foreign service of the Church Missionary Society. His field of labor was in the countries in the  Mediterranean. and the fruits of his observations were, Christian Researches in the Mediterranean from 1815 to 1820, and; Christian Researches in Syria and the Holy Land in 1823 and 1824. He was also the author of, Time and, Temper: a Manual of Selections from Holy Scripture, with Thoughts on Education (4th ed. 1852): — Helps to Pastoral Visitations (2d ed. 1848, 3 parts). From 1832 to 1840 he acted as clerical secretary to the Church Missionary Society; for many years held the Sunday evening lectureship of St. Mary's, Aldermanbury; and, in 1851 succeeded the Reverend R. Bickersteth as St. John's chaplain. He died at Clapharn, Surrey, February 20, 1855. See Hardwicke, Annual Biography, 1856, page 208.

## Joy[[@Headword:Joy]]

             (usually some form of גּיל, which prop. means to spin round with pleasurable emotion, and is thus a stronger term than שָׂמִח, which expresses gladness; but less so than עָלַוֹ, to exult or leap with exuberant  joy, Gr. prop. χαρά), a delight of the mind arising from the consideration of a present or assured approaching possession of a future good (Ezr 6:16; Est 8:16).

1. NATURAL joy is of various degrees: when it is moderate, it is called gladness; when raised on a sudden to the highest degree, it is then exultation or transport; when we limit our desires by our possessions, it is contentment; when our desires are raised high, and yet accomplished, this is called satisfaction, when our joy is derived from some comical occasion or amusement, it is mirth; if it arise from considerable opposition that is vanquished in the pursuit of the good we desire, it is then called triumph; when joy has so long possessed the mind that it is settled into a temper, we call it cheerfulness; when we rejoice upon the account of any good which others obtain, it may be called sympathy or congratulation.

2. MORAL joy is also of several kinds, as the self approbation, or that which arises from the performance of any good actions; this is called peace, or serenity of conscience; if the action be honorable and the joy rise high, it may be called glory.

3. There is also a SPIRITUAL joy, which the Scripture calls a "fruit of the Spirit" (Gal 5:22), "the joy of faith" (Php 1:25), and "the rejoicing of hope" (Heb 3:6). The objects of it are —

(1.) God himself (Psa 43:4, Isa 61:10).

(2.) Christ (Php 3:3; 1Pe 1:8).

(3.) The promises (Psa 119:162).

(4.) The administration of the Gospel and Gospel ordinances (Psa 89:15).

(5.) The prosperity of the interest of Christ (Act 15:3; Rev 11:15; Rev 11:17).

(6.) The happiness of a future state (Rom 5:2; Matthew 25). The nature and properties of this joy:

[1.] It is, or should be, constant (Php 4:4).

[2.] It is unknown to the men of the world (1Co 2:14).

[3.] It is unspeakable (1Pe 1:8).

[4.] It is permanent (Joh 16:22). See Watts, On Pass. sec. 31: Gil's Body of Div. 3, 111, 8vo ed.; Grove's Moral Philippians 1, 356.

## Joy Of God[[@Headword:Joy Of God]]

             relates,

1. To the delight and complacency he has in himself, his own nature, and perfections.

2. He rejoices in his own works (Psa 104:31).

3. In his Son Christ Jesus (Mat 3:17).

4. In the work of redemption (Joh 3:15).

5. In the subjects of his grace (Psa 147:11; Zep 3:17; Psa 149:4.

## Joy Or Joye, George[[@Headword:Joy Or Joye, George]]

             an early promoter of the Reformation, a native of the county of Bedford, was educated at Peterhouse, Cambridge, where he graduated M.A. in 1517. An associate of Tyndale, he was in 1527 accused of heresy, and obliged to go to Germany, where he resided for many years. He was concerned in the superintendence of Tyndale's Bibles, printed at Antwerp, and finally returned to his native country but the time of his death is unknown. Besides his translation of part of the Bible, he published On the Unity and Schism of the ancient Church (1534) — Subversion of More's False Foundation (1534): — Commentary on Daniel, in the main from Melancthon, etc. See Gorton, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Joy of the Law, Festival Of The[[@Headword:Joy of the Law, Festival Of The]]

             Is a name given to the ninth day of the Feast of Tabernacles among the modern Jews. On that day three MSS. of the Pentateuch are laid upon the desk, and three portions are read by three different persons, one portionr from each MS., the first closing with the end of Deuteronomy. Another immediately begins with the first of Genesis, to indicate that man should be continually employed in reading and studying the word of God.

## Joyce, Thomas[[@Headword:Joyce, Thomas]]

             a Dominican, proceeded D.D. in, Oxford, and, living there, became provincial of his order both in England and Wales. From this place, without ever having any other preferment, pope Clement. He created him cardinal of St. Sabine — a contradiction,. as some call attention, between the friar's profession and practice. He had six brethren, all Dominicans, and Fuller, refusing to liken them to the seven sons of Scevaj (Act 19:14), all exorcists, terms them "a week of brethren, whereof this rubricated cardinal was the dominical letter." Thomas flourished in 1310, and was buried in his convent at Oxford. See Fuller, Worthies of of England (ed. Nuttall), 3:12.

## Joyner, James E[[@Headword:Joyner, James E]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Amherst County, Va., and died at his own home in Henly County, Va., March 15, 1868. For more than thirty years Joyner served the Church with great acceptability and usefulness in various appointments. His preaching was earnest, pointed, and eminently practical During the late war he served as a chaplain in the Confederate States army, and exerted among the officers and men an influence for good which was felt and acknowledged by all. — Conf. Minutes M. E. Church South, 3, 203.

## Jozabad[[@Headword:Jozabad]]

             (Heb. Yozabad', יוֹזָבָד, a contraction for JEHOZABAD; Sept. Ι᾿ωζαβάδ, but sometimes in Chronicles Ι᾿ωζαβάθ v.r. Ι᾿ωζαβαίθ, Ι᾿εζεβούθ; also Ι᾿ωσαβέδ or Ι᾿ωσαβάδ in Nehemiah; Auth. Vers. "Josabad" in 1Ch 12:4), the name of several men.

1. A Gederathite, one of the famous Benjamite archers who joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:4). B.C. 1055.

2. A chiliarch of Manasseh, who reinforced David on retreating to Zildag (1Ch 12:20), B.C. 1053.

3. Another chiliarch of Manasseh, who deserted Saul's cause for that of David when he made Ziklag his residence (1Ch 12:20); it is possible, however, that the name has been erroneously repeated for the preceding. B.C. 1053.

4. Probably a Levite, one of the persons charged with the care of the Temple offerings under the superintendence of Cononiah and Shimei, at the reformation by Hezekiah (2Ch 31:13). B.C. 726.

5. One of the chief Levites who made offerings for the renewal of the Temple services under Josiah (2Ch 35:9). B.C. 623.

6. A son of Jeshua, and one of the Levites who took account of the precious metals and vessels offered for the Temple by the Israelites who declined personally to return from the captivity (Ezr 8:33). B.C. 459. He was probably the same with one of the chief Levites who "had the oversight of the outward matters of the house of God" after the reestablishment at Jerusalem (Neh 11:16). B.C. cir. 440. He was possibly identical with No. 8.

7. An Israelite, one of the "sons" of Pashur, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezr 10:22). B.C. 459.

8. One of the Levite who divorced his heathen wife after the return from Babylon (Ezr 10:23). B.C. 459. He is probably identical with one of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the Law to the people assembled in the Tyropoeon (Neh 8:7). B.C. cir. 410.

## Jozachar[[@Headword:Jozachar]]

             (Heb. Yozakar', יוֹזָכָר, Jehovah-remembered; Sept. Ι᾿ωσαβάδ v.r. Ι᾿ωζαχάρ), the son of Shimeath, an Ammonitess, one of the two servants who assassinated Jehoash, king of Judah, in Millo (2Ki 12:21). In the parallel passage (2Ch 24:26) the name is erroneously written ZABAD. B.C. 837. "It is uncertain whether their conspiracy was prompted by a personal feeling of revenge for the death of Zechariah, as Josephus intimates (Ant. 9, 8, 4), or whether they were urged to it by the family of Jehoiada. The care. of the chronicler to show that they were of foreign descent seems almost intended to disarm a suspicion that the king's assassination was an act of priestly vengeance. But it is more likely that the conspiracy had a different origin altogether, and that the king's murder was regarded by the chronicler as an instance of divine retribution. On the accession of Amaziah the conspirators were executed."

## Jozadak[[@Headword:Jozadak]]

             (Ezr 3:2; Ezr 3:8; Ezr 5:2; Ezr 10:18; Neh 12:26). SEE JEHOZADAK.

## Jozzabdus[[@Headword:Jozzabdus]]

             (Ι᾿ωάζαβδος v.r. Ι᾿ώζαβδος), a Graecized form (1Es 9:48) of the name of JOZABAD SEE JOZABAD (q.v.), the Levite (Neh 8:7).

## Jozzar[[@Headword:Jozzar]]

             (Ι᾿ωάζαρος, Ι᾿ώζαρος, i.e. Joezer), a son of Boëthus and brother-in-law of the high priest Matthias (q.v.), whom he succeeded in the pontifical office by the arbitrary act of Herod the Great on the day preceding an eclipse of the moon (Josephus, Ant. 17, 6, 4), which occurred March 13, B.C. 4. He was deprived of the office by Cyrenius (although he had aided that officer in enforcing the tax, ib. 18, 1, 1) in the 37th year after the battle of Actium (ib. 18, 2, 1), i.e. A.D. 7-8. It appears, however, that he had been temporarily removed (A.D. 4) by Archelaus during the short term of his brother Eleazar, and then of Jesus, the son of Sie (ib. 17:13, 1), and restored by popular acclamation (ib. 18:2, 1). SEE HIGH PRIEST.

## Jo?b[[@Headword:Jo?b]]

             (Heb. Yoäb', יוֹאָב, Jehovah is his father; Sept. Ι᾿ωάβ, but Ι᾿ωβάβ in 1Ch 2:16), the name of three men. SEE ATAROTH-BETH-JOAB.

1. The son of Seraiah (son of Kenaz, of the tribe of Judah), and progenitor of the inhabitants of Charashim or craftsmen (1Ch 4:14). B.C. post. 1567.

2. One of the three sons of Zeruiah, the sister of David (2Sa 8:16; 2Sa 20:13), and “captain of the host” (generalissimo of the army) during nearly the whole of David's reign (2Sa 2:13; 2Sa 10:7; 2Sa 11:1; 1Ki 11:15; 2Sa 18:2). It is a little remarkable that he is designated by his maternal parentage only, his father's name being nowhere mentioned in the Scriptures. Josephus (Ι᾿ωάβος), indeed, gives (Ant. 7, 1,3) the father's name as Suri (Σούρι), but this may be merely a repetition of the preceding Sarouiah (Σαρουϊvα). Perhaps he was a foreigner. He seems to have resided at Bethlehem, and to have died before his sons, as we find mention of his sepulchre at that place (2Sa 2:32).

Joab first appears associated with his two brothers, Abishai and Asahel, in the command of David's troops against Abner, who had set up the claims of a son of Saul in opposition to those of David, then reigning in Hebron. The armies having met at the pool of Gibeon, a general action was brought  on, in which Abner was worsted, B.C. 1053. SEE GIBEON.

In his flight he had the misfortune to kill Joab's brother, the swift-footed Asahel, by whom he was pursued (2Sa 2:13-32). SEE ABNER; SEE ASAHEL.

Joab smothered for a time his resentment against the shedder of his brother's blood; but, being whetted by the natural rivalry of position between him and Abner, he afterwards made it the excuse of his policy by treacherously, in the act of friendly communication, slaying Abner, at the very time when the services of the latter to David, to whom he had then turned, had rendered him a most dangerous rival to him in power and influence (2Sa 3:22-27). That Abner had at first suspected that Joab would take the position of blood avenger, SEE BLOOD-REVENGE is clear from the apprehension which he expressed (2Sa 2:22); but that he thought that Joab had, under all the circumstances, abandoned this position, is shown by the unsuspecting readiness with which he went aside with him (2Sa 3:26-27); and that Joab placed his murderous act on the footing of vengeance for his brother's blood is plainly stated in 2Sa 3:30; by which it also appears that the other brother, Abishai, shared in some way in the deed and its responsibilities. At the same time, as Abner was perfectly justified in slaying Asahel to save his own life, it is very doubtful if Joab would ever have asserted his right of blood revenge had not Abner appeared likely to endanger his influence with David. The king, much as he reprobated the act, knew that it had a sort of excuse in the old customs of blood revenge, and he stood habitually too much in awe of his impetuous and able nephew to bring him to punishment, or even to displace him from his command. “I am this day weak,” he said, “though anointed king, and these men, the sons of Zeruiah, be too hard for me” (2Sa 3:39). B.C. 1046.

Desirous probably of making some atonement before David and the public for this atrocity, in a way which at the same time was most likely to prove effectual, namely, by some daring exploit, Joab was the first to mount to the assault at the storming of the fortress on Mount Zion, which had remained so long in the hands of the Jebusites, B.C. cir. 1044. By this service he acquired the chief command of the army of all Israel, of which David was by this time king (2Sa 5:6-10). He had a chief armor bearer of his own, Naharai, a Beerothite (2Sa 23:37; 1Ch 11:39), and ten attendants to carry his equipment and baggage (2Sa 18:15). He had the charge, formerly belonging to the king or judge, of giving the signal by trumpet for advance or retreat (2Sa 18:16). He was called by the almost regal title of “lord” (2Sa 11:11), “the prince of the king's army” (1  Chronicles 27:34). His usual residence (except when campaigning) was in Jerusalem, but he had a house and property, with barley fields adjoining, in the country (2Sa 14:30), in the “wilderness” (1Ki 2:34), probably on the northeast of Jerusalem (compare 1Sa 13:18; Jos 8:15; Jos 8:20), near an ancient sanctuary, called from its nomadic village “Baalhazor” (2Sa 13:23; compare with 14:30), where there were extensive sheep walks. It is possible that this “house of Joab” may have given its name to Ataroth Beth-Joab (1Ch 2:54), to distinguish it from Ataroth-adar. His great military achievements, which he conducted in person, may be divided into three campaigns:

(a) The first was against the allied forces of Syria and Ammon. He attacked and defeated the Syrians, while his brother Abishai did the same for the Ammonites. The Syrians rallied with their kindred tribes from beyond the Euphrates, and were finally routed by David himself. SEE HADAREZER.

(b) The second was against Edom. The decisive victory was gained by David himself in the “valley of salt,” and celebrated by a triumphal monument (1Sa 8:13). But Joab had the charge of carrying out the victory, and remained for six months extirpating the male population, whom he then buried in the tombs of Petra (1Ki 11:15-16). So long was the terror of his name preserved that only when the fugitive prince of Edom, in the Egyptian court, heard that “David slept with his fathers, and that Joab, the captain of the host, was dead,” did he venture to return to his own country (1Ki 11:21-22).

(c) The third was against the Ammonites. They were again left to Joab (2Sa 10:7-19). He went against them at the beginning of the next year, at the time when kings go out to battle” — to the siege, of Rabbah. The ark was sent with him, and the whole army was encamped in booths or huts round the beleaguered city (2Sa 11:1; 2Sa 11:11). After a sortie of the inhabitants, which caused some loss to the Jewish army, Joab took the lower city on the river, and then, with true loyalty, sent to urge David to come and take the citadel, “Rabbah,” lest the glory of the capture should pass from the king to his general (2Sa 12:26-28).

It is not necessary to trace in detail the later acts of Joab, seeing that they are in fact part of the public record of the king he served. See DAVID. He served him faithfully, both in political and private relations; for, although he knew his power over David, and often treated him with little ceremony, there can be no doubt that he was most truly devoted to his interests. But  Joab had no principles apart from what he deemed his duty to the king and the people, and was quite as ready to serve his master's vices as his virtues, so long as they did not interfere with his own interests, or tended to promote them by enabling him to make himself useful to the king. (See Niemeyer, Charakt. 4, 458 sq.) His ready apprehension of the king's meaning in the matter of Uriah, and the facility with which he made himself the instrument of the murder, and of the hypocrisy by which it was covered, are proofs of this, and form as deep a stain upon his character as his own murders (2Sa 11:14-25), B.C. 1035. As Joab was on good terms with Absalom, and had taken pains to bring about a reconciliation between him and his father, we may set the higher value upon his firm adhesion to David when Absalom revolted, and upon his stern sense of duty to the king — from whom he expected no thanks — displayed in putting an end to the war by the slaughter of his favorite son, when all others shrunk from the responsibility of doing the king a service against his own will (2Sa 18:1-14). B.C. cir. 1023. In like manner, when David unhappily resolved to number the people, Joab discerned the evil and remonstrated against it, and although he did not venture to disobey, he performed the duty tardily and reluctantly, to afford the king an opportunity of reconsidering the matter, and took no pains to conceal how odious the measure was to him (2 Samuel 24). David was certainly ungrateful for the services of Joab when, in order to conciliate the powerful party which had supported Absalom, he offered the command of the host to Amasa, who had commanded the army of Absalom (2Sa 19:13). But the inefficiency of the new. commander, in the emergency which the revolt of Bichri's son produced, arising perhaps from the reluctance of the troops to follow their new leader, gave Joab an opportunity of displaying his superior resources, and also of removing his rival by a murder very similar to that of Abner, and in some respects less excusable and more foul. SEE AMASA. Besides, Amasa was his own cousin, being the son of his mother's sister (2Sa 20:1-13). B.C. cir. 1022.

When David lay apparently on his death bed, and a demonstration was made in favor of the succession of the eldest surviving son, Adonijah, whose interests had been compromised by the preference of the young Solomon, Joab joined the party of the former. B.C. cir. 1015. It would be unjust to regard this as a defection from David. It was nothing more or less than a demonstration in favor of the natural heir, which, if not then made,  could not be made at all. But an act which would have been justifiable had the preference of Solomon been a mere caprice of the old king, became criminal as an act of contumacy to the divine king, the real head of the government, who had called the house of David to the throne, and had the sole right of determining which of its members should reign. We learn from David's last song that his powerlessness over his courtiers was even then present to his mind (2Sa 23:6-7), and now he recalled to Solomon's recollection the two murders of Abner and Amasa (1Ki 2:5; 1 Kings 6), with an injunction not to let the aged soldier escape with impunity. When the prompt measures taken under the direction of the king rendered Adonijah's demonstration abortive (1Ki 1:7), Joab withdrew into private life till some time after the death of David, when the fate of Adonij ah, and of Abiathar — whose life was only spared in consequence of his sacerdotal character — warned Joab that he had little mercy to expect from the new king. He fled for refuge to the altar; but when Solomon heard this, he sent Benaiah to put him to death; and, as he refused to come forth, gave orders that he should be slain even at the altar. Thus died one of the most- accomplished warriors and unscrupulous men that Israel ever produced. His corpse was removed to his domain in the wilderness of Judah, and buried there (1Ki 2:5; 1Ki 2:28-34). B.C. cir. 1012. He left descendants, but nothing is known of them, unless it may be inferred from the double curse of David (2Sa 3:39) and of Solomon (1Ki 2:23) that they seemed to dwindle away, stricken by a succession of visitations — weakness, leprosy, lameness, murder, starvation. His name is by some supposed (in allusion to his part in Adonijah's coronation on that spot) to be preserved in the modern appellation of Enrogel — “ the well of Job” — corrupted from Joab.

3. One of the “sons” of Pahath-moab (1Es 8:35), whose descendants, together with those of Jeshua, returned from the exile to the number of 2812 or 2818 (Ezr 2:6; Neh 7:11), besides 218 males subsequently under the leadership of one Obadiah (Ezr 8:9). B.C. ante 536.

## Jo?chaz[[@Headword:Jo?chaz]]

             (Ι᾿ωάχαζ v.r. Ι᾿ώχαζ and Ι᾿εχονίας), a Graecized form (I Esdr. 1, 34) of the name of king JEHOHAZ SEE JEHOHAZ (q.v.).

## Jo?chim[[@Headword:Jo?chim]]

             (Ι᾿ωακείμ), a Graecized form of the Heb. name JEHOIAKIM, and applied in the Apocrypha to

1. The king of Judah, son of Josiah (Bar 1:3).

2. A priest (ὁ ἱερεύς, A.V. “high priest”), said to be son of Hilkiah at the time of the burning of Jerusalem by the Babylonians (Bar 1:7). SEE JOACIM, 4. As no such pontiff occurs at this time, SEE HIGH PRIEST, the person intended may perhaps have been not the successor, but only a junior son of Hilkiah — if, indeed, the whole narrative be not spurious. SEE BARUCH.

## Juan Valdez[[@Headword:Juan Valdez]]

             SEE VALDEZ.

## Juan de Dios[[@Headword:Juan de Dios]]

             SEE JOHN DE DIEU.

## Juanes, Juan Baptista[[@Headword:Juanes, Juan Baptista]]

             an eminent Spanish painter, was born at Valencia in 1523 and studied at Rome,. but afterwards settled at Valencia. He is ranked by the Spanish writers as one of the greatest artists of the glorious age of pope Leo X. Pacheco bestows upon him the highest encomiums, and Palomino Velasco does not hesitate to prefer him to Morales, or even to Raphael himself. Juanes limited himself to subjects of sacred history, and his works are  entirely confined to the churches and convents of his native city. There is a fine picture by him, representing The Baptism of Christ, in the Cathedral. of Valencia. There are three others, representing The Nativity; The Martyrdom of St. Inez; The Burial of a Monk. Another fine picture is a Dead Christ, in the Church of San Pedro. He died in 1579.

## Jubal[[@Headword:Jubal]]

             (Heb. Yubal', יוּבָל, prob. for יוּבֶל, jubilee, i.e. music Sept. Ι᾿ουβάλ), Lamech's second son by Adah, of the line of Cain; described as the inventor of the כּנּור, kinnor, and the עוּגָב, ugab, rendered in our version "the harp and the organ," but perhaps more properly "the lyre and mouth-organ," or Pandaean pipe (Gen 4:21). See Music. B.C. prob. cir. 3490. According to Josephus (Ι᾿ούβαλος, Ant. 1, 2, 2), "he cultivated music, and invented the psaltery and cithara." Some have compared him with the Apollo of heathen mythology (Hasse's Entdeck. 2, 37; comp. Euseb. Proep. Evang. 10, 6; Diod. Sic. 1, 20; Buttmann, Mythol. 1, 164; Kalisch, Commentary, ad loc.).

## Jubilate[[@Headword:Jubilate]]

             SEE SUNDAY.

## Jubilation, Gift Of[[@Headword:Jubilation, Gift Of]]

             a privilege alleged by theurgic mysticism to be granted to eminent Romish saints, by which they are enabled in their last moments to sing a triumphant death-song.

## Jubilee[[@Headword:Jubilee]]

             (Heb. Yobel', יוֹבֵלor וֹבֵל, a joyful shout or clangor of trumpets; once in the Author. Vers. for תְּרוּעָה, Lev 25:9, which is elsewhere rendered "a shout," etc.), usually in the connection YEAR OF JUBILEE (שְׁנִת הִיּוֹבֵל, or merely יובֵל, as in Lev 25:28; Septuag. usually translates ἔτος τῆς ἀφἐσεως, or simply ἄφεσις; but Graecizes Ι᾿ωβήλ in Jos 6:8; Jos 6:13; Josephus Graecizes Ι᾿ώβηλος, Ant. 3, 12, 3; Vulgate annus jubilee, orjubilceus, but buccina in Exo 19:13); also galled the "year of liberty" (שְׁנִת דְּרוֹר. Eze 46:17), the great semi- centennial epoch of the Hebrews, constituting a festival, and marked by striking public and domestic changes. The relation in which it stood to the sabbatical year, and the general directions for its observance, are given Lev 25:8-16; Lev 25:23-55. Its bearing on lands dedicated to Jehovah is stated Lev 27:16-25. There is no mention of the jubilee in the book of Deuteronomy, and the only other reference to it in the Pentateuch is in the appeal of the tribe of Manasseh, on account of the daughters of Zelophehad (Num 36:4). It is rarely mentioned in the prophetical books, but is very frequently referred to by Talmudical writers. SEE FESTIVAL.

I. Signification of the Name. — According to pseudo-Jonathan (Targum on Jos 6:5-9), the Talmud (Rosh Ha-shana, 26, a), Rashi, Aben- Ezra (on Exo 19:3), Kimchi (on Jos 5:6), and other Jewish authorities, the meaning ram, which יובֵל seems at times to bear (see Fürst., Lexicon, s.v.; but Gesenius utterly denies this sense), is the primary one; hence metonymically a ram's horn (comp. Exo 19:13 with Jos 6:5); and so the sound of a ram's horn, like the Latin buccina. According to another ancient interpretation, the Heb. word is from a root יָבִל, to liberate (parallel with דרור, a freed captive; comp. Hitzig on Jer 34:8); an etymology which is somewhat sanctioned by Lev 25:10, and the usual rendering of the Sept. (also Josephus, ἐλευθερίανδὲ σημαίνει τοὔνομα, Ant. 3, 12, 3; and by St. Jerome, Jobel est demittens aut mittens, Comment. ad loc.). Others, again, regard the root יבלas onomatopoetic, like the Latin jubilare, denoting to  bejubilant (Gesenius, etc.). Most modern critics, however; derive יובלfrom the better known root יבל, to flow impetuously (Gen 6:17), and hence assign to It the meaning of the loud or impetuous sound (Gen 4:21) streaming forth from the trumpet, and proclaiming this festival. The other notions respecting the word may be found in Fuller (Misc. Sac. p. 1026 sq.; Critici Sacri, vol. 9), in Carpzov (p. 448 sq.), and, most completely given, in Kranold (p. 11 sq.).

II. Laws connected with this Festival. — These embrace the following three main points:

1. Rest for the Soil. — This enactment, which is comprised in Lev 25:11-12, enjoins that, as on the Sabbatical year, the land should lie fallow, and that there should be no tillage nor harvest during the jubilee year. The Israelites, however, were permitted to fetch the spontaneous produce of the field for their immediate wants (טן השדה תאבלו את תבואתה), but not to lay it up in their storehouses.

2. Reversion of landed Property. — This provision is comprised in Lev 25:13-34; Lev 27:16-24. The Mosaic law enacted that the Promised Land should be divided by lot, in equal parts, among the Israelites, and that the plot which should thus come into the possession of each family was to be absolutely inalienable, and forever continue to be the property of the descendants of the original possessor. SEE LAND.

When a proprietor, therefore, being pressed by poverty, had to dispose of a field, no one could buy it of him for a longer period than up to the time of the next jubilee, when it reverted to the original possessor, or to his family. Hence the sale, properly speaking, was not of the land, but of the produce of so many years, and the price was fixed according to the number of years (שני תבואת) up to the next jubilee, so as to prevent any injustice being done to those who were compelled by circumstances to part temporarily with their land (Lev 25:15-16). The lessee, however, according to Josephus, in case he had made great outlays on the field just before he was required by the law of jubilee to return it to its owner, could claim compensation for these (Ant. 3, 12, 3). But even before the jubilee year the original proprietor could recover his field, if either his own circumstances improved, or if his next of kin, SEE GOEL could redeem it for him by paying back according to the same price which regulated the purchase (Lev 25:26-27). In the interests of the purchaser, however, the  Rabbinical law enacted that this redemption should not take place before he had the benefit of the field for two productive years (so the Rabbins understood שני תבואת), exclusive of a sabbatical year, a year of barrenness, and of the first harvest, if he happened to buy the plot of land shortly before the seventh month, i.e. with the ripe fruit (Erachin, 9, 1; Maimonides, Jobel, 11, 10-13). As poverty is the only reason which the law supposes might lead one to part with his field, the Rabbins enacted that it was not allowable for any one to sell his patrimony on speculation (comp. Maimonides, Jobel, 11, 3). Though nothing is here said about fields which were given away by the proprietors, yet there can be no doubt, as Maimonides says (ibid. 11, 10), that the same law is intended to apply to gifts (comp. Eze 46:17), but not to those plots of land which came into a man's possession through marriage with an heiress (Num 36:4-9; compare Mishna, Berachoth, 8, 10). Neither did this law apply to a house in a walled city. Still, the seller had the privilege of redeeming it at any time within a full year from the day of the sale. After the year it became the absolute property of the purchaser (Lev 25:29-30, Keri). As this law required a more minute definition for practical purposes, the Rabbins determined that this right of redemption might be exercised from the very first day of the sale to the last day which made up the year. Moreover, as the purchaser sometimes concealed himself towards the end of the year, in order to prevent the seller from redeeming his house, it was enacted that when the purchaser could not be found, the original proprietor should hand over the redemption — money to the powers that be, break open the doors, and take possession of the house; and if the purchaser died during the year, the original proprietor could redeem it from the heir (comp. Mishna, Erachin, 9, 3,4; Maimonides, Jobel, 12, 1-7).

Open places, however, which are not surrounded by walls, belong to landed property, and, like the cultivated land on which they stand, are subject to the law of jubilee, and must revert to their original proprietors (Lev 25:31). But, although houses in open places are thus treated like fields; yet, according to the Rabbinic definition, the reverse is not to be the case; i.e. fields or other places not built upon in walled cities are not to be treated as cities, but come under the jubilee law of fields (comp. Erachin, 9, 5). The houses of the Levites, in the forty-eight cities given to them (Num 35:1-8), were exempt from this general law of house property. Having the. same value to the Levites as landed property had to the other tribes, these houses were subject to the jubilee law for fields, and could at any time be redeemed (Lev 25:32; comp. Erachin, 9, 8), so that, even if a  Levite redeemed the house which his brother Levite was obliged to sell through poverty, the general law of house property is not to obtain, even among the Levites themselves, but they are obliged to treat each other according to the law of landed property. Thus, for instance, the house of A, which he, out of poverty, was obliged to sell to the non-Levite B, and was redeemed from him by a Levite C, reverts in the jubilee year from C to the original Levitical proprietor A. This seems to be the most probable meaning of the enactment contained in Lev 25:33, and it does not necessitate us to insert into the text the negative particle לא before יגאל, as is done by the Vulgate, Houbigant, Ewald (Alterthümer, p.421), Knobel, etc., nor need we, with Rashi, Aben-Ezra, etc., take גאל in the unnatural sense of buying. The lands in the suburbs of their cities the Levites were not permitted to part with under any condition, and therefore these did not come under the law of jubilee (Lev 25:34). The only exception to this general law were the houses and the fields consecrated to the Lord, or to the support of the sanctuary. If these were not redeemed before the ensuing jubilee, instead of reverting to their original proprietors, they at the jubilee became forever the property of the priests (Lev 27:20-21). The conditions, however, on which consecrated property could be redeemed were as follows: A house thus devoted to the Lord was valued by the priest, and the donor who wished to redeem it had to pay one fifth in addition to this fixed value (Lev 27:14-15). A field was valued according to the number of homers of barley which could be sown thereon, at the rate of fifty silver shekels of the sanctuary for each homer for the whole fifty years, deducting from it a proportionate amount for the lapse of each year (Lev 27:16-18). According to the Talmud the fiftieth year was not counted. Hence, if any one wished to redeem his field, he had to pay one fifth in addition to the regular rate of a sela (shekel), and a pundium (=1-48th sela) per annum for every homer, the surplus pundium being intended for the forty-ninth year. No one was therefore allowed to sanctify his field during the year which immediately preceded the jubilee, for he would then have to pay for the whole forty-nine years, because months could not be deducted from the sanctuary, and the jubilee year itself was not counted (Mishna, Erachin, 7, 1). If one sanctified a field which he had purchased, i.e. not freehold property, it reverted to the original proprietor in the year of jubilee (Lev 27:22-24).

3. Manumission of those Israelites who had become Slaves. — This enactment is comprised in Lev 25:39-54. All Israelites who through  poverty had sold themselves as slaves to their fellow Israelites or to the foreigners resident among them, and who, up to the time of the jubilee, had neither completed their six years of servitude, nor redeemed themselves, nor been redeemed by their relatives, were to be set free in the jubilee, to return with their children to their family and to the patrimony of their fathers. Great difficulty has been experienced in reconciling the injunction here, that in the jubilee all slaves are to regain their freedom, with Exo 25:6, where it is enacted that those bondmen who refuse their liberty at the expiration of the appointed six years' servitude, and submit to the boring of their ears, are to be slaves forever (ועבדו לעלם). Josephus (Ant. 4, 8, 28), the Mishna (Kidushin, 1, 3) and Talmud (ibid. 14, 15), Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Maimonides (Hilchoth Abadim, 3, 6), and most Jewish interpreters, who are followed by Ainsworth, Bp. Patrick, and other Christian commentators, take, לעל to denote till the jubilee, maintaining that the slaves who submitted to have their ears bored are included in this general manumission, and thus try to escape the difficulty.

But against this is to be urged, that, 1. The phrase, עבד לעל is used in Lev 25:46 for perpetual servitude, which is unaffected by the year of jubilee. 2. The declaration of the slave that he will not have his freedom, in Exo 21:5, unquestionably shows that perpetual slavery is meant. 3. Servitude till the year of jubilee is not at all spoken of in Lev 25:40-42 as something contemptible, and therefore could not be the punishment designed for him who refused his freedom, especially if the year of jubilee happened to occur two or three years after refusing his freedom; and that it is bondage beyond that time which is characterized as real slavery; and, 4. The jubilee, without any indication whatever from the lawgiver, is here, according to this explanation, made to give the slave the right to take with him the maid and the children who are the property of the master the very right which had previously been denied to him. Ewald, therefore (Alterthümer, p. 421), and others, conclude that the two enactments belong to different periods, the manumission of slaves in the year of jubilee having been instituted when the law enjoining the liberation of slaves at the expiration of six years had become obsolete; while Knobel (on Exo 21:6) regards this jubilee law and the enactments in Exo 21:5-6 as representing one of the many contradictions which exist between the Jehovistic and Elohistic portions of the Pentateuch. All the difficulties. however, disappear when the jubilee manumission enactment is regarded as designed to supplement the law in Exo 21:2-6. In the latter case the  regular period of servitude is fixed, at the expiration of which the bondman is ordinarily to become free, While Lev 25:39-54 institutes an additional and extraordinary period, when those slaves who had not as yet completed their appointed six years of servitude at the time of jubilee, or had not forfeited their right of free citizenship by spontaneously submitting to the yoke of bondage, and becoming slaves forever (עבד עלם), are once in every fifty years to obtain their freedom. The one enactment refers to the freedom of each individual at different days, weeks, months, and years, inasmuch as hardly any twenty of them entered on their servitude at exactly the same time, while the other legislates for a general manumission, which is to take place at exactly the same time. The enactment in Lev 25:39-54, therefore, takes for granted the law in Exo 21:2-6, and begins where the latter ends, and does not mention it because it simply treats on the influence of jubilee upon slavery.

4. That there must also have been a perfect remission of debts in the year of jubilee is self evident, for it is implied in the fact that all persons who were in bondage for debt, as well as all the landed property of debtors, were freely returned. Whether debts generally, for which there were no such pledges, were remitted, is a matter of dispute. Josephus positively declares. that they were (Ant. 13, 2,3), while Maimonides (Jobel, 10, 16) as positively denies it.

III. Time when the Jubilee was celebrated. — According to Lev 25:8-11, it is evident that forty-nine years are to be counted, and that at the end thereof the fiftieth year is to be celebrated as the jubilee. Hence the jubilee is to follow immediately upon the sabbatical year, so that there are to be two successive fallow vears. This is also corroborated by Lev 25:21, where it is promised that the produce of the sixth year shall suffice for three years, i.e. forty-nine, fifty, and fifty-one, or the two former years, which are the sabbatical year and the jubilee, and the immediately following year, in which the ordinary produce of the preceding year would be wanting. Moreover, from the remark in Lev 25:22, it would appear that the sabbatical year, like the jubilee, began in the autumn, or the month of Tisri, which commenced the civil year, when it was customary to begin sowing for the ensuing year. At all events, Lev 25:9 distinctly says that the jubilee is to be proclaimed by the blast of the trumpet," on the tenth of the seventh month, on the day of atonement," which is Tisri. SEE ATONEMENT, DAY  OF.

The opinion that the sabbatical year and the jubilee were distinct, or that there were two fallow years, is also entertained by the Talmud (Rosh Ha-Shana, 8 b, 9 a), Philo (On the Decalogue, 30), Josephus (1.c.), and many other ancient writers. It must, however, be borne in mind that, though there was to be no sowing, nor any regular harvest, during these two years, yet the Israelites were allowed to fetch from the fields whatever they wanted (Lev 25:12). That the fields did yield a crop in their second fallow year is most unquestionably presupposed by the prophet Isaiah (Isa 37:30). Palestine was, at all events, not less fruitful than Albania, in which Strabo tells us (lib. 11, c. 4, sec. 3), "The ground that has been sowed once produces in many places two or three crops, the fruit of which is even fifty-fold."

It must, however, be remarked, that many, from a very early period down to the present day, have taken the jubilee year to be identical with the seventh sabbatical year. Thus the "Book of Jubilees," which dates prior to the Christian era, SEE JUBILEES, BOOK OF, divides the Biblical history from the creation to the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan into fifty jubilees of forty-nine years each, which shows that this view of the jubilee must have been pretty general in those days. Some Rabbins in the Talmud (Erachin, 12 b, with 33 a), as well as many Christian writers (Scaliger, Petavius, Usher, Cunaeus, Calvitius, Gatterer, Frank, Schröder, Hug, Rosenmüller), support the same view. As to the remark, "Ye shall hallow the fiftieth year" (Lev 25:10), "a jubilee shall that fiftieth year be unto you" (Lev 25:11), it is urged that this is in accordance with a mode of speech which is common to all languages and ages. Thus we call a week eight days, including both Sundays, and the best classical writers called an olympiad by the name of quinquennium, though it only contained four entire years. Moreover, the sacred number seven, or the sabbatic idea. which underlies all the festivals, and connects them all into one chain, the last link of which is the jubilee, corroborates this view, inasmuch as we have,

1. A Sabbath of days;

2. A Sabbath of weeks (the seventh week after the Passover being the Sabbath week, as the first day of it is the festival of weeks);

3. A Sabbath of months (inasmuch as the seventh month has both a festival and a fast, and with its first day begins the civil year);

4. A Sabbath of years (the seventh year is the sabbatical year); and,

5. A Sabbath of Sabbaths, inasmuch as the seventh sabbatical year is the jubilee. SEE SABBATH.

IV. Mode of Celebration. — As the observance of the jubilee, like that of the sabbatical year, was only to become obligatory when the Israelites had taken possession of the promised land, and cultivated the land for that period of years, at the conclusion of which the festival was to be celebrated, the ancient tradition preserved in the Talmud seems to be correct, that the first sabbatical year was in the one-and-twentieth, and the first jubilee in the sixty-fourth year after the Jews came into Canaan, for it took them seven years to conquer it, and seven years more to distribute it (Erachin, 12, 6; Maimonides, Jobels 10:2). The Bible says nothing about the manner in which the jubilee is to be celebrated, except that it should be proclaimed by the blast of a trumpeter SEE TRUMPETER.

As in many other cases, the lawgiver leaves the practical application of this law, and the necessarily complicated arrangements connected therewith, to the elders of Israel. Now tradition tells us that the trumpets used on this occasion, like those of the feast of trumpets, or new year, were of rams' horns, straight, and had their mouth piece covered with gold (Mishna, Rosh Ha-Shana, 3, 2; Maimonides, Jobel, 10, 11); that every Israelite blew nine blasts, so as to make the trumpet literally "sound throughout the land" (Lev 25:9); and that "from the feast of trumpets, or new year (i.e. Tisri 1), till the day of atonement (i.e. Tisri 10), the slaves were neither manumitted to return to their homes nor made use of by their masters, but ate, drank, and rejoiced, and wore garlands on their heads; and when the day of atonement came the judges blew the trumpet, the slaves were manumitted to go to their homes, and the fields were set free" (Rosh Ha- Shana, 8 b; Maimonides, Jobel, 10, 14). Though the Jews, from the nature of the case, cannot now celebrate the jubilee, yet on the evening of the day of atonement the conclusion of the fast is announced in all the synagogues to the present day by the blast of the Shophar or horn, which, according to the Rabbins, is intended to commemorate the ancient jubilee proclamation (Orach Chajim, cap. 623, sec. 6, note).

Because the Bible does not record any particular instance of the public celebration of this festival, Michaelis, Winer, etc., have questioned whether the law of jubilee ever came into actual operation; while Kranold, Hupfeld, etc., have positively denied it. The following considerations, however, speak for its actual observance:  1. All the other Mosaic festivals have been observed, and it is therefore surpassing strange to suppose that the jubilee which is so organically connected with them, and is the climax of all of them, is the only one that never was observed.

2. The law about the inalienability of landed property, which was to be the result of the jubilee, actually obtained among the Jews, thus showing that this festival must have been observed. Hence it was with a view to observing the jubilee law that the right of an heiress to marry was restricted (Num 36:4; Num 36:6-7); and it was the observance of this law, forbidding the sale of land in such a manner as to prevent its reversion to the original owner or his heir in the year of jubilee, that made Naboth refuse to part with his vineyard on the solicitation of king Ahab (1Ki 21:1-4).

3. From Eze 46:17, where even the king is reminded that if he made a present of his landed property to any of his servants it could only be to the jubilee year, when it must revert to him, it is evident that the jubilee was observed. Allusions to the jubilee are also to be found in Neh 5:1-19; Isa 5:7-10; Isa 61:1-2; Eze 7:12-13 (Isa 37:30 is less clear). Ewald contends that the institution is eminently practical in the character of its details, and that the accidental circumstance of no particular instance of its observance having been recorded in the Jewish history proves nothing. Besides the passages to which reference has been made, he applies several others to the jubilee. He conceives that "the year of visitation" mentioned in Jer 11:23; Jer 23:12; Jer 48:44, denotes the punishment of those who, in the jubilee, withheld by tyranny or fraud the possessions or the liberty of the poor. From Jer 32:6-12, he infers that the law was restored to operation in the reign of Josiah (Alterthümer, p. 424, note 1). It is likely, however, that in the general declension of religious observances under the later monarchs of Judah this institution yielded to the avarice and worldliness of landed proprietors, especially as mortgaged property and servants would thereby be released (see Jer 34:8-11; comp. Nehemiah 5). Indeed, it is intimated that the Babylonian captivity should be of such a duration as to compensate for the years (sabbatical and jubilee together) of which Jehovah had thus been defrauded (2Ch 36:21).

4. The general observance of the jubilee is attested by the unanimous voice of Jewish tradition. This unanimity of opinion, however, only extends to the observance of the jubilee prior to the Babylonian captivity, for many of  the later Rabbins affirm that it was not kept after the captivity. But in the Seder Olam (cap. 30), the author of which lived shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, we are positively assured that it was observed. Josephus, too (Ant. 3, 12, 3), speaks of it as being permanently observed. This is, moreover, confirmed by Diodorus Siculus (lib. 40), who tells us that the Jews cannot dispose of their own patrimony (ἰδιους κλήρους πωλεῖν), as well as by the fact that we have distinct records of the law respecting the redemption of houses in cities without walls, which forms an integral part of the jubilee law, being strictly observed to a very late period (Erachin, 31 b; Baba Kama, 82 b).

V. Origin, Design, and Importance of the Jubilee. — The foundation of the law of jubilee appears to be so essentially connected with the children of Israel that it seems strange that Michaelis should have confidently affirmed its Egyptian origin, while yet he acknowledges that he can produce no specific evidence on the subject (Mos. Law, art. 73). The only well proved instance of anything like it in other nations appears to be that of the Dalmatians, mentioned by Strabo, lib. 7 (p. 315, edit. Casaubon). He says that they redistributed their land every eight years. Ewald, following the statement of Plutarch, refers to the institution of Lycurgus; but Mr. Grote has given another view of the matter (History of Greece, 2, 530).

The object of this institution was that those of the people of God who, through poverty or other adverse circumstances, had forfeited their personal liberty or property to their fellow citizens, should have their debts forgiven by their coreligionists every half century, on the great day of atonement, and be restored to their families and inheritance as freely and fully as God on that very day forgave the debts of his people and restored them to perfect fellowship with himself, so that the whole community, having forgiven each other and being forgiven of God, might return to the original order which had been disturbed in the lapse of time, and, being freed from the bondage of one another, might unreservedly be the servants of him who is their redeemer. The aim of the jubilee, therefore, is to preserve unimpaired the essential character of the theocracy, to the end that there be no poor among the people of God (Deu 15:4). Hence God, who redeemed Israel from the bondage of Egypt to be his peculiar people, and allotted to them the promised land, will not suffer any one to usurp his title as Lord over those whom he owns as his own. It is the idea of grace for all the suffering children of man, bringing freedom to the captive and rest to the weary as well as to the earth, which made the  year of jubilee the symbol of the Messianic year of grace (Isa 61:2), when all the conflicts in the universe should be restored to their original harmony, and when not only we, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, but the whole creation, which groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, may be restored into the glorious liberty of the sons of God (comp. Isa 61:1-3, Luk 4:21; Rom 8:18-23 : Heb 4:9).

The importance of this institution will be apparent if it is considered what moral and social advantages would accrue to the community from the sacred observance of it.

1. It would prevent the accumulation of land on the part of a few to the detriment of the community at large.

2. It would render it impossible for any one to be born to absolute poverty, since every one had his hereditary land.

3. It would preclude those inequalities which are produced by extremes of riches and poverty, and which make one man domineer over another.

4. It would utterly do away with slavery.

5. It would afford a fresh opportunity to those who were reduced by adverse circumstances to begin again their career of industry, in the patrimony which they had temporarily forfeited.

6. It would periodically rectify the disorders which crept into. the state in the course of time, preclude the division of the people into nobles and plebeians, and preserve the theocracy inviolate.

VI. Literature. — The Mishna (Erachin, ch. 8, 9) gives very important enactments of a very ancient date respecting the jubilee. In Maimonides (Jod Ha-Chezaka, especially the tract so often above referred to as Hilchoth Shemita Ve-Jobel, ch. 10-13) an epitome will be found of the Jewish information on this subject which is scattered through the Talmud and Midrashim. Of the modern productions are to be mentioned the valuable treatises of Cunaeus, De Rep. Hebr. chap. 2, sec. 4 (in the Critici Sacri, 9:278 sq.), and Meyer, De Tempor. et Diebus Hebroeorum (in Ugolini Thesaurus, 1, 703, 1755), p. 341-360; Michaelis, Commentaries on the Laws of Moses (Engl. version, Lond. 1814), vol. 1, art. 83, p. 376 sq.; Ideler, Handbuch der Chronologie (Berl. 1825), 1, 502 sq; the  excellent prize essays of Kranold, De Anno Hebr. Jubiloeo (Götting. 1837), and Wolde, De anno Hebr. Jubiloeo (Göttingen, 1837); Bhhr, Symbolik des Mosaischen Cultus (Heidelberg, 1839), 1, 572 sq.; Ewald, Die Alterthümer des Folkes Israel (Götting. 1854), p. 415 sq.; Saalschitz, Das Mosaische Recht (Berlin, 1853), 1, 141, etc.; and Archaologie der Hebraer (Konigsb. 1856), 2, 224, etc.; Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volkes Israel (Nordhausen, 1855), 1, 463, etc.; Keil, Handbuch der Biblischen Archäologie (Frankf. a. M. 1858), 1, 374, etc. Hupfeld (Commentatio de Hebroeorum Festis, part 3, 1852) has lately dealt with it in a willful and reckless style of criticism. Vitringa notices the prophetical bearing of the jubilee in lib. 4, c. 4 of the Observationes Sacroe. Lightfoot (Harm. Evang. in Luke 4, 19) pursues the subject in a fanciful manner, and makes out that Christ suffered in a jubilee year. For further details, see Wagenseil, De anno Jubiloeo Hebr. (Altdorf, 1700); J.C. Buck, De anno Hebroeor. jubiloeo (Viteb. 1700); Carpzov, De annojubiloeo (Lips. 1730; also in his Apparat. crit. p. 447): Ode, De anno Heb. jubilate (Traj. a. K. 1736; also in Oelrich's Collectio, 2, 421-508); Laurich, Legislatio Mosaica de anno semiseculari (Altenb. 1794); also Marck, Syllog. dissert. 302; Bauer, Gottesd. Verfass. 2, 277; Hullmann, Urgesch. des Staats, 73; Van der Hardt, Dejubil. Mosis (Helmstadt, 1728); Jochanan Salomo, De jubil. Hebr. (Danz. 1679); Meier, De mysterii Jobelcei (Brem. 1700), Reineccius, De origine Jubiloeorum (Weissenfels, 1730); Stemler, De anno Jobeleo (Lips. 1730); Van Poorteren, Jubilcus Hebroeorum (Cob. 1730); Walther, De Jubiloeo Judoeorum (Sodin. 1762). Other monographs, relating, however, rather to later times, are cited by Volbeding, Index, p. 128, 162. SEE SABBATICAL YEAR.

## Jubilee, Or Jubilee Year[[@Headword:Jubilee, Or Jubilee Year]]

             an institution of the Roman Catholic Church, the name of which is borrowed from that of the Jewish jubilee (see above). The Catholic jubilee is of two kinds, ordinary and extraordinary. The ordinary jubilee is that which is celebrated at stated intervals, the length of which has varied at different times. Its origin is traced to pope Boniface VIII, who issued, for the year 1300, a bull granting a plenary indulgence to all pilgrim visitors of Rome during that year on condition of their penitently confessing their sins, and visiting the church of St. Peter and St. Paul fifteen times if strangers, and thirty times if residents of the city. The invitation was accepted with marvelous enthusiasm. Innumerable troops of pilgrims from every part of the Church flocked to Rome. Giovanni Villani a contemporary chronicler,  states that the constant number of pilgrims in Rome, not reckoning those who were on the road going or returning, during the entire year, never fell below 200,000. Boniface, finding the jubilee a success, and having been informed, so the story goes, by a hoary patriarch, who, at the age of 107, attended it, that a hundred years ago a like jubilee had been held, now ordered that it should thereafter be held every hundredth year. The great gain which the occasion afforded to. the churches at Rome induced Clement VI to abridge the time to fifty years. His jubilee accordingly took place in 1350, and was even more numerously attended than that of Boniface, the average number of pilgrims, until the heats of summer suspended their frequency, being, according to Matthew Villani, no fewer than 1,000,000!

The term of interval was still further abridged by Urban VI; but in the stormy days of his pontificate the jubilee could not take place, and his successor, Boniface IX, improved this to his advantage, and ordered it to take place in 1390. Ten years later he repeated it, and. besides, instituted extra years of jubilee, and permitted their observance also in foreign cities provided the worshippers would pay into the Roman treasury the cost of a journey to the holy city (comp. Amort, De origine, progressu, valore ac fructu indulgent. 1, 87 sq.). Paul II finally ordered in 1470 that thenceforward every twenty-fifth year should be held as jubilee, an arrangement which has continued ever since to regulate the ordinary jubilee. As the indulgences could, by the payment of given sums and the contribution to ecclesiastical purposes, always be obtained at the home of the penitent, the pilgrimages to Rome gradually diminished in frequency; but the observance itself has been punctually maintained at each recurring period, with the single exception of the year 1800, in which, owing to the vacancy of the holy see and the troubles of the times, it was not held. For the excesses committed in the sale of indulgences, SEE INDULGENCES.

The extraordinary jubilee is ordered by the pope out of the regular period, either on his accession, or on some occasion of public calamity, or in some critical condition of the fortunes of the Church; one of the conditions for obtaining the indulgence in such cases being the recitation of certain stated prayers for the particular necessity in which the jubilee originated. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 7, 117; Chambers, s.v.; Walcott, Sac. Archoeol. p. 334.

## Jubilees, Book of[[@Headword:Jubilees, Book of]]

             This apocryphal or Hagadic book, which was used so largely in the ancient Church, and was still known to the Byzantines, but of which both the  original Hebrew and the Greek were afterwards lost, has recently been discovered in an Ethiopic version in Abyssinia.

I. Title of the Book, and its Signification. — The book is called Ι᾿ωβηλαῖα = ספר הרובלות, "the Jubilees," or "the book of Jubilees," because it divides the period of the Biblical history upon which it treats, i.e. from the creation to the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan, into fifty jubilees of forty-nine years each, equal to 2450 years, and carefully describes every event according to the jubilee, sabbatical year, or year in which it transpired, as stated in the inscription: "These are the words of the division of the days according to the law and the testimony, according to the events of the years in sabbatical years and in jubilees," etc. It is also called by the fathers ἡ λετὴ Γἐνεσις, λεπτοσγένεσις, μικρογένεσις, τὰ λεπτὰ Γενέσεως = זוטא בראשית, i.e. the small Genesis, compendium of Genesis, because it only selects certain portions of Genesis, although through its lengthy comments upon these points it is actually longer than this canonical book (comp. Epiphanius, Adv. Hoer. lib. 1, tom. 3, cap. 6, edit. Petav.; G. Syncellus, p. 8); or, according to Ewald's rendering of it, τὰ λεπτὰ (subtilia, minuta) Γένεσις, because it divides the history upon which it treats into very minute and small periods (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 1, 271); it is called by St. Jerome the apocryphal Genesis (see below, sec. 3), and it is also styled ἡ τοῦ Μωυσέως ἀποκάλυψις, the Apocalypse of Moses, by George Syncellus and Cedrenus, because the book pretends to be a revelation of God to Moses, and is denominated" the book of the division of days" by the Abyssinian Church, from the first words of the inscription.

II. Design and Contents of the Book. — This apocryphal book is designed to be a commentary on the canonical books of Genesis and Exodus.

(1) It fixes and arranges more minutely the chronology of the Biblical history from the creation to the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan;

(2) Solves the various difficulties to be found in the narratives of these canonical books;

(3) Describes more fully events which are simply hinted at in the sacred history of that early period; and

(4) Expatiates upon the religious observances, such as the Sabbath, the festivals, circumcision, sacrifices, lawful and unlawful meats, etc., setting  forth their sacred character, as well as our duty to keep them, by showing the high antiquity of these institutions, inasmuch as they have been sacredly observed by the patriarchs, as may be seen from the following notice of these four points.

a. In its chronological arrangements we find that it places the deluge in A.M. 1353 (Jubil. 6, 61), and the exodus in the year A.M. 2410 (4, 10). This, with the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness, yields fifty jubilees of forty-nine years each from the creation to the entrance into Canaan, i.e. 2450, and also allows a new jubilee period to commence immediately upon the entering of the Israelites into the Promised Land. Though in the calculations of this period the book of Jubilees agrees in its particulars with the Hebrew text of Genesis and Exodus, yet it differs from the canonical text both as to the time of the sojourn in Egypt and the years in which the ante and post-diluvian patriarchs begat their children. Thus Jared is said to have lived 62 instead of 162 years before Enoch was born, Methuselah was 67 instead of 187 at the birth of Lamech, and Lamech again was 53 instead of 182 when he begat Noah, agreeing partly with the Samaritan Pentateuch, and partly with the Septuagint in their statements about these antediluvian patriarchs. In the chronology of the post-diluvian patriarchs, however, the book of Jubilees deviates from these versions, and says that Arphaxad begat Cainan when 74-75; after the deluge, Cainan begat Salah when 57, Salah begat Eber when 67, Eber begat Peleg when 68, Peleg begat Reu when 61; the birth of Serug is omitted, but Serug is said to have begat Nahor in the year 116 after the birth of Reu, and Nahor begat Terah in his 62d year (compare Jubil. 4:40, etc.). The going down into Egypt is placed about A.M. 2172-2173 (Jubil. 45:1-3), so that when we deduct it from 2410, in which year the exodus is placed, there remains for the sojourn in Egypt 238 years. In the description of the lives of Noah, Abraham (23:23), Isaac (36:49-52), Jacob (45:40-43), and Joseph (46:9- 15), the chronology agrees with the Hebrew text of Genesis.

b. Of the difficulties in the sacred narrative which the book of Jubilees tries to solve may be mentioned that it accounts for the serpent speaking to Eve by saying that all animals spoke before the fall in paradise (comp. Gen 1:1 with Jubil. 3:98); explains very minutely whence the first heads of families took their wives (Jubi. 4, 24, 71, 100, etc.); how far the sentence of death pronounced in Gen 2:17 has been fulfilled literally (4:99, etc.); shows that the sons of God who came to the daughters of men were angels (5:3); with what help Noah brought the animals into the ark  (5:76); wherewith the tower of Babel was destroyed (10:87); why Sarah disliked Ishmael and urged Abraham to send him away (17:13); why Rebecca loved Jacob so dearly (19:40-84); how it was that Esau came to sell his birthright for a mess of pottage (24:5-20); who told Rebekah (Gen 27:42) that Esau determined to kill Jacob (37:1, etc.); how it was that he afterwards desisted from his determination to kill Jacob (35:29- 105); why Rebekah said (Gen 27:45) that she would be deprived of both her sons in one day (37:9); why Er, Judah's first born, died (41:1-7); why Onan would not redeem Tamar (41:11-13); why Judah was not punished for his sin with Tamar (41:57-67); why Joseph had the money put into the sacks of his brethren (42:71-73) and how Moses was nourished in the ark (47:13), and that it was not God, but the chief mastemah, משַשמה, the enemy, who hardened the hearts of the Egyptians (48:58).

c. Instances where events which are briefly mentioned or simply hinted at in the canonical book of Genesis, and which seem to refer to another narrative of an earlier or later date, are given more fully in the book of Jubilees, will be found in Jubil. 16:39-101, where an extensive description is given of the appearance of the angels to Abraham and Sarah as a supplement to Gen 18:14; in Jubil. 32:5-38, 50-53, where Jacob is described as giving tithes of all his possessions, and wishing to erect a house of Good in Bethel, which is a fuller description of that hinted at in Gen 28:22; in Jubil. 34:4-25, where Jacob's battle with the seven kings of the Amorites is described, to Which allusion is made in Gen 48:22.

d. As to the religious observances, we are told that the Feast of Weeks, or Pentecost (הקגיר םשבועות חג םיוםהבכורים), is contained in the covenants which God made with Noah and Abraham (comp. Jubil. 6:5660 with Gen 9:8-17 with Gen 15:18-21); the Feast of Tabernacles was first celebrated by Abraham at Beersheba (Jubil. 16:61- 101); the concluding Festival (שמיני עצרת), which is on the 23d of Tisri, continuing the Feast of Tabernacles, SEE FESTIVAL, was instituted by Jacob (Jubil. 32:87-94) after his vision at Bethel (Gen 35:9-14); and that the mourning on the Day of Atonement (יוםכפיר) was instituted (Lev 16:29) to commemorate the mourning of Jacob over the loss of Joseph (Jubil. 34:50-60).  (The German version by Dillmann, through which this book has recently been made known to Europeans, has been divided by the erudite translator into fifty chapters, but not into verses. The references in this article are to those chapters, and the lines of the respective chapters.)

III. Author and Original Language of the Book. — That the author of this book was a Jew is evident from,

(1) His minute description of the Sabbath and festivals, as well as all the Rabbinic ceremonies connected therewith (1:19-33, 49-60), which developed themselves in the course of time, and which we are told are simply types described by Moses from heavenly archetypes, and have not only been kept by the angels in heaven, but are binding upon the Jews world without end;

(2) The elevated position he ascribes to the Jewish people (2:79-91; 16:50- 56); ordinary Israelites are in dignity equal to angels (15:72-75), and the priests are like the presence angels (31:47-49); over Israel only does the Lord himself rule, while he appointed evil spirits to exercise dominion over all other nations (15:80-90); and

(3) The many Hagadic elements of this book which are still preserved in the Talmud and Midrashim. Compare, for instance, Jubil. 1:116, where the presence angel, שר הפניםמטטרון, is described as having preceded the hosts of Israel, with Sanhedrim, 38, b; the description of the creation of paradise on the third day (Jubil. 2:37 with Bereshith Rabba, c. 15); the twenty-two generations from Adam to Jacob (Jubil. 2:64, 91, with Bereshith Rabba and Midrash Tadshe, 169); the animals speaking before the fall (Jubil. 3:98 with the Midrashim); the remark that Adam lived 70 years less than 1000 years in order that the declaration might be fulfilled "in the day in which thou eatest thereof thou shalt die," since 1000 years are as one day with the Lord (Jubil. 4:99 with Bereshith Rabba, c. 19; Justin. Dial. c. Tryph. p. 278, ed. Otto); the causes of the deluge (Jubil. 5:5-20 with Bereshith Rabba, c. 31); the declaration that the beginning of the first, fourth, seventh, and tenth months are to be celebrated as festivals, being the beginning of the four seasons called תקפות, and having already been observed by Noah (Jubil. 6:31-95 with Pirke R. Eliezer, cap. 8; Pseudo- Jonathan on Gen 8:22); the statement that Satan induced God to ask Abraham to sacrifice his son (Jubil. 17:49-53 with Sanhedrim, 89, b); that Abraham was tempted ten times (Jubil. 19:22 with Mishna, Aboth, 5;  Targum Jerusalem on Gen 22:1, etc.); and that Joseph spoke Hebrew when he made himself known to his brothers (Jubil. 43:54 with Bereshith Rabba, cap. 93). As, however, some of the practices, rites, and interpretations given in this book are at variance with the traditional expositions of the Rabbins, Beer is of opinion that the writer was a Dosithean who was anxious to bring about a fusion of Samaritanism and Rabbinic-Judaism by making mutual concessions (Das Buch d. Jubilaen, p. 61, 62); Jellinek, again, thinks that he was an Essene, and wrote this book against the Pharisees, who maintained that the beginning of the month is to be fixed by observation and not by calculation (הראייה קידושׁ ההדש על פי), and that the Sanhedrim had the power of ordaining intercalary years, SEE HILLEL II, adducing in corroboration of this view the remark in Jubil. 6:95-133, the chronological system of the author, which is based upon heptades; and the strict observance of the Sabbath, which, as an Essene loving the sacred number seven, he urges upon every Israelite (compare Jubil. 2:73-135; 4:19-61; Beth ha-Midrash, 3, p. 11); while Frankel maintains that the writer was an Egyptian Jew, and a priest at the temple in Leontopolis, which accounts for his setting such a high value upon sacrifices, and tracing the origin of the festivals and sacrifices to the patriarchs (Monatsschrift, 5, p. 396).

Notwithstanding the difference of opinion as to which phase of Judaism the author belonged, all agree that this book was written in Hebrew, that it was afterwards translated into Greek, and that the Ethiopic, of which Dillmann has given a German version, was made from the Greek. Many of the expressions in the book can only be. understood by retranslating them into Hebrew. Thus, for instance, the remarks "und es gibt keine Uebergehung" (Jubil. 6:101, 102), "und sie sollen keinen Tag uebergehen" (6:107), become intelligible when we bear in mind that the original had עיבור, intercalation. Moreover, the writer designates the wives of the patriarchs from the family of Seth by names which express beauty and virtue in Hebrew; Seth married Azurah, עצורה, restraint; Jared married Beracha, ברכה, blessing; Enoch and Methuselah married wives of the name of Adni, עדנה, pleasure; while Cain married his sister Avan, ]אָוֶ, vice (Jubil. 4:24-128). The words בי נשבעתי, Gen 22:16, are rendered in the book of Jubil. (17:42) bei meinem Haupte, which is the well known Palestinian oath! בחיי ראשי ראש(compare Sanhedrin, 2, 3, al.), and which no Greek writer would use, especially as the Sept. does not have it  here. There are also other renderings which show that the writer had the Hebrew Scriptures before him and not the Sept., a fact which is irreconcilable on the supposition that he was a Greek Jew, or wrote in Greek, as he would undoubtedly have used the Sept. Thus, for instance, the book of Jubil. 14:9,10, has "der aus deinem Liebe hervorgeht," which is a literal translation of the Hebrew!אשר יצא ממעי, Gen 15:4; otherwise the Sept. ὅς ἐξελεύσεται ἐκ σοῦ: Jubil. 14:29 has "aber Abram wehrte sie ab," so the Hebrew, וִיִּשֵׁב אוֹתָםאִבְרָ(Gen 15:11), not the Sept. καὶ συνεκάθισεν αὐτοῖς ῞Αβραμ (comp. also book of Jubil. 15:17 with Sept. Genesis 17:7; 15:43 with Sept. 17:17; 15:46 with Sept. 17:19). To these is to be added the testimony of St. Jerome, who remarks upon רַסָּה, "Hoc verbum, quantum memoria suggerit, nusquam alibi in scripturis sanctis apud Hebraeos invenisse me novi, absque libro apocrypho, qui a Graecis μικρογένεσις appellatur. Ibi in aedificatione turris pro stadio ponitur, in quo excercentur pugiles et athletae et cursorum velocitas comprobatur" (comp. In epistola ad Fabiolam de mansionibus, Mansio 18 on Num 33:21-22); and again (Mansio 24 on Num 33:27-28), "Hoc eodem vocabulo (תֶּיִח) et iisdem literis scriptum invenio patrem Abraham, qui in supradicto apocrypho Geneseos volumine abactis corvis, qui hominum frumenta vastabant, abactoris vel depulsoris sortitus est nomen;" as well as the fact that portions of the book are still extant in Hebrew (comp. Jellinek, Beth Ha-Midrash, vol. 3, p. 9, etc.). The agreement of many passages with the Sept., when the latter deviates from the Hebrew, is, as Dillmann observes, to be ascribed to the translator, who, when rendering it into Greek, used the Sept. (Ewald, Jahrbuch, 3, 90).

IV. Date and Importance of the Book. — That this book was written before the destruction of the Temple is evident not only from its description of the sacrifices and the services performed therein, but from its whole complexion, and this is admitted by all who have written on it. Its exact date, however, is a matter of dispute. Kruger maintains that it was written between B.C. 332 and 320; Dillmann and Frankel think that it was written in the first century before Christ; while Ewald is of opinion that it originated about the birth of Christ. The medium of the two extremes is the most probable.

The importance of this book can hardly be overrated when we remember that it is one of the very few Biblical works which have come down to us  written between the close of the O.T. canon and the beginning of the N.T. There are, however, several other considerations which render this book a most important contribution, both to the interpretation of the Bible and to the history of Jewish belief anterior to the Christian era.

1. Many portions of it are literal translations of the book of Genesis, and therefore enable us to see in what state the Hebrew text was at that age, and furnish us with some readings which are preferable to those given in the textus receptus, e.g. Jubil. 17:17 renders it probable that the correct reading of Gen 21:11 is אדת אמתו על אדת בנו ועל, which is corroborated by the verse immediately following.

2. It shows us that the Jews of that age believed in the survival of the soul after the death of the body (23:115). though the resurrection of the body is nowhere mentioned therein; that they believed in the existence of Satan, the prince of legions of evil spirits, respecting which so little is said in the O. Test. and so much in the New; and that these evil spirits have dominion over men, and are often the cause of their illnesses and death (10:35-47; 49:7-10).

3. It shows us what the Jews believed about the coming of the Messiah, and the great day of judgment (33:37-118).

4. It explains the statements in Act 7:53; Galatians 3, 19; Heb 2:2, which have caused so much difficulty to interpreters, by most distinctly declaring that the law was given through the presence angel (1:99-102).

5. It even appears to be quoted in the N.T. (compare 2Pe 2:4; Jud 1:6, with Jubil. 4:76; 5, 3, 20).

V. Literature. — It has already been remarked that the Hebrew original of this book is lost. Chapters 34 and 35 are, however, preserved from Maidrash Vujisau, in Midrash Jalkut Sabbat. section Bereshith, 133, as has been pointed out by Jellinek (see below); and Treuenfels has shown parallels between other parts of the book of Jubilees and the Hagada and Midrashim in the Literaturblatt des Orients, 1846, p. 81 sq. The Greek version of this book, which was made at a very early period of the Christian era, as is evident from Clement's Recognit. cap. 30-32, though Epiphanius (Adv. Hoeres. lib. 1, cap. 4, 6; lib. 2; tom. 2, cap. 83, 84) and St. Jerome (in Epistola ad Fabiolanz de mansionibus, Mansio 18 on  Num 33:21-22; Mausio 24 on Num 33:27-28) are the first who mention it by name, was soon lost in the Western Church, but it still existed in the Eastern Church, and was copiously used in the Chronographia of Georgius Syncellus and Georgius Cedrenus, and quoted several times by Joannes Zanoras and Michael Glycas, Byzantine theologians and historians of the 11th and 12th centuries (compare Fabricius, Codex Pseud.-epigraph. V. Test. p. 851-863; Dillmann, in Ewald's Jahrbuech. 3, 94 sq.). From that time, however, the Greek version was also lost, and the book of Jubilees was quite unknown to Europeans till 1844, when Ewald announced in the Zeitschrift fur die Kunde des Morgenlandes, p. 176-179, that Dr. Krapff had found it preserved in the Abyssinian church in an Ethiopic translation, and brought over a MS. copy which was made over to the Tübingen University. This Ethiopic version was translated into German by Dillmann in Ewald's Jahrbücher, 2, 230- 256, and 3, 1-96 (Göttingen, 1849-51), and Ewald at once used its contents for the new edition of his Geschichte d. Volkes Israel (vol. 1, Götting. 1851, p. 271; vol. 2, 1853, p. 294). This was seasonably followed by Jellinek's edition of the Midrash Vajisau, with an erudite preface in Beth Ha-Midrash, vol. 3 (Leipzig, 1855); next by the learned treatises of Beer, Das Buch der Jubiläen und sein Verhältniss zu den Midraschim, 1856; and Frankel, Das Buch d. Jubilaen (in the Monatsschrift. f. Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, 5, 311-316, 380-400); then by another masterly production by Beer, entitled Noch ein Wort über das Buch der Jubilaen (in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1857); and strictures on the works of Jellinek, Beer, and Frankel, by Dillmann, in the Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenlandischen Gesellschaft, 11 (Leipzig, 1857), 161 sq. Kruger, too, published an article on Die Chronologie im Buche der Jubilaen in the same journal, 12 (Lpz. 1858), 279 sq., and Dillmann at last published the Ethiopic itself (Kiel and Lond. 1859), which Ronsch has since translated with notes (Leips. 1874, 8vo).

## Jubin (or Gebuin), Saint[[@Headword:Jubin (or Gebuin), Saint]]

             a French prelate, was the son of Hugues III, count of Dijon. Having entered the ministry, he was appointed archdeacon of the Church of Langres. In 1077 he attended the provincial Council of Lyons at Autun, became archbishop of Lyons, and died there, April 18,1082. He is invoked in cases of gout and the stone, with which he had himself been afflicted during his life. There are extant of Jubin six letters treating of the primacy to his see printed by Descordes, Dom Liran, Baluze, etc. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Jucal[[@Headword:Jucal]]

             (Jer 38:1). SEE JEHUCAL.

## Juda[[@Headword:Juda]]

             (Ι᾿ούδα, merely the Genitive case of Ι᾿ούδας, the Graecized form of Judah), an incorrect Anglicizing of the name JUDAS or JUDAH in several passages of the Auth. Vers. SEE Jud 1:1. The patriarch JUDAH, Son of Jacob (Susan. 56; Luk 3:33; Heb 7:14; Rev 5:5; Rev 7:5). For the "city of Juda" (i.e. the tribe of Judah), in Luk 1:39, SEE JUTTAH.

2. The son of Joseph, and father of Simeon, in Christ's maternal ancestry (Luk 3:30); probably the same with ADAIAH, the father of Maaseiah, which latter was one of the Jewish centurions who aided Jehoiada in restoring Joash to the throne (2Ch 23:1). B.C. ante 876. SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

3. The son of Joanna, and father of Joseph (Luk 3:26), another of Christ's maternal ancestors; probably identical with ABIUD, the father of Eliakim, among Christ's paternal ancestry (Mat 1:13); and likewise with OBADIAH, the son of Aman, and father of Shechaniah (1Ch 3:21). B.C. ante 406. (See Strong's Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 16, 17.)

4. One of the Lord's brethren, enumerated in Mar 6:3. SEE JOSES; SEE JOSEPH. On the question of his identity with Jude, the brother of James, one of the twelve apostles (Luk 6:16; Act 1:13), and with the author of the general epistle, SEE JAMES. In Mat 13:55, his name is given more correctly in the A. Vers. as JUDAH.

## Juda (Or Juda) Leo[[@Headword:Juda (Or Juda) Leo]]

             SEE JUDAH LEO.

## Judaea[[@Headword:Judaea]]

             (Ι᾿ουδαία, fem. Of Ι᾿ουδαῖος, Jew or Jewish, sc. land; once in A.V. for Chald. יְהוּד, Judah, Ezr 5:8; "Jewry," Luk 23:5; Joh 7:1), the southernmost of the three divisions of the Holy Land. It denoted the kingdom of Judah as distinguished from that of Israel. SEE JUDAH. But after the captivity, as most of the exiles who returned belonged to the kingdom of Judah, the name Judaea (Judah) was applied generally to the whole of Palestine west of the Jordan (Hag 1:1; Hag 1:14; Haggai 2, 2). Under the Romans, in the time of Christ, Palestine was divided into Galilee, Samaria, and Judaea (Joh 4:4-5; Act 9:31), the last including the whole of the southern part west of the Jordan But this division was only observed as a political and local distinction, for the sake of indicating the part of the country, just as we use the name of a county (Mat 2:1; Mat 2:5; Mat 3:1; Mat 4:25; Luk 1:65); but when the whole of Palestine was to be indicated in a general way, the term Judaea was still employed. Thus persons in Galilee and elsewhere spoke of going to Judaea (Joh 7:3; Joh 11:7), to distinguish the part of Palestine to which they were proceeding; but when persons in Rome and other places spoke of Judea (Act 28:21), they used the word as a general denomination for the country of the Jews, or Palestine. Indeed, the name seems to have had a more extensive application than even to Palestine west of the Jordan It denoted all the dominions of Herod the Great, who was called the king of Judaea; and much of these lay beyond the river (comp. Mat 19:1, Mar 10:1). After the death of Herod, however, the Judaea to which his son Archelaus succeeded was only the southern province so called (Mat 2:22), which afterwards became a Roman province dependent on Syria and governed by procurators, and this was its condition during our Lord's ministry (see Nohrbor, Judoea provincia Romanorum, Upsal. 1822). It was afterwards for a time partly under the dominion of Herod Agrippa the elder (Act 12:1-19), but on his death it reverted to its former condition under the Romans. See Smith's Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.

It is only Judaea, in the provincial sense, that requires our present notice, the country at large being described in the article PALESTINE. In this sense, however, it was much more extensive than the domain of the tribe of Judah, even more so than the kingdom of the same name. There are no materials for describing its limits with precision, but it included the ancient territories of Judah, Benjamin, Dan, Simeon, and part of Ephraim. It is, however, not correct to describe Idumaea as not anciently belonging to Judah. The Idumaea of later times, or that which belonged to Judaea, was the southern part of the ancient Judah, into which the Idumaeans had intruded during the exile, and the annexation of which to Judea only restored what had anciently belonged to it.

The name Judea occurs among the list of nations represented at the paschal outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Act 2:9), where some have preferred the various readings India or Idumoea (see Kuinol, ad loc.), and even Junia (Ι᾿ουνίαν, Schulthess, De charismat. 1, 145), a place in Armenia, with various other conjectural emendations (see Bowyer's Conjectures on the N.T. ad loc.), all alike unnecessary (see Hackett, Alford, ad loc.).

In the Rabbinical writings, Judaea, as a division of Palestine, is frequently called" the south," or "the south country," to distinguish it from Galilee,  which was called" the north" (Lightfoot, Chorog. Cent. 12). The distinction of the tribe of Judah into "the Mountain," "the Plain," and /" the Vale," which we meet with in the Old Testament (Num 13:30), was preserved under the more extended denomination of Judea (for the more specific divisions in Jos 15:21-63, see Keil's Comment. ad loc.; Schwarz, Palest. p. 93-122). The Mountain, or hill country of Judaea (Jos 21:11; Luk 1:39), was that "broad back of mountains," as Lightfoot calls it (Chorog. Cent. 11), which fills the center of the country from Hebron northward to beyond Jerusalem (for Luk 1:39, SEE JUTTAH ).

The Plain was the low country towards the sea coast, and seems to have included not only the broad plain which extends between the sea and the hill country, but the lower parts of the hilly region itself in that direction. Thus the Rabbins allege that from Beth-horon to the sea is one region (Talmud Hieros. Shebiith, 9:2). The Vale is defined by the Rabbins as extending from Engedi to Jericho (Lightfoot, Panergon, § 2); from which, and other indications, it seems to have included such parts of the Ghor, or great plain of the Jordan, as lay within the territory of Judaea. This appropriation of the terms is far preferable to that of some writers, such as Lightfoot, who suppose "the Plain" to be the broad valley of the Jordan, and "the Valley" to be the lower valley of the same river. That which is called the Wilderness of Judaea was the wild and inhospitable region lying eastward of Jerusalem, in the direction of the Jordan and Dead Sea (Isa 40:3; Mat 3:1; Luk 1:80; Luk 3:2-4). In the N.T. only the Highlands and the Desert of Judaea are distinguished. We may have some notion of the extent northward which Judaea had obtained, from Josephus calling Jerusalem the center of the country ( War, 3, 3, 5), which is remarkable, seeing that Jerusalem was originally in the northernmost border of the tribe of Judah. In fact. he describes the breadth of the country as extending from the Jordan to Joppa which shows that this city was in Judaea. How much further to the north — the boundary — lay we cannot know with precision, as we are unacquainted with the site of Annath, otherwise Borceros, which he says lay on the boundary in between Judaea and Samaria. The mere fact that Josephus makes Jerusalem the center of the land seems to prove that the province did not extend so far to the south as the ancient kingdom of the same name. As the southern boundary of Judea was also that of the whole country, it is only necessary to remark that Josephus places the southern boundary of the Judaea of the time of Christ at a village called Jardan, on the confines of Arabia Petraea. No place of this name has been found, and the indication is very indistinct,  from the fact that all the country which lay beyond the Idumaea of those times was then called Arabia. In fixing this boundary, Josephus regards Idumaea as part of Judaea, for he immediately after reckons that as one of the eleven districts into which Judaea was divided. Most of these districts were denominated, like our counties, from the chief towns. They were,

1. Jerusalem;

2. Gophna;

3. Acrabatta;

4. Thumna;

5. Lydda;

6. Emmaus;

7. Pella;

8. Idumaea;

9. Engaddi;

10. Herodium; and,

11. Jericho.

Judaea is, as the above intimations would suggest, a country full of hills and valleys. The hills are generally separated from one another by valleys and torrents, and are, for the most part, of moderate height, uneven, and seldom of any regular figure. The rock of which they are composed is easily converted into soil, which being arrested by the terraces when washed down by the rains, renders the hills cultivable in a series of long, narrow gardens, formed by these terraces from the base upwards. In this manner the hills were in ancient times cultivated most industriously, and enriched and beautified with the fig tree, the olive tree, and the vine; and it is thus that the scanty cultivation which still subsists is now carried on. But when the inhabitants were rooted out, and the culture neglected. the terraces fell to decay, and the soil which had been collected, in them was washed down into the valleys, leaving only the arid rock, naked and desolate. This is the general character of the scenery; but in some parts the hills are beautifully wooded, and in others the application of the ancient mode of cultivation still suggests to the traveler how rich the country once was and might be again, and how beautiful the prospects which it offered. As, however, much of this was the result of cultivation, the country was probably anciently, as at present, naturally less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travelers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judea, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately about Jerusalem, is barren and  desolate. But the prospect brightens as soon as you quit it, and Samaria and Galilee still smile like the land of promise." But there is a season — after the spring rains, and before the summer heat has absorbed all the moisture left by them — when even the desert is clothed with verdure, and at that season the valleys of Judaea present a refreshingly green appearance. This vernal season, however, is of short duration, and by the beginning of May the grass upon the mountains, and every vestige of vegetation upon the lower grounds, have in general completely disappeared. (See Kitto, Pictorial History of Palestine, Introduct. p. 39, 40, 119, 120; and the Travels of Nau, p. 439; Roger, p. 182; Mariti, 2, 362; Lindsay, 2, 70; Stephens, 2, 249; Elliot, p. 408, 409; Olin, 2, 323; Stanley, p. 161, 173. For a general discussion, see Reland, Paloest. p. 31, 174, 178; Rosenmüller, Bibl. Geogr. 2, 2, 149; Ritter, Erdk. 14, 81, 1064, 1080, 1088; 15, 25, 125, 131, 655; 16, 1 sq., 21 sq., 33 sq., 35 sq., 509 sq., 26, 114 sq., 547.) SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

## Judaeo-Arabic Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Judaeo-Arabic Version Of The Scriptures]]

             This is not properly a version, but Arabic in Hebrew characters. As early as 1820 the printing of an edition of the Arabic New Test. in Hebrew characters was suggested to the British and Foreign Bible Society. Nothing, however, was done for the many thousand Jews in Egypt, Tunis, and the whole north of Africa, Yemen, Syria, and Mesopotamia (to whom the Arabic is vernacular, but who seldom read or write except in Hebrew characters), until 1846, when the Bombay Auxiliary Bible Society commenced for their use an edition of the gospels of Matthew and John, with the Acts of the Apostles, and the epistle to the Hebrews, under the superintendence of the Reverend Dr. Wilson of Bombay. The work was published in 1847, and has ever since been circulated. (B.P.)

## Judaeo-German Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Judaeo-German Version Of The Scriptures]]

             Like the above, this is the German New Test. in rabbinical characters. The first edition of this testament was printed at Cracow in 1540; the work was executed by John Herzuge, a converted Jew, on the basis of Luther's  version; but the book of Revelation is omitted. In 1820 the London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews undertook to furnish the German Jews with copies of the German Scriptures in rabbinical characters. The society's first edition appeared in 1820: the German text was from Luther's version, published by Meyer at Frankfort in 1819, and the transcription into rabbinical characters was made by Mr. Judah D'Allemand of London. In 1859 the British and Foreign Bible Society published the Judaeo-German Old Test., under the care of Reverend R. Konig, and in 1869 the book of Psalms, carefully revised by Reverend W. Edwards of Breslau, was printed at Vienna. (B.P.)

## Judaeo-Persian Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Judaeo-Persian Version Of The Scriptures]]

             This is the Persian New Test. in Hebrew characters, and designed for the Jews in Persia. When, in 1841, Dr. Haberlin applied to some Christian friends for aid in imparting the Scriptures to the Persian Jews, he received in reply from Herat a copy of Martyn's Persian New Test., written in Hebrew characters. under the care of Dr. Login. Dr. Haberlin laid the version before the Calcutta committee, and they agreed to refer the matter to the British and Foreign Bible Society. The latter requested the Calcutta Society to print an edition of two thousand New Tests. in this form, and arrangements were made to have the edition printed at Calcutta, under the eye of the Reverend Dr. Yates. The death of the latter rendered this plan abortive, and after the Bombay Society had transmitted to London manuscript copies of the Judaeo-Persian gospels, an edition of one thousand copies was completed at London in 1849, under the superintendence of the Reverend Dr. Wilson of Bombay. These are all the printed parts extant. (B.P.)

## Judaeo-Spanish Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Judaeo-Spanish Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Judaeo-Spanish is spoken by the Jews of Turkey, who are descendants of the Jews formerly settled in the Spanish Peninsula, but forcibly ejected from Spain in 1492, and from Portugal in 1497, by the merciless mandate of Ferdinand and Isabella. As to the versions of the Old Test., SEE ROMANIC VERSIONS. A translation of the New Test. into Judseo- Spanish was undertaken by the British and Foreign Bible Society at the  suggestion of Dr. Pinkerton, and, in 1823, the Reverend Mr. Leeves, their agent in Turkey, undertook the translation which was printed in 1829 at Corfu. It was afterwards revised, and reprinted at Athens in 1844. In 1874 the British and Foreign Bible Society undertook a careful revision of the New Test., with the assistance of the Reverend J. Christie of the Scottish Missionary. Society. This new edition was printed at Constantinople in 1877, and is now in circulation. The Old Test. in Judaeo-Spanish, with Hebrew in parallel columns, has also been published by the American Bible Society. (B. P.)

## Judah[[@Headword:Judah]]

             (Heb. Yehudah', יְהוּדָה, celebrated; comp. Gen 29:35; Gen 49:8, Chald.

יְהוּד, Yehud', Ezr 5:1; Ezr 7:14; Dan 2:25; Dan 5:13; Dan 6:13; "Judaea," Ezr 5:8; "Jewry," Dan 5:13; Sept. and N.T. generally Ι᾿ούδας [as also Josephus]; but comp. Ι᾿ούδα, Luk 3:26; Luk 3:30; for Luk 1:39, SEE JUTTAH ), the name of several persons, etc., in Scripture. SEE JUDAS; SEE JUDE.

1. The fourth son of Jacob by Leah, born B.C. 1916 (Gen 29:35), being the last before the temporary cessation in the births of her children. His whole brothers were Reuben, Simeon, and Levi, elder than himself — Issachar and Zebulun younger (see Gen 35:23). The name is explained as having originated in Leah's exclamation of "praise" at this fresh gift of Jehovah — "She said, 'Now will I praise (אוֹדֶה, odeh) Jehovah,' and she called his name Yehudah" (Gen 29:35). The same play is preserved in the blessing of Jacob — "Judah, thou whom thy brethren shall praise!" (Gen 49:8).

The narrative in Genesis brings this patriarch more before the reader, and makes known more of his history and character than it does in the case of any other of the twelve sons of Jacob, with the single exception of Joseph. It was Judah's advice that the brethren followed when they sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites instead of taking his life. By the light of his subsequent  actions we can see that his conduct on this occasion arose from a generous impulse, although the form of the question he put to them has been sometimes held to suggest an interested motive: "What profit is it if we slay our brother and conceal his blood? Come, let us sell him" (Gen 37:26-27). Though not the first born, he "prevailed above his brethren" (1Ch 5:2), and we find him subsequently taking a decided lead in all the affairs of the family. When a second visit to Egypt for corn had become inevitable, it was Judah who, as the mouthpiece of the rest, headed the remonstrance against the detention of Benjamin by Jacob, and finally undertook to be responsible for the safety of the lad (Gen 43:3-10). When, through Joseph's artifice, the brothers were brought back to the palace, he is again the leader and spokesman of the band. In that thoroughly Oriental scene it is Judah who unhesitatingly acknowledges the guilt which had never been committed, throws himself on the mercy of the supposed Egyptian prince, offers himself as a slave, and makes that wonderful appeal to the feelings of their disguised brother which renders it impossible for Joseph any longer to conceal his secret (Gen 44:14; Gen 44:16-34). So, too, it is Judah who is sent before Jacob to smooth the way for him in the land of Goshen (Gen 46:28). This ascendency over his brethren is reflected in the last words addressed to him by his father — Thou whom thy brethren shall praise! thy father's sons shall bow down before thee! unto him shall be the gathering of the people (Gen 49:8-10). In the interesting traditions of the Koran and the Midrash his figure stands out in the same prominence. Before Joseph his wrath is mightier and his recognition heartier than the rest. It is he who hastens in advance to bear to Jacob the fragrant robe of Joseph (Weil's Biblical Legends, p. 88-90).

Not long after the sale of Joseph, Judah had withdrawn from the paternal tents, and gone to reside at Adullam, in the country which afterwards bore his name. Here he married a woman of Canaan, called Shuah, and had by her three sons. Er, Onan, and Shelah. When the eldest of these sons became of fit age, he was married to a woman named Tamar, but soon after died. SEE ER. As he died childless, the patriarchal law, afterwards adopted into the Mosaic code (Deu 25:6), required Judah to bestow upon the widow his second son. This he did; but as Onan also soon died childless SEE ONAN, Judah became reluctant to bestow his only surviving son upon this woman, and put her off with the excuse that he was not yet of sufficient age. Tamar accordingly remained in her father's house  at Adullam. She had the usual passion of Eastern women for offspring, and could not endure the stigma of having been twice married without bearing children, while the law precluded her from contracting any alliance but that which Judah withheld her from completing. Meanwhile Judah's wife died, and, after the time of mourning had expired, he went, accompanied by his friend Hirah, to attend the shearing of his sheep at Timnath, in the same neighborhood. These circumstances suggested to Tamar the strange thought of connecting herself with Judah himself, under the guise of a loose woman. Having waylaid him on the road to Timnath, she succeeded in her object, and when the consequences began to be manifest in the person of Tamar, Judah was highly enraged at her crime, and, exercising the powers which belonged to him as the head of the family she had dishonored, he commanded her to be brought forth, and committed to the flames as an adulteress. But when she appeared she produced the ring, the bracelet, and the staff which he had left in pledge with her, and put him to confusion by declaring that they belonged to the father of her coming offspring. SEE TAMAR.

Judah acknowledged them to be his, and confessed that he had been wrong in withholding Shelah from her. The result of this painful affair was the birth of two sons, Zerah and Pharez (B.C. cir. 1893), from whom, with Shelah, the tribe of Judah descended. Pharez was the ancestor of the line from which David, the kings of Judah, and Jesus came (Genesis 38; Gen 46:12; 1Ch 2:3-5; Mat 1:3; Luk 3:33). These circumstances seem to have disgusted Judah with his residence in towns, for we find him ever afterwards at his father's tents. His experience of life, and the strength of his character, appear to have given him much influence with Jacob; and it was chiefly from confidence in him that the aged father at length consented to allow Benjamin to go down to Egypt. That this confidence was not misplaced has already been shown, SEE JOSEPH; and there is not in the whole range of literature a finer piece of true natural eloquence than that in which Judah offers himself to remain as a bond slave in the place of Benjamin, for whose safe return he had made himself responsible to his father. The strong emotions which it raised in Joseph disabled him from keeping up longer the disguise he had hitherto maintained, and there are few who have read it without being, like him, moved even to tears (Gen 44:14-34). B.C. 1874. SEE JACOB.

We hear nothing more of Judah till he received, along with his brothers, the final blessing of his father, which was conveyed in lofty language, glancing  far into futurity, and strongly indicative of the high destinies which awaited the tribe that was to descend from him (Gen 49:8-12). B.C. 1856. SEE SHILOH.

## Judah (Or Juda), Leo[[@Headword:Judah (Or Juda), Leo]]

             one of the Swiss reformers, was born at Germar, in Alsace, in 1482. His father's name was John Jud, but whether of Jewish descent, Leo himself tells us he was unable to say. The name, however, exposed him to reproach, and perhaps for this reason we find him sometimes designating himself as Leo Keller; in Zürich he was known as Meister Löw, and this name his descendants adopted. He was educated for the medical profession, but through the influence of Zwingle forsook this for the clerical. He succeeded the latter in the church of Notre Dame des Eremites, and finally became his associate at Zurich. Together they entered zealously on their work of reform, and Judah contributed no little to the spreading and propagating of Zwinglian ideas. With the great reformer he appeared at the second conference in Zurich (1523), and together they replied to all who defended the worship of images and the celebration of the mass as a sacrifice. Judah died June 19, 1542. He made a translation of the greater part of the Old Testament from the Hebrew text, and also of the New from the Greek. It was completed by Bibliander and Peter Cholin, and reviewed by Pellicanus (Zurich, 1543; reprinted at Paris, with the Vulgate, in 1545). SEE GERMAN VERSIONS. Of his original productions, his Catechism (1534, Latin and German) is the most noted. He translated the writings of Zwingle and Luther. See Hook, Eccles. Biog. 6, 365; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.

## Judah Hak-Kodesh[[@Headword:Judah Hak-Kodesh]]

             or the Holy, son of Simon, of the tribe of Benjamin, and a descendant of Hillel I, is one of the most celebrated characters in Jewish history. He was born at Tiberias, according to accounts, about 135, on the same day on which Rabbi Akiba suffered martyrdom — an event predicted, according to his admirers, in the verse of Solomon: "One sun ariseth, and one sun goeth down." While yet a youth he was, on account of his extraordinary proficiency in Jewish law, admitted to the Sanhedrim, and on the death of his father followed him in the presidency of that learned body. The manner in which he administered the duties of this high office was in itself sufficient to win for him "the praise of his people in all their generations." Maimonides describes him as having been a man so nobly gifted by the Almighty with the choicest endowments as to be the phoenix and ornament of his age. But the best evidence of the high estimation in which his contemporaries held him is afforded by the many favorable epithets which they fastened on him. Besides the title of Nasi, which his position as president of the Sanhedrim secured him, he was more generally known as "Rabbi," which was applied to him κατ᾿ έξοχήν,s with no further note of  individual distinction.

He was known as the "saint," the "holy one," the meek. Being, like Hillel I, of the house of David, he sometimes was, as Bar-Cocheba had previously been, looked upon as the promised Messiah. But this opinion was, after all, confined only to a few. Certain it is, however, that he exerted an influence over the Jewish nation of his day far wider and more powerful in its extent than had ever fallen to the lot of any Nasi, even any member of his house since the days of Hillel. This may be due perhaps not so much to his vast erudition as to his wealth, which enabled him to become the supporter of hundreds and thousands of poor youths, who after they had sat at his feet, went out all over the Jewish abodes to sound aloud the praises of their noble master and teacher in Israel. But Judah hak-Kodesh has far greater claims for our consideration: he has built himself a far more enduring monument as the Moses of later Rabbinism (q.v.), as the compiler of the Mishna (q.v.), or code of traditional law, the embodiment of all the authorized interpretations of the Mosaic law, the traditions, the decisions of the learned. and the precedents of the courts or schools — a sort of Jewish Pandects. "In attempting this Herculean task," says Etheridge (Introd. Jewish Lit. p. 88), "he may have been moved by the peculiar condition of the Jewish community.

They were a scattered people, liable at any hour to the renewal of a wasting persecution, and maintaining their religious standing in the presence of an ever advancing Christianity, and in defiance of the menaces of a world which always viewed them with hatred. Their schools, tolerated today, might tomorrow be under the imperial interdict, and the lips of the Rabbins, which now kept the knowledge of the law, become dumb by the terror of the oppressor. These circumstances possessed him with the apprehension that the traditional learning received from their fathers would, without a fixed memorial, at no distant time be either greatly corrupted or altogether perish from among them.

It was his wish also to furnish the Hebrew people with such a documentary code as would be a sufficient guide for them, not only in the affairs of religion, but also in their dealings with one another hi civil life, so as to render it unnecessary for them to have recourse to suits at law at the heathen tribunals. In addition to these motives, he was probably actuated also by the prevailing spirit of codification, which was one of the characteristics of the age. Legal science was in the ascendant, and the great law schools of Rome, Berytus, and Alexandria were in their meridian; and Judah, who loved his law better than they could theirs, wished to give it the same advantages of simplification, system, and immutability which such jurists as Salvius Julianus had  accomplished for the Roman laws in the time of Hadrian, and Ulpian was laboring at in his own day." The Mishna is divided into six parts (sedarim): the first treats of agriculture, the second of festivals, the third of marriages, the fourth of civil affairs, the fifth of sacrifices and religious ceremonies, and the sixth of legal purification. The text was published with short glosses at Amsterdam (1631, 8vo), and often reprinted, with more or less extensive commentaries, at Amsterdam, Venice, Constantinople, etc. (See a list of the editions, translations, etc., in First, Biblioth. Judaica.) His last days Judah hak-Kodesh spent at Sepphoris, whither he removed on account of his failing health. The exact date of his death is not known, but it must have occurred between 190 and 194. He is frequently spoken of as a friend and contemporary of one of the emperors Antoninus, generally supposed to be Marcus Aurelius, but Grätz and other critics are inclined to doubt the possibility of an intimate relation between this head of the Jewish Church and a Roman emperor. See, however, Bodeck, M. A. Antoninus als Freund u. Zeitgenosse des R. Jehuda ha-Nasi (Lpz. 1868); Contemp. Rev. 1869, p. 81 sq. Grätz, Geschichte d. Juden, 4, 246 sq. See also Schneeberger, Life and Works of Rabbi Jehuda ha-Nasi (Berl. 1870); Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Sekten, 2, 425 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Judah Judghan, The Persian[[@Headword:Judah Judghan, The Persian]]

             one of the most celebrated of the Karaites, afterwards himself the founder of an independent Jewish sect, flourished probably about the first half of the 9th century, in the city Hamadan, in Persia. His opponents say of him that he was of low descent, and that his early years were spent as a tender of camels, but the learning he displayed and his intimate knowledge of Mohammedanism make this report doubtful. We know nothing definitely of him until he appeared before his countrymen with the declaration that he was the forerunner of the Messiah, and preached the doctrine of free will, and non intervention of God in mundane affairs. He also argued that Sabbaths and festivals were no longer to be kept, as they had been done away with by the dispersion of the chosen people, enjoining, however, at the same time, a life of strict asceticism. Preaching, as he did, under the very shadow of Mohammedanism, doctrines very much akin to it. SEE MUTAZILITES, he found ready converts, and his followers increased rapidly. They continued faithful even after his decease, believing (like the Shiites of Ali) that he did not die a natural death and that he was to reappear and give to Judaism a new law. The Mushkhanites (q.v.) may be considered as a branch of this sect. For further details, see Fürst,  Geschichte d. Karäerthums, p. 26 sq.; Grätz, Gesch. der Juden, 5, 227 sq., 516 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Judah Upon Jordan[[@Headword:Judah Upon Jordan]]

             (יְהוּ דָה הִיִּרְדֵּ, Judah of the Jordan; Sept. and Vulg. in most editions omit "Judah" altogether), is mentioned as the extreme eastern limit of the territory of Naphtali (but not within it), apparently on its northern boundary (Jos 19:34), and therefore probably referring to a tract immediately east of that around the sources of the Jordan, between Mount Hermon and Banias. Schwarz (Palestine, p. 185) plausibly explains the application of the name of Judah to a region so far distant from the territory of that tribe by assigning it as the title to the Gileaditish district embraced in the circuit of the towns of Havoth-Jair, i.e. the villages of Jair, who was a descendant of Judah (1Ch 2:21); and he adduces Talmudical authorities for reckoning his possessions as a part of that tribe. SEE JAIR. The same explanation had been suggested by C. von Raumer (cited by Keil, Comment. on Josh. ad loc.). Dr. Thomson (Land and Book, 1, 389 sq.) speaks of three interesting domes in this vicinity, called those of Seid Yehuda (i.e. "Lord Judah," the Arabs traditionally holding that they represent the tomb of the son of Jacob), which he believes is a clue to the connection of this city with the tribe of the same name.

2. One of the Levites who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh 12:8). B.C. 536. It is perhaps he whose sons are alluded to (but unnamed) as aiding the priests in pushing the reconstruction of the Temple (Ezr 3:9); unless this latter be rather the person elsewhere called HODAVIAH (Ezr 2:40).

3. One of those who followed the half of the Jewish chiefs around the southern section of the newly erected walls of Jerusalem, but whether he was a Levite or priest is not stated (Neh 12:34). B.C. 446.

4. One of those who accompanied with musical performances the procession around the southern quarter of the walls of Jerusalem lately reconstructed (Neh 12:36). B.C. 446. He was perhaps identical with the preceding..

5. Son of Senuah, a descendant of Benjamin, and prefect of Acra or the Lower City (עִלאּהָעַיר מַשְׁנֶה, over the second city, not "second over the city," as the Auth. Vers. following the Sept. and Vulg.) after the exile (Neh 11:9). B.C. cir. 440.

## Judah, Kingdom Of[[@Headword:Judah, Kingdom Of]]

             When the territory of all the rest of Israel, except Judah and Benjamin, was lost to the kingdom of Rehoboam, a special single name was needed to denote that which remained to him; and almost of necessity the word Judah received an extended meaning, according to which it comprised not Benjamin only, but the priests and Levites, who were ejected in great numbers from Israel, and rallied round the house of David. At a still later time, when the nationality of the ten tribes had been dissolved, and every practical distinction between the ten and the two had vanished during the captivity, the scattered body had no visible head, except in Jerusalem,  which had been reoccupied mostly by a portion of Judah's exiles. SEE CAPTIVITY. In consequence, the name Judah (or Jew) attached itself to the entire nation from about the epoch of the restoration SEE JEW. But in this article Judah is understood of the people over which David's successors reigned, from Rehoboam to Zedekiah. It substantially corresponded to the Judoea (q.v.) of later times.

I. Extent of the Kingdom. — When the disruption of Solomon's kingdom took place at Shechem, only the tribe of Judah followed the house of David. But almost immediately afterwards, when Rehoboam conceived the design of establishing his authority over Israel by force of arms, the tribe of Benjamin also is recorded as obeying his summons, and contributing its warriors to make up his army. Jerusalem, situate within the borders of Benjamin (Jos 18:28, etc.), yet won from the heathen by a prince of Judah, connected the frontiers of the two tribes by an indissoluble political bond. By the erection of the city of David, Benjamin's former adherence to Israel (2Sa 2:9) was cancelled, though at least two Benjamite towns, Bethel and Jericho, were included in the northern kingdom. A part, if not all, of the territory of Simeon (1Sa 27:6; 1Ki 19:3; comp. Jos 19:1) and of Dan (2Ch 11:10; comp. Jos 19:41-42) was recognized as belonging to Judah, and in the reigns of Abijah and Asa the southern kingdom was enlarged by some additions taken out of the territory of Ephraim (2Ch 13:19; 2Ch 15:8; 2Ch 17:2). After the conquest and deportation of Israel by Assyria, the influence, and perhaps the delegated jurisdiction of the king of Judah, sometimes extended over the territory which formerly belonged to Israel. SEE JUDAEA.

II. Population. — A singular gauge of the growth of the kingdom of Judah is supplied by the progressive augmentation of the army under successive kings. In David's time (2Sa 24:9, and 1Ch 21:5) the warriors of Judah numbered at least 500,000. But Rehoboam brought into the field (1Ki 12:21) only 180,000 men; Abijah, eighteen years afterwards, 400,000 (2Ch 13:3); Asa (2Ch 14:8), his successor, 580,000, exactly equal to the sum of the armies of his two predecessors; Jehoshaphat (2Ch 17:14-19), the next king, numbered his warriors in five armies, the aggregate of which is 1,160,000, exactly double the army of his father, and exactly equal to the sum of the armies of his three predecessors. After four inglorious reigns,  the energetic Amaziah could muster only 300,000 men when he set out to recover Edom. His son Uzziah had a standing (2Ch 26:11) force of 307,500 fighting men. It would be out of place here to discuss the question which has been raised as to the accuracy of these numbers. SEE NUMBER So far as they are authentic, it may be safely reckoned that the population subject to each king was about four times the number of the fighting men in his dominions. SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

III. Resources. — Unless Judah had some other means of acquiring wealth besides pasture and tillage — as by maritime commerce from the Red Sea ports, or (less probably) from Joppa, or by keeping up the old trade (1Ki 10:28) with Egypt — it seems difficult to account for that ability to accumulate wealth which supplied the Temple treasury with sufficient store to invite so frequently the hand of the spoiler. Egypt, Damascus, Samaria, Nineveh, and Babylon had each in succession a share of the pillage. The treasury was emptied by Shishak (1Ki 14:26), again by Asa (1Ki 15:18), by Jehoash of Judah (2Ki 12:18), by Jehoash of Israel (2Ki 14:14), by Ahaz (2Ki 16:8), by Hezekiah (2Ki 18:15), and by Nebuchadnezzar (2Ki 24:13).

IV. Advantages of Position. — In Edom a vassal king probably retained his fidelity to the son of Solomon, and guarded for Jewish enterprise the road to the maritime trade with Ophir. Philistia maintained, for the most part, a quiet independence. Syria, in the height of her brief power, pushed her conquests along the northern and eastern frontiers of Judah, and threatened Jerusalem; but the interposition of the territory of Israel generally relieved Judah from any immediate contact with that dangerous neighbor. The southern border of Judah, resting on the uninhabited desert, was not agitated by any turbulent stream of commercial activity like that which flowed by the rear of Israel, from Damascus to Tyre. Though some of the Egyptian kings were ambitious, that ancient kingdom was far less aggressive as a neighbor to Judah than Assyria was to Israel.

The kingdom of Judah thus possessed many advantages which secured for it a longer continuance than that of Israel. A frontier less exposed to powerful enemies, a soil less fertile, a population hardier and more united, a fixed and venerated center of administration and religion, a hereditary aristocracy in the sacerdotal caste, an army always subordinate, a succession of kings which no revolution interrupted, many of whom were wise and good, and strove successfully to promote the moral and spiritual  as well as the material prosperity of their people; still more than these, the devotion of the people to the One True God, which, if not always a pure and elevated sentiment, was yet a contrast to such devotion as could be inspired by the worship of the calves or of Baal; and, lastly, the popular reverence for arid obedience to the divine law so far as they learned it from their teachers — to these and other secondary causes is to be attributed the fact that Judah survived her more populous and more powerful sister kingdom by 135 years, and lasted from B.C. 975 to B.C. 586. (See Bernhardy, De causis quibus effectum sit quod regnum Judoe diutius persisteret quam regn. Israel, in the Annal. Acad. Groning. 1822-23, p. 124 sq.; also Lovan. 1824; Schmeidler, Der Untergang d. Reichs Juda, Bresl. 1831.)

V. History. — For the circumstances that led to the schism, and for a comparison with the history of the rival kingdom, SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF. For a further examination of the many chronological difficulties arising from the double list of kings, SEE CHRONOLOGY. The annals of the kingdom will be found detailed under the name of the several kings, and a general view under the articles JERUSALEM SEE JERUSALEM, and PALESTINE SEE PALESTINE. (See White, Kings of Judah and Israel, Lond. 1863; Hessey, Biographies of Kings of Judah, Lond. 1865; Hess, Geschichte der Könige Juda und Israel, Zurich, 1787; also Gesch. der Regenten Juda nach dem Exil, ib. 1788.) It will be sufficient, as a resume, here to notice the fact that the kingdom of Judah, in the course of its history, acted upon three different lines of policy in succession.

1. Animosity against the rival Kingdom of Israel. — The first three kings of Judah seem to have cherished the hope of reestablishing their authority over the Ten Tribes; for sixty years there was war between them and the kings of Israel. Neither the disbanding of Rehoboam's forces by the authority of Shemaiah, nor the pillage of Jerusalem by the irresistible Shishak, served to put an end to the fraternal hostility. The victory achieved by the daring Abijah brought to Judah a temporary accession of territory. Asa appears to have enlarged it still further, and to have given so powerful a stimulus to the migration of religious Israelites to Jerusalem that Baasha was induced to fortify Ramah with a view to checking the movement. Asa provided for the safety of his subjects from invaders by building, like Rehoboam, several fenced cities; he repelled an alarming irruption of an Ethiopian horde, he hired the armed intervention of  Benhadad I, king of Damascus, against Baasha; and he discouraged idolatry and enforced the worship of the true God by severe penal laws. (See Junge, Bella inter Judsam et Israel. Tub. 1716.)

2. Resistance (generally in Alliance with Israel) to Damascus. — Hanani's remonstrance (2Ch 16:7) prepares us for the reversal by Jehoshaphat of the policy which Asa pursued towards Israel and Damascus. A close alliance sprang up with strange rapidity between Judah and Israel. For eighty-years, till the time of Amaziah, there was no open war between them, and Damascus appears as their chief and common enemy, though it rose afterwards from its overthrow to become, under Rezin, the ally of Pekal against Ahaz. Jehoshaphat, active and prosperous, repelled nomad invaders from the desert, curbed the aggressive spirit of his nearer neighbors, and made his influence felt even among the Philistines and Arabians. A still more lasting benefit was conferred on his kingdom by his persevering efforts for the religious instruction of the people and the regular administration of justice. The reign of Jehoram, the husband of Athaliah, a time of bloodshed, idolatry, and disaster, was cut short by disease. Ahaziah was slain by Jehu. Athaliah, the granddaughter of a Tyrian king, usurped the blood stained throne of David, till the followers of the ancient religion put her to death, and crowned Jehoash the surviving scion of the royal house. His preserver, the high priest, acquired prominent personal influence for a time; but the king fell into idolatry, and failing to withstand the power of Syria, was murdered by his own officers. The vigorous Amaziah, flushed with the victory of Edom, provoked a war with his more powerful contemporary Jehoash, the conqueror of the Syrians, and Jerusalem was entered and plundered by the Israelites. But their energies were sufficiently occupied in the task of completing the subjugation of Damascus. Under Uzziah and Jotham, Judah long enjoyed political and religious prosperity till the wanton Ahaz, surrounded by united enemies, with whom he was unable to cope, became in an evil hour the tributary and vassal of Tiglath-Pileser.

3. Deference, perhaps Vassalage, to the Assyrian King. — Already in the fatal grasp of Assyria, Judah was yet spared for a checkered existence of almost another century and a half after the termination of the kingdom of Israel. The effect of the repulse of Sennacherib, of the signal religious revivals under Hezekiah and Josiah, and of the extension of these kings' salutary influence over the long severed territory of Israel, was apparently done away by the ignominious reign of the impious Manasseh, and the  lingering decay of the whole people under the four feeble descendants of Josiah. Provoked by their treachery and imbecility, their Babylonian master, who had meanwhile succeeded to the dominion of the Assyrians, drained, in successive deportations, all the strength of the kingdom. The consummation of the ruin came upon them in the destruction of the Temple by the hand of Nebuzaradan, amid the wailing of prophets and the taunts of heathen tribes released at length from the yoke of David.

VI. Moral State. — The national life of the Hebrews appeared to become gradually weaker during these successive stages of history, until at length it seemed extinct; but there was still, as there had been all along, a spiritual life hidden within the body. It was a time of hopeless darkness to all but those Jews who had strong faith in God, with a clear and steady insight into the ways of Providence as interpreted by prophecy. The time of the division of the kingdoms was the golden age of prophecy. In each kingdom the prophetical office was subject to peculiar modifications which were required in Judah by the circumstances of the priesthood, in Israel by the existence of the house of Baal and the altar in Bethel. If, under the shadow of the Temple, there was a depth and a grasp elsewhere unequalled, in the views of Isaiah and the prophets of Judah; if their writings touched and elevated the hearts of thinking men in studious retirement in the silent night watches, there was also, in the few burning words and energetic deeds of the prophets of Israel, a power to tame a lawless multitude and to check the high handed tyranny and idolatry of kings. The organization and moral influence of the priesthood were matured in the time of David; from about that time to the building of the second Temple the influence of the prophets rose and became predominant. Some historians have suspected that after the reign of Athaliah, the priesthood gradually acquired and retained excessive and unconstitutional power in Judah. The recorded facts scarcely sustain the conjecture. Had it been so, the effect of such power would have been manifest in the exorbitant wealth and luxury of the priests, and in the constant and cruel enforcement of penal laws, like those of Asa, against irreligion. But the peculiar offenses of the priesthood, as witnessed in the prophetic writings, were of another kind. Ignorance of God's word, neglect of the instruction of the laity, untruthfulness, and partial judgments, are the offenses specially imputed to them, just such as might be looked for where the priesthood is a hereditary caste and irresponsible, but neither ambitious nor powerful. When the priest either, as was the case in Israel, abandoned the land, or, as in Judah, ceased to be really a teacher, ceased from spiritual  communion with God, ceased from living sympathy with man, and became the mere image of an intercessor, a mechanical performer of ceremonial duties little understood or heeded by himself, then the prophet was raised up to supply some of his deficiencies, and to exercise his functions so far as was necessary. While the priests sink into obscurity and almost disappear, except from the genealogical tables, the prophets come forward appealing everywhere to the conscience of individuals — in Israel as wonder workers, calling together God's chosen few out of an idolatrous nation, and in Judah as teachers and seers, supporting and purifying all that remained of ancient piety, explaining each mysterious dispensation of God as it was unfolded, and promulgating his gracious spiritual promises in all their extent. The part which Isaiah, Jeremiah, and other prophets took in preparing the Jews for their captivity, cannot, indeed, be fully appreciated without reviewing the succeeding efforts of Ezekiel and Daniel. But the influence which they exercised on the national mind was too important to be overlooked in a sketch, however brief, of the history of the kingdom of Judah. SEE PROPHET.

## Judah, Mountains Of[[@Headword:Judah, Mountains Of]]

             This is appropriately the name of a range of hills to the south and west of Jerusalem, styled in Luk 1:39; Luk 1:65, the "hill country of Judaea" (ἡ ὀρεινὴ τῆς Ι᾿ουδαίας). The hills are low and conical, uniform in shape even to weariness; the vegetation, save in early spring, is dry and parched, the valleys are broad and featureless. Everywhere at the present day are signs that the land of corn, and wine, and oil has become desolate. The fenced cities and villages surmount the hills, but they are in ruins; the terraces where once were vineyards and cornfields can be traced along the mountain sides, but they are neglected; wells and pools of water are to be found in every valley, but there is none to drink of them. SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

## Judah, Tribe And Territory Of[[@Headword:Judah, Tribe And Territory Of]]

             I. Historical Memoranda. —

1. Judah's sons were five. Of these, three were by his Canaanitish wife Bathshua; they are all insignificant; two died early, and the third, Shelah, does not come prominently forward either in his person or his family. The other two, Pharez and Zerah — twins — were illegitimate sons by the widow of Er, the eldest of the former family. As is not unfrequently the case, the illegitimate sons surpassed the legitimate, and from Pharez, the elder, were descended the royal and other illustrious families of Judah. These sons were born to Judah while he was living in the same district of Palestine, which, centuries after, was repossessed by his descendants — amongst villages which retain their names unaltered in the catalogues of the time of the conquest. The three sons went with their father into Egypt at the time of the final removal thither (Gen 46:12; Exo 1:2). SEE JACOB.

2. When we again meet with the families of Judah they occupy a position among the tribes similar to that which their progenitor had taken amongst the patriarchs. At the time that the Israelites quitted Egypt, it already exhibited the elements of its future distinction in a larger population than any of the other tribes possessed (Num 1:26-27). It numbered 74,000 adult males, being nearly 12,000 more than Daniel the next in point of numbers, and 34,100 more than Ephraim, which in the end contested with it the superiority among the tribes. During the sojourn in the wilderness, Judah neither gained, like some tribes, nor lost like others.

Its numbers had increased to 76,500, being 12,100 more than Issachar, which had become next to it in population (Num 26:22). The chief of the tribe at the former census was Nahshon, the son of Amminadab (Num 1:7; Num 2:3; Num 7:12; Num 10:14), an ancestor of David (Rth 4:20). Its representative amongst the spies, and also amongst those appointed to partition the land, was the great Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (Num 13:6; Num 34:19). During the march through the desert Judah's place was in the van of the host, on the east side of the tabernacle, with his kinsmen Issachar and Zebulun (2:3-9; 10:14). The traditional standard of the tribe  was a lion's whelp, with the words, Rise up, Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered! (Targ. Pseudojon. on Num 2:3.)

3. During the conquest of the country the only incidents specially affecting the tribe of Judah are, (1) the misbehavior of Achan, who was of the great house of Zerah (Jos 7:1; Jos 7:16-18); and (2) the conquest of the mountain district of Hebron by Caleb, and of the strong city Debir, in the same locality, by his nephew and son-in-law Othniel (Jos 14:6-15; Jos 15:13-19). It is the only instance given of a portion of the country being expressly reserved for the person or persons who conquered it. In general the conquest seems to have been made by the whole community, and the territory allotted afterwards, without reference to the original conquerors of each locality. In this case the high character and position of Caleb, and perhaps a claim established by him at the time of the visit of the spies to "the land whereon his feet had trodden" (Jos 14:9; comp. Num 14:24), may have led to the exception.

4. The history of the Judges contains fewer facts respecting this important tribe than might be expected. It seems, however, to have been usually considered that the birthright which Reuben forfeited had passed to Judah under the blessing of Jacob; and a sanction was given to this impression when, after the death of Joshua, the divine oracle nominated Judah to take precedence of the other tribes in the war against the Canaanites (Jdg 1:2). It does not appear that any tribe was disposed to dispute the superior claim of Judah on its own account except Ephraim, although in doing this Ephraim had the support of other tribes. Ephraim appears to have rested its claims to the leadership of the tribes upon the ground that the house of Joseph, whose interest it represented, had received the birthright, or double portion of the eldest, by the adoption of the two sons of Joseph, who became the founders of two tribes in Israel. The existence of the sacerdotal establishment at Shiloh, in Ephraim, was doubtless' also alleged by the tribe as a ground of superiority over Judah. When; therefore, Judah assumed the scepter in the person of David, and when the sacerdotal establishment was removed to Jerusalem, Ephraim could not brook the eclipse it had sustained, and took the first opportunity of erecting a separate throne, and forming separate establishments for worship and sacrifice. Perhaps the separation of the kingdoms may thus be traced to the rivalry of Judah and Ephraim. After that separation the rivalry was between the two kingdoms, but it was still popularly considered as representing the ancient rivalry of these great tribes; for the prophet, in foretelling the repose of a coming  time, describes it by saying, "The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim" (Isa 13:12). When the kingdom was divided under Rehoboam and Jeroboam, the history of Judah as a tribe lapsed into that of Judah as a kingdom. SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

II. Geographical Data. — In the first distribution of lands, the tribe of Judah received the southernmost part of Palestine to the extent of fully one third of the whole country west of the Jordan, which was to be distributed among the nine and a half tribes for which provision was to be made (Joshua 15). This oversight was discovered and rectified at the time of the second distribution, which was founded on an actual survey of the country, when Simeon received an allotment out of the territory which had before been wholly assigned to Judah (Jos 19:9). SEE SIMEON.

That which remained was still very large, and more proportioned to the future greatness than the actual wants of the tribe. We now also know, through the researches of recent travelers, that the extent of good land belonging to this tribe, southward, was much greater than had usually been supposed, much of that which had been laid down in maps as mere desert being actually composed of excellent pasture land, and in part of arable soil, still exhibiting some traces of ancient cultivation. Dan defended the western border against the inroads of the Philistines with a brave and well trained band of soldiers, having established, as it seems, a permanent camp on the commanding height between Zorah and Eshtaol (Jdg 13:25; Jdg 16:31; Jdg 18:12; SEE DAN ). Simeon bore the brunt of all attacks and forays made on the southern border by the tribes of the great "Wilderness of Wandering;" and when the Edomites attempted to penetrate Judah, Simeon could always check them by an attack upon their flank. When Judah became a kingdom, the original extent of territory assigned to the tribe was more than restored or compensated, for it must have embraced the domains of Simeon, and probably also of Dan, and we know that Benjamin was likewise included in it. SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

The boundaries and contents of the territory allotted to Judah are narrated at great length, and with greater minuteness than the others, in Jos 15:20-63. This may be due either to the fact that the lists were reduced to their present form at a later period, when the monarchy resided with Judah, and when more care would naturally be bestowed on them than on those of any other tribe, or to the fact that the territory was more important and more thickly covered with towns and villages than any other part of  Palestine. The greater prominence given to the genealogies of Judah in 1Ch 2:3-4, no doubt arises from the former reason. The towns are also specifically named, not only under the general divisions, but even in detailed groups. (See below.) The north boundary — coincident with the south boundary of Benjamin — began at the embouchure of the Jordan, entered the hills apparently at, or about the present road from Jericho, ran westward to en-Shemesh — probably the present Ain-Haud, below Bethany — thence over the Mount of Olives to Enrogel, in the valley beneath Jerusalem; went along the ravine of Hinnom, under the precipices of the city, climbed the hill in a northwest direction to the water of Nephtoah (probably Lifta), and thence by Kirjath-jearim (probably Kuriet el-Enab), Bethshemesh (Ain-Shems), Timnath, and Ekron to Jabneel on the sea coast. On the east the Dead Sea, and on the west the Mediterranean, formed the boundaries. The southern line is hard to determine, since it is denoted by places many of which have not been identified. It left the Dead Sea at its extreme south end, and joined the Mediterranean at the wady el- Arish; but between these two points it passed through Maaleh Acrabbim, the Wilderness of Zin, Hezron, Adar, Karkaa, and Azmon; the Wilderness of Zin the extreme south of all (Jos 15:1-12). The country thus defined was sixty-five miles long, and averaged about fifty in breadth. But while this large tract was nominally allotted to Judah, the portion of it available for actual settlement was comparatively small, not amounting to one third of the whole. From it must also be deducted a large section. stretching entirely across from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea, being the part set off to the tribe of Simeon. The actual territory of Judaea therefore extended, on an average, only about twenty-five miles from north to south, by about forty from east to west. SEE TRIBE. The whole of the above extensive region was from a very early date divided into four main regions.

1. The South. — the undulating pasture country which intervened between the hills, the proper possession of the tribe, and the deserts which encompass the lower part of Palestine (Jos 15:21). It is this which is once designated as the wilderness (midbar) of Judah (Jdg 1:16). It contained twenty-nine cities, with their dependent villages (Jos 15:20-32), which, with Ether and Ashan in the mountains, were ceded to Simeon (Jos 19:1-9). Amongst these southern cities the most familiar name is Beersheba. These southern pasturelands were the favorite  camping grounds of the old patriarchs, as they still are of those nomad tribes that frequent the southern border of Palestine. SEE SIMEON.

2. The Lowland (15:33; A.V. "valley") — or, to give it its own proper and constant appellation, the Shephelah — the broad belt or strip lying between the central highlands — "the mountain" — and the Mediterranean Sea; the lower portion of that maritime plain which extends through the whole of the seaboard of Palestine, from Sidon in the north to Rhinocolura at the south. This tract was the garden and the granary of the tribe. In it, long before the conquest of the country by Israel, the Philistines had settled themselves, never to be completely dislodged (Neh 13:23-24). There, planted at equal intervals along the level coast, were their five chief cities, each with its circle of smaller dependents, overlooking, from the natural undulations of the ground, the "standing corn," "shocks," "vineyards and olives," which excited the ingenuity of Samson, and are still noticeable to modern travelers. "They are all remarkable for the beauty and profusion of the gardens which surround them — the scarlet blossoms of the pomegranates, the enormous oranges which gild the green foliage if their famous groves" (Stanley, Syr. and Pal. p. 257). From the edge of the sandy tract, which fringes the immediate shore right up to the very wall of the hills of Judah, stretches the immense plain of cornfields. In those rich harvests lies the explanation of the constant contests between Israel and the Philistines (Syr. and Pal. p. 258). From them were gathered the enormous cargoes of wheat which were transmitted to Phoenicia by Solomon in exchange for the arts of Hiram, and which in the time of the Herods still "nourished" the country of Tyre and Sidon (Act 12:20). There were the olive trees, the sycamore trees, and the treasures of oil, the care of which was sufficient to task the energies of two of David's special officers (1Ch 27:28). The nature of this locality would seem to be reflected in the names of many of its towns if interpreted as Hebrew words: Dilean cucumbers; Gederah, Gederoth, Gederothaim, sheep folds; Zoreah, wasps; Ex-gannim, spring of gardens, etc. But we have yet to learn how far these names are Hebrew, and whether at best they are but mere Hebrew accommodations of earlier originals, and therefore not to be depended on for their significations. The number of cities in this district, without counting the smaller villages connected with them, was forty-two. Of these, however, many which belonged to the Philistines can only have been allotted to the tribe, and, if taken possession of by Judah, were only held for a time. What were the exact boundaries of the Shephelah we do not  know. We are at present ignorant of the principles on which the ancient Jews drew their boundaries between one territory and another. One thing only is almost certain, that they were not determined by the natural features of the ground, or else we should not find cities enumerated as in the lowland plain whose modern representatives are found deep in the mountains. SEE JARMUTH; SEE JIPHTAH, etc. (The latest information regarding this district is contained in Tobler's Dritte Wanderung, 1859.)

3. The third region of the tribe — the Mountain, the "hill country of Judah" — though not the richest, was, if not the largest, yet the most important of the four. Beginning considerably below Hebron, it stretches northward to Jerusalem, eastward to the Dead Sea slopes, and westward to the Shefelah, and forms an elevated district or plateau, which, though thrown into considerable undulations; yet preserves a general level in both directions. It is the southern portion of that elevated hilly district of Palestine which stretches north until intersected by the plain of Esdraelon, and on which Hebron, Jerusalem, and Shechem are the chief spots. On every side the approaches to it were difficult, and the passes easily defended. The towns and villages, too, were generally perched on the tops of hills or on rocky slopes. The resources of the soil were great. The country was rich in corn, wine, oil, and fruits; and the daring shepherds were able to lead their flocks far out over the neighboring plains and through the mountains. The surface of this region, which is of limestone, is monotonous enough. Round swelling hills and hollows, of somewhat bolder proportions than those immediately north of Jerusalem, which, though in early times probably covered with forests, SEE HARETH, have now, where not cultivated, no growth larger than a brushwood of dwarf oak, arbutus, and other bushes. In many places there is a good soft turf, discoverable even m the autumn, and in spring the hills are covered with flowers. The number of towns enumerated (Jos 15:48-60) as belonging to this district is thirty- eight, but, if we may judge from the ruins which meet the eye on every side, this must have been very far below the real number. Hardly a hill which is not crowned by some fragments of stone buildings more or less considerable, those which are still inhabited surrounded by groves of olive trees, and inclosure of stone walls protecting the vineyards. Streams there are none, but wells and springs are frequent — in the neighborhood of "Solomon's Pools" at Urtas most abundant ones.

4. The fourth district is the Wilderness (Midbar, which here and there only appears to be synonymous with Arabah), the sunken district immediately  adjoining the Dead Sea (Jos 15:6), averaging ten miles in breadth, a wild, barren, uninhabitable region, fit only to afford scanty pasturage for sheep and goats, and a secure home for leopards, bears, wild goats, and outlaws (1Sa 17:34; Mar 1:13; 1 Samuel 22. sq.). Different sections of it were called by different names, as "Wilderness of Engedi" (1Sa 24:1); "Wilderness of Judah" (Jdg 1:16) "Wilderness of Maon", 1Sa 23:24; SEE DESERT. It was the training ground of the shepherd warriors of Israel, "where David and his mighty men" were braced and trained for those feats of daring courage which so highly distinguished them. SEE BETHLEHEM; SEE DAVID. It contained only six cities, which must have been either, like Engedi, on the edge of the cliffs overhanging the sea, or else on the higher slopes of the basin. The "city of Salt" may have been on the salt plains, between the sea and the cliffs which form the southern termination to the Ghor.

Nine of the cities of Judah were allotted to the priests (Jos 21:9-19). The Levites had no cities in the tribe, and the priests had none out of it.

The following is a tabulated view of these subdivisions of the tribe with the cities in each group, as laid down in Jos 15:21-63 :

I. "The South" (צהִנֶּגֶב), or Simeonitish portion.

1. Kabzeel. 2. Eder. 3. Jagur. 4. Kinah. 5 Dimonah. 6. Adadah. 7. Kedlesh (Kadesh-Barnea). 8. Hazor. 9 and 10. Ithnan-Ziph or Zephath, and Hormah (Hazor-addah). 11. Telen. 12. Shema or Sheba (Hazorshual). 13. Moladah. 14. Heshmon or Azmon. 15. Beth-palet.  16. Beersheha. 17 and 18. Bealoth or Balah (Ramath-Nekeb) and Bizjoth-jah-Baalah (Baalath-beer or Lehi). 19. Iim. 20. Azem. 21. Eltolad. 22. Chesil or Bethul. 23. Ziklag. 24. Madmannah or Bethmarcaboth. 25. Sansannah or Hazor-su-sah. 26. Lebaoth or Beth-lebaoth 27. Shilhim or Shamba 28 and 29. Ain-Rimmon or En-rimmon. The villages (1.) Hazor-hadattah and (2.) Kerioth-hezron, or Hazor-amam, both belonged to Hazor proper; (3.) Hazor-gaddah to Hazor-shual. Also [1.] Ether and [2.] Ashan out of the "plain" subdivision.

II. "The Valley" (הִשְּׁפֵלָה), or Plain.

A. First group-N.W. corner.

1. Eshtaol.. 2. Zoreah. 3. Ashna. 4. Zanoah. 5. En-gannim. 6. Tappuah. 7. Enam. 8. Jarmuth. 9. Adullam 10. Socoh. 11. Azekah.  12. Sharaim. 13. Adithain. 14. Gederah and Gedero-thaim.

B. Second group-south of the above, in the west part of the tribe.

1. Zenan. 2. Hadashah. 3. Migdal-gad. 4. Dileam. 5. Mizpeh 6. Joktheel } no copulative 7. Lachish } between.] 8. Bozkath. 9. Eglon. 10. Cabbon, 11. Lahmam. 12. Kithlish. 13. Gederoth [no וcopulative between.] 14. Beth-dagon 15. Naamah. 16. Makkedah.

C. Third group-E. of group b and S. of group a; in the middle of the tribe, E. of the road from Eleutheropolis to Jerusalem.

1. Libnah. (2.) Ether. (3.) Ashan. 4. Jiphtah. 5. Ashnah. 6. Nezib 7. Keilah. 8. Achzib. 9. Mareshah.

D. Fourth group-Philistine pentarchy, on the Mediterranean shore.

1. Ekron (really in Dan).  2. Ashdod. 3. Gaza.

etc. (Ashkelon, and Gath [the last=Mizpeh, really in the " valley"]).

III. "The Mountains" (הָהָר), or Highland.

A. First group — along the border of Simeon, in the middle.

1. Shamir. 2. Jattir. 3. Socoh. 4. Dannah. 5. Kirjath-sannah=Debir. 6. Anah. 7. Eshtemoh. 8. Anim. 9. Goshen. 10. Holon. 11. Giloh.

B. Second group-N. of group a, in the southern part of the tribe, around Hebron.

1. Arab. 2. Dumah. 3. Eshean.. 4. Janum. 5. Beth-tappuah. 6. Aphekah. 7. Humtah. 8. Kirjath-arba=Hebron. 9. Zior.

C. Third group-E. of group b.

1. Maon } [no וcopulative between.] 2. Carmel 3. Ziph. 4. Juttah.  5. Jezreel. 6. Jokdeam. 7. Zanoah} [no וּ. 8. Cain} copulative 9. Gibeah} between] 10. Timnah.

D. Fourth group-N. of groups b and c, to Jerusalem on the N. boundary.

1. Halhul} [no copulative וbetween.] 2. Beth-zur 3. Gedor. 4. Maarath. 5. Beth-anoth 6. Eltekon.

E. Fifth group-in the N. medial angle, between group d and the "Valley" district.

1. Kirjath-baal=Kirjath-iearim. 2. Rabbah (? merely a title of Jerusalem).

F. Group added in the Septuagint between d and e -situated N. of group e, up to Jerusalem — probably should be added to e.]

1. Tekoah. 2. Ephrathah=Bethlehem. 3. Phagor. 4. Etam. 5. Kulon [in Benjamin] [prob. spurious]. 6. Tatam. 7. Sores (Thebez) [in Benjamin] [spurious]. 8. Karem (? Beth-haccerem.) 9. Gallim [in Benjamin]. 10. Bethel [Thether]. 11. Menukah.

IV. "The Wilderness" (הִמּדְבָּר), or Desert.

1. Beth-arabah] [really in Benjamin.]}[no copulative וbetween.]  2. Middin Supplementary-Jebus.} 3. Secacah. 4. Nibshan. 5. Ir-ham-Melach. 6. En-gedi. The following table comprises all the scriptural localities in Judah (except those in Jerusalem), with their probable or ascertained identifications.

Aceldama.Field.SEE JERUSALEM.Achor.Valley.Wady Dabr?Achzib.Town.SEE CHEZIB.Adithaim.do.[Moheisin]?Adoraim.do.Dura.Adullam.do.[El-Kheishum]?Adummim.do.Kulat-ed-Dem.Anab.do.Anab.Anim.do.Ghuwein.Aphekah.do.[Sibta]?Aphrah.do.SEE BETH-LE-APHEAH.Arab.do.[El-Hadb]?Ashdod.do.Esdud.Ashkelon.do.Askulan.Ashnah.do.[Beit-Alam]?Ashnah (Jos 15:43).do.[Deir Aban]?Azekah (Jos 15:33).do.AhbekAzotus.do.SEE ASHDOD.Azzah.do.SEE GAZA.Baalah or Baale.do.SEE KIRJATH-JEARIM.Baalah.Mount.[Tell Hermes]?Beer.Town.[Deir Dubban]?Berachah.Valley.Wady Berakut.Bethanoth.Town.Beit-Anun.Bethany.do.El-Azariyeh.Beth-dagon.do.[Beit-Jerja]?Bethel.do.SEE BETHUL.

Bether.Mount.Bittir?Beth-ezel.Town.[Beit-Daras]?Beth-gader.do.SEE GEDER.Beth-haccerem.do.Jebel Fureidis?Beth-le-Aphrah.do.[Beit-Affa]?Beth-lehem.do.Beit-Lahm.Bethphage.Village.[S. top of Jebel-et Tur]?Beth-tappuah.Town.Taffuh.Beth-zur.do.Beit-Sur.Bezekieldo.[E. of Nukhalin]??Bilhah.do.SEE BAALAH.Bozkath.do.[Tell Hessy]?Cabbon.do.[El-Kufeir]?Cain.do.Yukin.Carmel.do.Kurmul.Chesalon.do.Kisla.Chezib.do.[Ruins with wells on W. Seir]?Dannah.do.[Ed-Dhokeriyeh]?Debir (Jos 15:49).doKhurbet ed-Dilbeh?Debir (Jos 15:7).do.[N.E. of Wady Dabor]?Dileon.do.SEE DIMONAH.Dilean.do.Tina?Dimonah.do.Ed-Dheib?Dumah.do.Daumeh.Eben-Bohan.Stone.[N. side of W. Dahr]?Enar.Tower.[S. of Bethlehem]?Eglou.Town.Ajlan.Elah.Valley.Wady es-Sumt.Eltekon.Town.[Beit-Sahur]?Enam.do.[Deir el-Butm]?Eu-gannim.do.[Rana]?En-gedi.do.Ain-Jidy.Ephes-dammin.Field.SEE ELAH.Ephrath or Ephrata.Town.SEE BETHLEHEM.Eshcol.Valley.Ain-Eskali.Eshean.do.Khursa?

Eshtemoa.do.Semua.Etam.do.Urtus?Gath.do.Tell es-SafiehGaza.do.Ghuzzeh.Geder.Town.SEE GEDOR.Gederah.do.Gheterah.Gederoth.do.[Beit-Tima]?Gederothaim.do.SEE GEDERAH.Gedor.do.Jedur.Gibeah.do.[Erfaiyeh]?Gilon.do.[Rafat?]Goshen.do.[Deir Shems]?Goshen.District.[S. of Kirjath-jearim]?Hachilah.Hill.[Tell Ziph].Hadashah.Town.El-Jorah?Halhul.do.Halhul.Hareth.Forest.SEE ARUBOTH.Hazezon-tamar.Town.SEE ENGEDI.Hebron.do.El-Khulil.Hepher.do.[Um-Burj]?Holon.do.[Beit-Amra]?Humtah.do.[Sabzin el-Almeh]?Ir-nahash.do.Deir Nekhaz.Jabez.do.SEE KIRJATH-JEARIM.Janum.do.[Ras Jabreh]?Jarmuth.do.Yarmuk.Jattir.do.Attir.Jebus.do.S. part of JERUSALEM.Jehovah-jireh.Altar.SEE MORIAH.Jeruel.Desert.[S.E. of Minea]?Jerusalem.City.El-Khuds.Jeshimon.Desert.SEE JUDAH (Desert of).Jeshua.Town.Yeshua.Jezreel.do.[Zurtul]?Jiphtah.do.[Jimrin]?Jokdeam.do.[Ed-Dar]?Joktheel.do.[Balen]?

Jordan.River.Sheriat el-KebirPlain.El-GhorMts.Middle RidgeJudaea.Desert.E. plainValley.Sea shoreJuttah.Town.YuttaKeilahdo.KilaKerioth.do.Kureitein.Kirjath-jearim.do.Kuryat el-Enab?Kirjath-arba or Kirjath- Baal.do.SEE HEBRONKirjath-sannah or Kirjath-sepher.doSEE DEBIRKithlish.do.[Jelameh]?Lachishdo.Um-Lakhis.Lahmam.do.[Beit-Lehia]?Libnah.do.Arak el-Menshiyeh?Maarath.do.[Mersian]?Macpelah.Cave.SEE HEBRON.Makkedah.Town.Sumeil?Mamre.Field.SEE HEBRONMaon.Town.Tell Main.Mareshah.do.Tell Merahs.Mekonah.do.[Jerash]?Middin.do.[Khan Mardeh]?Migdal-gad.Town.El-MejelMizpeh.do.SEE GATH.Moresheth-gathdo.Mar Hanneh?Naamah.do.[Neamah]?Nephtoah.Spring.Ain Yalo?Netophah.Town.Antubah?Nezib.do.Beit Nusib.Nibshan.do.[Kasr el-Leiman]?Rabbah.do.SEE JERUSALEM.Rachel's Tomb.SepulchrN. of BethlehemRamah or Ramathaim- zophim.Town.Rameh?

Salt City.do.[Khulat um-Baghek]?Saphir.do.Es-Sawafir?Secacah.do.[Kasr Antar]?Sela-hammalekoth.Rock.SEE MAON.Shaaraim or Sharaim.Town[Shahmeh]?Shamir.do.[Simia]?Shocho (Jos 15:48)doShuweikeh.Siddim.Vale.S. end of Dead Sea?Sirah.Well.[Sasirah]?Socoh or Shocoh.Town.Shuweikeh.Sorek.Valley.Wady Simsin?Tappuah.Town.[Beit Atab]?Tekoah.do.Tekua.Timnah.Town.[Um el-Amad]?Zaanan.do.SEE ZENAN.Zauoali (in the plain).do.Zannah.Zanoah (in the hills).do.Zanutah?Zeiuan.do.[Jenin]?Zephathah.Valley.Wady S. of Maresh?Ziklag.Town.[Musrefa]?Zior.do.Sair?Ziph.do.Zif.Ziz.Cliff.Precipice W. of Ain Jidy?Zuph.District.SEE RAMATHAIM ZOPHIM.

## Judah, Wilderness Of[[@Headword:Judah, Wilderness Of]]

             The desert of Judah (מַדְבִּר יְהוּדָה) is mentioned in the title of Psalms 63, and the desert of Judaea (αἱ ἔρεμαι, or ἡ ἔρημος τής Ι᾿ουδαίας), frequently referred to in the gospels, is considered to be the same locality. It was situated adjacent to the Dead Sea and the River Jordan, and was a mountainous and thinly inhabited tract of country, but abounding in pastures. In the time of Joshua it had six cities, with their villages  (Jos 15:61-62), but it is now, and has long been, one of the most dreary and desolate regions of the whole country (Robinson's Researches, 2, 202, 310). The positions of this desert specially alluded to in the N.T. are,

(1.) That in which John the Baptist grew up, probably west of the Dead Sea (Luk 1:80; Luk 3:2);

(2.) That where he baptized, i.e. the uninhabited tract along the Jordan (Mat 3:1; Mar 1:4; compare 5);

(3.) That where Jesus was tempted, perhaps the high desert west of Jericho (Mat 4:1; Mar 1:12-13);

(4.) The tract between the Mount of Olives and Jericho, probably referred to in Act 21:38 (see Josephus, Ant. 20, 8, 6);

(5.) The tract adjacent to the city Ephraim, probably Tayibeh, towards the Jordan (Joh 11:54). SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

## Judaism[[@Headword:Judaism]]

             the name by which we designate the religious doctrines and rites of the people chosen by Jehovah as his peculiar people; the descendants of Jacob, to whom the law was given by Moses, and religious light and truth were revealed in the Old Testament; the most important branch of that family of nations conventionally comprised under the title of Shemites — a people of many fates and of many names, called by the Bible the people of God; by Mohammed, the people of the Book; by Hegel, "the people of the Geist," and now generally known as Hebrews, Israelites, or Jews.

Abrahamism. — To the Christian student especially, the early development of the doctrines of this people is interesting, as unfolded in the pages of the older half of the inspired writings that go to make up the basis of his own creed. Judaism is preeminently a monotheistic faith, originating with the  patriarch Abraham when, in an era of polytheism and flagrant vice, he became the founder of monotheism by a prompt recognition and worship of the one living and true God; and from that remote day to this, all the Jewish people pride themselves in being "children of Abraham." It is a fact striking to every student of comparative religion, and in no small degree a proof of the authenticity of the O.T. Scriptures, that this monotheistic faith originated at a time when the religion of all other branches of the, Isame family, which with the Hebrew, make up the Shemitic, differed widely from it in every respect. The Assyrians, Babylonians, Phoenicians, and Carthaginians all possessed a nearly identical religion, but one that lacked the essential feature of Judaism.

They all, it is true, believed in a supreme god, called by the different names of Ilu, Bel, Set, Hadad, Moloch, Chemosh, Jaoh, El, Adon, Asshur, but they also all believed in subordinate and secondary beings, emanations from this supreme being, his manifestations to the world, rulers of the planets; and, like other pantheistic religions, the custom prevailed among these Shemitic nations of promoting first one and then another deity to be the supreme object of worship. Among the Assyrians, as among the Egyptians, the gods were often arranged in triads, as that of Anu, Bel, and Ao. Anu or Oannes wore the head of a fish; Bel wore the horns of a bull; Ao was represented by a serpent. These religions, in short, represented the gods as that Spirit within and behind natural objects and forces powers within the world, rather than, as among the Hebrews, a Spirit above the world. The Hebrews' God was a God above nature, not simply in it. He stood alone; unaccompanied by secondary deities. His worship required purity, not pollution; its aim was holiness, and its spirit humane, not cruel. Monotheistic from the first, it became an absolute monotheism in its development. In all the Shemitic nations, behind the numerous divine beings representing the powers of nature there was, it is true, dimly visible one supreme Being, of whom all these were emanations; but there was also among all of them, except the Hebrew branch, a tendency to lose sight of the first great Cause, the very reverse of the tendency of the faith of Abraham, whose soul rose to the contemplation of the perfect Being, above all and the source of all. With passionate love he adored this most high God, maker of heaven and earth. Such was his devotion to this almighty Being, that men said, "Abraham is the friend of the most high God." The difference, then, between the religion of Abraham and that of the polytheistic nations was, that while they descended from the idea of a supreme Being into that of subordinate ones,  he went back to that of the supreme, and clung to this with his whole soul (Clark, Ten great Religions, chap. 10). SEE ABRAHAM.

Mosaism. — This abstract faith continued to be the faith of the Israelites until it was transformed at Mount Sinai by the Lord himself, through his chosen servant Moses. Thereafter the Abrahamic idea was clothed in forms rendered necessary not only by the character of the age, but also by the frailty of men, to the generality of whom hitherto ceremonies had been absolutely essential. From the "Mosaic Revelation," as Dean Stanley (Jewish Ch., First Series, Lect. 7) calls it, dates the establishment not only of the Judaic principle itself, but of the Theocracy (see Josephus, Apion, 2, 17). Thenceforth the followers of Abraham not only worshipped the one "supreme Being," but they were governed by him; i.e. from the converse of Moses with the Lord dates the ultimate union of the Jewish Church and State — the correlation of life and religion, of the nation and the individual. SEE MOSES; SEE LAW.

Prophetism. — Surrounded by idolaters on all sides, with whom they were brought in contact continually, the Hebrews gradually disobeyed the commandments of Sinai until idolatry destroyed all personal morality, and the chosen people knew not their Lord. To save the race from utter apostasy, holy men were inspired by the Lord to make known the penalty of idolatry and immorality. Amid the trials and sore afflictions with which he visits the nation, he yet declares the perpetuity of the Jewish faith. A Messiah shall eventually gather in the people, and to the Lord alone shall service be rendered. SEE MESSIAH. Though the present plant shall wither, the seed shall continue to live, from whose germination shall spring a flower of greater fragrance in the fullness of time. All through the captivity among the Assyrians and Babylonians, even after the destruction of the Temple, the life of the seed was attested by the fruit it bore. SEE CAPTIVITY; SEE PROPHECY.

Rabbinism. — When the political existence of the Jews was annihilated, they nerved themselves, with that determination characteristic of the Hebrew race, for another and more determined strife. In consequence of their dispersion as a nation, after the Babylonian exile the Mosaic constitution could be but partially reestablished. "The whole building was too much shattered, and its fragments too widely dispersed, to reunite in their ancient and regular form." But from his captivity the Jew had brought with him a reverential, or, rather, a passionate attachment to the Mosaic  law and the consecration of the second Temple, and the reestablishment of the state had been accompanied by the ready and solemn recognition of the law. The synagogue was instituted, and with it many of the institutions which have tended to perpetuate Judaism to the present hour. One of the most important of these was the constant interpretation of the law and the prophets; and as the acquaintance with the law became more intimate. the attachment to it grew deeper and deeper in the national character, until it finally was not only their Bible and statute book, but a guide for the most minute details of common life. "But no written law can provide for all possible exigencies; whether general and comprehensive, or minute and multifarious, it equally requires the expositor to adapt it to the immediate case which may occur, either before the public tribunal or that of the private conscience. Hence the law became a deep and intricate study. Learning in the law became the great distinction to which all alike paid reverential homage. Public and private affairs depended on the sanction of this self formed spiritual aristocracy... Every duty of life, of social intercourse between man and man, not to speak of its weightier authority as the national code of criminal and civil jurisprudence, was regulated by an appeal to the book of the law" (Milman, History of the Jews, 2, 417). Thus arose the office of the rabbis — the clergy, the learned interpreters of the law, the public instructors, to whom, by degrees, also the spiritual authority was transferred from the priesthood. At this time, also, besides the inspired Scriptures, traditional writings became another ground of authority over the public mind. SEE TRADITION.

This was not, however, as universally acknowledged, and gave rise to that schism in Judaism which originated the Karaites (q.v.). Thus Judaism had fortified itself after the captivity, so that when the Temple was finally again destroyed, and public worship became extinct, Rabbinism was able to supplant the original religion of the Jews, and from amid the blackened walls of Jerusalem rose, ere the smoke of the ruins had yet ceased, a new bond of national union. the great distinctive feature in the character of modern Judaism. With the Masora (q.v.) also came soon after the Mishna (q.v.) and the Gemara, which together form the Babylonian Talmud, SEE TALMUD; that wonderful monument of human industry formulated Mosaism — which to the Jew "became the magic circle within which the national mind patiently labored for ages in performing the bidding of the ancient and mighty enchanters, who drew the sacred line beyond which it might not venture to pass" (Milman), and which so securely enwrapped the Jewish idea in almost infinite rules and laws that it completely sheltered it from polluting  contact in the succeeding dark ages. It is thus that Judaism, weathering many a long and severe storm, has continued to prosper, and flourishes even in our own day.

Sects. — In the early age of Judaism we saw that the simple worship of a supreme Being constituted its peculiar characteristic. At that time, as a sign of the covenant of Abraham with the Lord, the rite of circumcision (q.v.) was introduced, and was soon followed by the formal institution of sacrifice. In the period of Mosaism the Jewish belief became an established form of religion, and then were introduced certain. ceremonies and feast days, together with the priesthood. In the Rabbinic period, as the law became overlaid by tradition, discussions arose, and the Jews were divided into three principal sects — the Pharisees (q.v.), who placed religion in external ceremony; the Sadducees (q.v.), who were remarkable for their incredulity; and the Essenes (q.v.), whose peculiar distinction was the practice of austere sanctity. Still later sprang up other sects; prominently among these are the Karaites, the strict adherents to the letter of the law, the opponents of rabbinical interpretations. For a review of Jewish literature, SEE RABBINISM.

Modern Judaism. — In the history of the Jews (q.v.) we have seen how greatly the condition of this people was ameliorated about the close of the 18th century by the influence of Moses Mendelssohn. But not only in their civil condition did his efforts affect the Jews; he also greatly changed the character of Judaism itself. With him originated a tendency of thought and action, which has since spread among the leaders of Judaism generally, to weaken rabbinical authority, and to maintain a more simple Biblical Judaism. These have now been developed into two special phases of Jewish opinion, which are represented by the terms "Conservative" (or Moderate Orthodox) and "Reformed" (or Liberal) Judaism. (See each of these titles below.)

General Creed. — A summary of the religious views of the Jews was first compiled in the 11th century by the second great Moses (Maimonides), and it continues to be with the Orthodox the Jewish confession of faith to the present day. It is as follows:

1. I believe, with a true and perfect faith, that God is the creator (whose name be blessed), governor, and maker of all creatures; and that he hath wrought all things, worketh, and shall work forever.

2. 1 believe, with perfect faith, that the Creator (whose name be blessed) is one; and that such a unity as is in him can be found in none other; and that he alone hath been our God, is, and forever shall be.

3. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Creator (whose name be blessed) is not corporeal, not to be comprehended with any bodily properties; and that there is no bodily essence that can be likened unto him.

4. I believe, with a perfect faith, the Creator (whose name be blessed) to be the first and the last; that nothing was before him, and that he shall abide the last forever.

5. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Creator (whose name be blessed) is to be worshipped, and none else.

6. I believe, with a perfect faith, that all the words of the prophets are true.

7. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the prophecies of Moses our master (may he rest in peace!) were true; that he was the father and chief of all wise men that lived before him, or ever shall live after him.

8. I believe, with a perfect faith, that all the law which at this day is found in our hands was delivered by God himself to our master Moses (God's peace be with him!).

9. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the same law is never to be changed, nor any other to be given us of God (whose name be blessed).

10. I believe, with a perfect faith, that God (whose name be blessed) understandeth all the works and thoughts of men, as it is written in the prophets; he fashioneth their hearts alike, he understandeth all their works.

11. I believe, with a perfect faith, that God (whose name be blessed) will recompense good to them that keep his commandments, and will punish them who transgress them.

12. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Messiah is yet to come; and although he retard his coming, yet I will wait for him till he come.

13. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the dead shall be restored to life when it shall seem fit unto God the creator (whose name be blessed, and memory celebrated without end. Amen).  Doctrine of immortality. — In regard to the future life, they believe in reward and punishment, but, like the Universalists (q.v.), the Jews believe in the ultimate salvation of all men. Like the Roman Catholics, SEE PURGATORY, the Jews offer up prayers for the souls of their deceased friends (comp. Alger, Hist. Doctr. Future Life, chap. 8 and 9).

Sacrifice. — Since the destruction of their Temple and their dispersion the sacrifices have been discontinued, but in all other respects the Mosaic dispensation is observed intact among the Orthodox Jews.

Worship. — Their divine worship consists in the reading of the Scriptures and prayer. But while they (do not insist on attendance at the synagogue, they enjoin all to say their prayers at home, or in any place where circumstances may place them, three times a day — morning, afternoon, and evening; they repeat also blessings and particular praises to God, aside from them, at their meals and on many other occasions.

In their morning devotions they use the phylacteries (q.v.) and the Talith, except Saturdays, when they use the Talith only. SEE FRINGE.

Calendar. — The Jewish year is either civil or ecclesiastical. The civil year commences in the month of Tisri, which falls into some part of our September, on the view that the world was created on the first day of this month (Tisri). The ecclesiastical year commences about the vernal equinox, in the month of Nisan, the latter part of our month of March and the first half of April. The seventh month of the civil year they call the first of the ecclesiastical year, because this was enjoined upon them at their departure from Egypt (Num 28:11). SEE CALENDAR.

Feast Days. — The feasts which they observe at present are the following:

1. Passover, on the 14th of Nisan, and lasting eight days. On the evening before the feast the first born of every family observes a fast in remembrance of God's mercy toward the nation. They eat at this feast unleavened bread, and observe as strict holidays the two first and last days.

2. Pentecost, or the Feast of Weeks, falling seven weeks after the Passover, is at present celebrated only two days.

3. Trumpets, on the 1James , 2 d of Tisri, of which the first is called New year's day. On the second day is read the 22d chapter of Genesis, which gives an account of Abraham's offering of his son Isaac and God's blessing  on him and his seed. Then they blow the trumpet, or, more accurately, the horn, and pray, as usual, that God would bring them to Jerusalem.

4. Tabernacles, on the 15th of Tisri, and lasting nine days; the first and the last two days being observed as feast days, and the other four as days of labor. On the first day they take branches of palm, myrtle, willow, and citron bound together, and go around the altar or pulpit singing psalms, because this ceremony was formerly performed at their Temple. On the seventh day of the festival they take copies of the torah, or law of Moses, out of the ark, and carry them to the altar, and all the congregation follow in procession seven times around the altar, in remembrance of the Sabbatical year, singing the 29th Psalm. On the evening of this day the feast of solemn assembly, or of rejoicing, commences. They read passages from the law and the prophets, and entreat the Lord to be propitious to them, and deliver them from captivity. On the ninth day they repeat several prayers in honor of the law, and bless God for his mercy and goodness in giving it to them by his servant Moses, and read that part of the Scriptures which makes mention of his death.

5. Purim, on the 14th and 15th of Adar (or March), in commemoration of the deliverance from Haman (Esther 9). The whole book of Esther is read repeatedly, with liberal almsgiving to the poor.

6. Besides these festivals appointed by Moses and Mordecai, they celebrate the dedication of the altar, in commemoration of the victory over Antiochus Epiphanes. This festival lasts eight days, and is appointed to be kept by lighting lamps. The reason they assign for this is that, at this purification and rededication of the Temple after the deliverance from Antiochus, there was not enough of pure oil left to burn one night, but that it miraculously lasted eight days, when they obtained a fresh supply.

7. Expiation day, the 10th day of Tisri, is observed by the Jews, though they have neither temple nor priest. Before the feast they seek to reestablish friendly relations with their neighbors, and, in short, do everything that may serve to evince the sincerity of their repentance. For twenty four hours they observe a strict fast, and many a pious soul does not quit the synagogue during these long hours, but remains in prayer through the night. SEE FESTIVAL.

Mission and Preservation of the Jews. — The preservation of the Jews as a distinct nation, notwithstanding the miseries which they have endured for  many ages, is a wonderful fact. The religions of other nations have depended on temporal prosperity for their duration; they have triumphed under the protection of conquerors, and have fallen and given place to others under a succession of weak monarchs. Paganism once overspread the known world, even where it no longer exists. The Christian Church, glorious in her martyrs, has survived the persecution of her enemies, though she cannot heal the wounds they have inflicted; but Judaism, hated and persecuted for so many centuries, has not merely escaped destruction, it has been powerful and flourishing. Kings have employed the severity of laws and the hand of the executioner to eradicate it, and a seditious populace have injured it by their massacres more than kings. Sovereigns and their subjects, pagans, Christians, and Mohammedans, opposed to each other in everything else, have formed, a common design to annihilate this nation without success. The bush of Moses has always continued burning, and never been consumed.

The expulsion of the Jews from the great cities of kingdoms has only scattered them throughout the world. They have lived from age to age in wretchedness, and their blood has flowed freely in persecution; they have continued to our day, in spite of the disgrace and hatred which everywhere clung to. them, while the greatest empires have fallen and been almost forgotten. Every Jew is at this moment a living witness to the Christian as to the authenticity of his own religion, an undeniable evidence that Christianity is the last revelation from God; and the patient endurance of the descendants of Abraham is an evidence that Providence has guarded them throughout all their miseries. Hence the Christian should regard with compassion a people so long preserved by this peculiar care amidst calamities which would have destroyed any other nation. "I would look at the ceremonies of pagan worship," says Dr. Richardson, "as a matter of little more than idle curiosity, but those of the Jews reach the heart. This is the most ancient form of worship in existence; this is the manner in which the God of heaven was worshipped when all the other nations in the world were sitting in darkness, or falling down to stocks and stones.

To the Jews were committed the oracles of God. This is the manner in which Moses and Elias, David and Solomon, worshipped the God of their fathers; this worship was instituted by God himself. The time will come when the descendants of his ancient people shall join the song of Moses to the song of the Lamb, and, singing hosannas to the son of David, confess his power to save."  Restoration of the Jews. — The Jews, as is well known, deny the accomplishment of the prophecies in the person of Jesus. The Reformed Jews (see below) deny the promise of a personal Messiah altogether; but the orthodox, the greater part of the Jews, hold that the Messiah has not yet come, but that they will be redeemed at the appointed time, when he of whom the prophets spoke shall make his appearance in great worldly pomp and grandeur, subduing all nations, and restoring the scepter of universal rule to the house of Judah. Then there shall reign universal peace and happiness in all the earth, never again to be interrupted, and to the Jewish fold shall return those of the flock that strayed into the Christian and Mohammedan folds; then idolatry shall cease in the world, and all men acknowledge the unity of God and his kingdom. (Comp. Zec 14:9, "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one.) This restoration shall be effected, not on account of any merits of their own, but for the Lord's sake; so as to secure their own righteousness, and the perfection to which they shall attain after their deliverance. (Atonement for sin is made by the fulfilling of the law and by circumcision, and not, as the Christian holds, by the sacrifice of the Messiah.) For the Christian doctrine of the Restoration of the Jews, SEE RESTORATION.

## Judaism, Conservative[[@Headword:Judaism, Conservative]]

             The gradual emancipation of the Jews in Germany, which, however, did not become final anywhere until 1848, and which was rendered complete in Bavaria so recently as 1866, insensibly diminished the influence of Talmudical studies and of Rabbinical lore as the paramount obligation of life. Compelled, happily, to bear their own share in their deliverance from oppression, the Jews became more and more attached to the land of their nativity, and more and more estranged from the traditional allegiance to the kingdom of Israel. Their love for Palestine, intense and impassioned as ever, has assumed a different form. Their union and fellowship no longer represented a nationality yearning to be released from captivity, but settled down into the indissoluble affection of race and a: common faith, not inconsistent with ties of citizenship in the world.

In 1807, when Napoleon convened the so called Jewish Sanhedrim, with a view of establishing the relations between the empire and the Jews resident in France, the first official and authoritative expression of the transformed Jewish sentiment was published. In effect, it was a defense of the Jew who  had for centuries been denied the rights of man, and pronounced unfit for citizenship. It declared that the Jews of France recognize in the fullest sense the French people as their brethren; that France is their country; that the Jews of France recognize as paramount the laws of the land, and their religious tribunals have no authority in conflict with the civil courts and national laws; that the Talmud enjoins the pursuit of a useful trade and prohibits usury; that polygamy is forbidden and divorce permitted.

The Jews of France were equal to the promise of the Sanhedrim. They proved good citizens, and faithfully adhered to their distinct religious belief and practice. The chief rabbi of France has been recognized as of corresponding dignity with the archbishop of Paris, and in the distribution of state aid to ecclesiastical institutions the Jews have been admitted to their proportionate share. The Jews of France, like those of Great Britain and Holland, are Conservative. The form of worship has not materially changed to this day. The Portuguese ritual is followed at one of the Paris synagogues, as at London and Amsterdam. The German or Polish ritual is otherwise the rule..

In Great Britain about the year 1842, the keynote of progress was struck by a Jewish congregation at London, followed by that of Manchester. There are now only two congregations in the United Kingdom denying the authority of the chief rabbi. In Great Britain, France, and Holland there exists a recognized ecclesiastical authority. The administration of religious affairs is conducted nearly upon the Episcopal system. The spirit of the churches in these three countries is extremely conservative. Nevertheless, great latitude is allowed to individual believers, and what would have been regarded as capital sins a century ago are considered trivial today. It may be said that the Jews have thoroughly assimilated themselves to the rest of the population. In France their conservatism is formal rather than substantial, and the nonconformist is treated with great liberality. That he violates the sanctity of the Jewish Sabbath is not necessarily a disqualification for high office in the congregation. The ministers are, expected to live consistently with their professions: the laity are not sharply criticized. In England conservatism is decided, authoritative, uncompromising. Nonconformists are on sufferance, and are rarely allowed a voice in the administration of synagogual affairs. In Holland liberty has dealt kindly with the Jewish people, who are prominent in the state and in commerce, in science, in learning, and in art, and are at once conservative and tolerant in their religious views, while consistent in the conduct of the  synagogue. There are successful Conservative colleges or theological seminaries at Paris, London; Amsterdam, Breslau, Berlin, and Würzburg.

Conservative Judaism is paramount in Belgium and Italy, and has held its own in some parts of Austria also. The great Rapoport (q.v.) of Prague, one of the finest scholars of that century, may be regarded as the type of the intelligent Conservative Jew who loved the Judaism of the past with fervor and intensity, but recognized as the duty of the present hour the preparation of his brethren for their place in the world at length grudgingly accorded them.

The Judaism of Poland and Russia, as of Palestine and the other Asiatic and the African countries, can scarcely be denominated Conservative. It is strictly stationary. Education has not yet been sufficiently diffused among the masses to enable them intelligently to comprehend the differences or points of unity in Judaism, conservative or progressive. The study of the Talmud is still pursued with ardor in every Polish village, but the spirit of Judaism is not as potent as the maintenance of form or of scholastic authority. Conservative Judaism has no history in these countries, yet its scholars have done the world a service in the preservation of Hebrew literature, and in rescuing from oblivion ancient thought so peculiarly habited and disguised. It is worthy of note that the chief rabbi at Jerusalem preserves great state, and is regarded as a functionary of signal consequence, but the institutions of learning within his jurisdiction are mainly sustained by the benevolence of European and American Jews.

The Hebrews in the United States number about half a million. Their material progress has been extraordinary. They comprise at present some three hundred congregations, of which full one half came to this country only within the last twelve years. The synagogues rival the most beautiful. and costly churches in the principal cities. In 1840 there were scarcely ten thousand Jews and not more than a dozen congregations in the United States. Their synagogues now number two hundred and fifty. The Conservative ministry is not strong. Only recently has any active interest been displayed in the higher Hebrew education, the preparation of candidates for clerical stations. Maimonides College, established in 1866 at Philadelphia, has not been successful in the number of students, although its faculty is scholarly and energetic. The Conservative pulpit is ably supplied in several synagogues of New York, Philadelphia, and New  Orleans. In other cities the leading scholars are of the progressive or Reform school.

The policy of Conservative American Israelites does not favor ecclesiastical authority. Occasionally efforts have been made to, perfect a union of synagogues; but they have uniformly failed when doctrinal or ritual questions were the points to be determined in convention. The tendency is clearly in favor of independent synagogues, united for purposes of a charitable, educational, or semi-political character — otherwise recognizing no will or exposition of Jewish doctrine superior to that of their respective ministers or secular officials. The cooperative movements for aiding oppressed Israelites in foreign countries, and for repressing anticipated danger or checking legal discriminations at home, resulting in the establishment of the "Board of Delegates of American Israelites," are not confined to the Conservative or to the Progressive congregations. Doctrinal questions are eschewed in this organization, which is purely voluntary, and assumes no authority except what may be delegated from time to time to interpret the sentiments of American Israelites.

The Conservatives have of late years paid attention to religious education. Elementary schools are attached to most congregations, and in New York a society was formed in 1865 for the gratuitous instruction in Hebrew and in English, of children whose parents are not attached to any synagogue, or are unable to contribute to its support. (M.S.L.)

## Judaism, Reformed[[@Headword:Judaism, Reformed]]

             also called progressive or modern Judaism, is the Jewish religion as reformed in the 19th century in Germany, Austria, America, and in some congregations of France and England. The places of worship are called temples, distinguished from other Jewish synagogues by choir, organ, regular sermons, and part of the liturgy in the vernacular of the country, and in America also by family pews. The ministers of these temples are rabbis who have attained proficiency in Hebrew lore, and are graduates of colleges or universities; or preachers by the choice of the congregation, who are mostly autodidactic students; and cantors, capable of reading the divine service and leading the choir. In some congregations the offices of preacher and cantor are united in one person. Large congregations are conducted by the ordained rabbi and the cantor: the former is the expounder of the law, and the latter presides over the worship, and is also called Hazan, or Reader (q.v.). Every congregation elects secular officers  to conduct the temporal affairs. The ministers are elected by the congregation for a stated period. A school for instruction in religion, Hebrew, and Jewish history is attached to every temple. Like all other Jews, the reformed also are unitarian in theology, and acknowledge the Old Testament Scriptures as the divine source of law and doctrine, but reject the additional authority of the Talmud, in place of which they appeal to reason and conscience as the highest authority in expounding the Scriptures. They believe in the immortality of the soul, future reward and punishment, the perfectibility of human nature, the final and universal triumph of truth and righteousness. They reject the belief in the coming of a Messiah; the gathering of the Hebrew people to Palestine to form a separate government, and to restore the ancient polity of animal sacrifices and the Levitical priesthood; the resurrection of the body and the last judgment day; and the authority of the Talmud above any other collection of commentaries to the Bible. All these doctrines are expressed in their prayer books and catechisms. Their hermeneutics is rationalistic. They reject the evidence of miracles, relying exclusively upon the internal evidence of the Scriptures, and the common consent of all civilized nations to the divinity of the scriptural laws and doctrines. Except in the case of Moses, of whom the Scriptures testify, "Mouth to mouth I speak unto him," the appearance and speaking of angels, as also the appearance and speaking of God, were subjective, in the vision, waking or dreaming, appearing objectively to the prophet, which was not the case in reality. In this respect they follow the guide of Moses Maimonides. SEE PHILOSOPHY, THEOLOGICAL, OF THE JEWS.

In respect to doctrine, they hold that all religious doctrines must be taken from the Bible, and must be in harmony with the loftiest and purest conceptions of the Deity and humanity suggested by the Scriptures, and confirmed by reason and conscience. In respect to law, they hold that all laws contained in the Decalogue, expressed or implied, are obligatory forever, both in letter or spirit. All laws not contained in the Decalogue, expressed or implied, are local and temporal (although the principle expressed by some may be eternal) and could have been intended for certain times and localities only. These theories of Judaism were developed by various Jewish authors between the years 1000 and 1500; partly they are also in the ancient Rabbinical literature, but were dropped after 1500, and taken up again by the disciples and successors of Moses Mendelssohn toward the close of the last century, and gradually developed to the present system. (I.M.W.)  From a few late articles in the Israelite (Nov. 1871), by the distinguished writer of the above article on Reformed Judaism, we learn that he regards as the first reformer in the camp of Judaism the celebrated gaon Saadia (q.v.) ben-Joseph, of Fayum, who flourished in the first half of the 10th century"; as the second, the famous body physician of the caliph of Cairo, Rambam, "the classical Moses Maimonides." Of perhaps minor influence, but also as active in the field of reform, he introduces us next to Bechai ben-Joseph, of Saragossa, and Ibn-Gebirol (q.v.), of Malaga, who flourished in the 11th century. He even counts among the reformers the celebrated French rabbi Isaac, of Troyes, better known under the surname of Rashi (q.v.); and on the side of reform or progressive Judaism are also ranked by Dr. Wise the celebrated Jewish savants Judah ha-Levy (q.v.), Aben-Ezra (q.v.), and Abraham ben-David; the celebrated author of the Emmeah Ramah (Exalted Faith), who fell a victim to fanaticism in A.D. 1180 at Toledo, in Spain, and with whom close up the two centuries that elapsed between the appearance of Saadia and Maimonides, in which days "all [Jewish] philosophy had become peripatetic," the Jewish philosophical writers of this period considering their main object "the self defense of Judaism on the one hand, and the expounding of the Bible and Talmud as rational as possible, in order to reconcile and harmonize faith and reason."

With the 13th century undoubtedly opens a new epoch in Judaism, for it is here that we encounter the great Jewish master mind Moses Maimonides, of whom it has been truly said that "from Moses [the lawgiver] to Moses [Mendelssohn] there was none like Moses [Maimonides]." Since the days of Ezra, no man has exerted so deep, universal, and lasting an influence on Jews and Judaism as this man, and we need not wonder that Orthodox, Conservative, and Reformed Jews alike lay claim to this master mind; but it must be confessed that, after all, he really belongs to the Progressive Jews only. It is true the creed drawn up by the second Moses is now the possession of all Jews, and the Orthodox cling to it with even more tenacity than the Conservatives and the Reformed, but his theologico- philosophical works gained authority mainly among the Reformed thinkers of the Judaistic faith. After that date, of course, Jewish literature abounds with names whose productions betray a rationalistic tendency, for "all Jewish thinkers up to date, Baruch Spinoza, Moses Mendelssohn, and the writers of the 19th century included, are more or less the disciples of Maimonides, so that no Jewish theologico-philosophical book, from and after 1200, can be picked up in which the ideas of Maimonides do not form  a prominent part." In our own days the Reform movement first became very prominent. In Germany, where Judaism has always been strong on account of the high literary attainments of the German Jews, the separation between the Orthodox and Reformed, and the establishment of independent Reformed congregations first originated, and the celebrated Holdheim (q.v.) was among the first as pastor of a temple in 1846. Other Jewish rabbis of note, identified with the Reform movement in Germany, are Stein, of Frankfurt-on-the-Main; Einhorn, now of New York City, Deutsch, now of Baltimore, Md.; and Ritter, the successor of Holdheim, and historian of the Reform agitation. In the U. States those prominently identified with the Reform question are Drs. Adler and Gutheim, of the Fifth Avenue Temple, New York City; Mr. Ellinger, editor of the Jewish Times, New York City; Dr. Lewin, of Brooklyn, editor of the New Era; Dr. Isaac M. Wise, editor of the Israelite, etc. See Jost, Gesch. des Judenthums u. Sekten, 3, 349 sq. Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 10; Ritter, Gesch. d. jüd. Reformation (Berlin, 3 vols. 8vo); Geiger, Judaism and its History, Engl. trans. by M. Mayer (N.Y. 1870 8vo); Astruc (the grand rabbi of Belgium), Histoire abrege des Juifs et de leur croyance (Paris, 1869); Raphael, D. C. Lewin, What is Judaism (N.Y. 1871, 12mo); New Era, May, 1871, art. 1; Brit. and For. Evang. Rev. April, 1869; Kitto, Journ. Sac. Literature, 8; Atlantic Monthly, Oct. 1870; and the works cited in the article JEWS. (J.H.W.)

## Judaizing Christians[[@Headword:Judaizing Christians]]

             a term frequently employed to designate a class of early Christians, of whom traces appear in the N.T. epistles, and still more distinctly in the succeeding century. They are believed to have been converts from Judaism, who still clung to the Mosaic institutions, particularly circumcision. They appear to have been of two classes, some considering the ceremonial law as binding only upon Christians descended from the Jews, while others looked upon it as obligatory also for the heathen. The headquarters of the Judaizing Christians is said to have been first at Antioch. The council held at Jerusalem decided that the heathen should not be subject to circumcision. The more zealous Judaizing Christians, thus opposed by the apostles, abandoned Palestine, and went about trying to convert the heathen to their views, but with little success. They were probably the "false apostles," persons "brought in unawares," etc., so often mentioned by Paul, and are known in history, the more moderate as NAZARENES SEE NAZARENES (q.v.), the others as EBIONITES SEE EBIONITES  (q.v.). See D. van Heyst, De Jud. Christianismo (1828). — Pieter, Universal Lexikon, 9, 159.

## Judas[[@Headword:Judas]]

             (Ι᾿ούδας), the Graecized form of the Hebrew name Judah, and generally retained in the A.V. of the Apocrypha and N.T., as also in Josephus, where it occurs of a considerable number of men. SEE JUDA; SEE JUDE.

1. The patriarch JUDAH SEE JUDAH (q.v.), son of Jacob (Mat 1:2-3).

2. One of the Levites who renounced his Gentile wife after the captivity (1Es 9:23); the JUDAH of Ezr 10:23.

3. The third son of Mattathias, and the leading one of the three Maccabaean brothers (1Ma 2:4, etc.). SEE MACCABEES.

4. The son of Calphi (Alphaeus), a Jewish general under Jonathan Maccabaeus (1Ma 11:70).

5. A Jew occupying a conspicuous position at Jerusalem at the time of the mission to Aristobulus (q.v.) and the Egyptian Jews (2Ma 1:10). He is thought by some to have been the same with

6. An aged person, and a noted teacher among the Essenes at Jerusalem, famous for his art of predicting events, which was confirmed in a remarkable manner by the death of Antigonus (q.v.) at the order of his brother Aristobulus, as related by Josephus (Ant. 13, 11, 2; War, 1, 3, 5).

7. A son of Simon, and brother of John Hyrcanus (1Ma 16:2), murdered by Ptolemaeus the usurper, either at the same time (B.C. cir. 135) with his father (1Ma 16:15 sq.), or shortly afterwards (Josephus Ant. 13, 8. 1; see Grimm, ad Macc. l. c.). — Smith.

8. Son of one Ezechias (which latter was famous for his physical strength), and one of the three principal bandits mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 17, 10, 2; War, 2, 4, 1) as infesting Palestine in the early days of Herod. This person, whom Whitson (ad loc.) regards as the Theudas (q.v.) of Luke (Act 10:36), temporarily got possession of Sepphoris, in Galilee. What became of him does not particularly appear, but it may be presumed. he shared the fate of the others named in the same connection.  9. Son of one Saripheus, or Sepphoris, and one of the two eminent Jewish teachers who incited their young disciples to demolish the golden eagle erected by Herod over the Temple gate, an act of sedition for which the whole party were burned alive (Josephus, Ant. 17, 6, 2-4; War, 1, 33, 2-4).

10. A person surnamed "the Galiloean" (ὁ Γαλιλαῖος, Act 5:37), so called also by Josephus (Ant. 18, 1, 6; 20, 5, 2; War, 2, 8, 1), and likewise "the Gaulonite" (ὁ Γαυλονίτης, Ant. 18, 1, 1). He was born at Gamala, a fortified city on the Sea of Galilee, in Lower Gaulonitis; and after the deposition of Archelaus, during the thirty-seventh year after the battle of Actium (Josephus, Ant. 18, 2, l), i.e. A.D. 6, he excited a violent insurrection among the Jews, in concert with a well known Pharisee named Sadok, against the Roman government exercised by the procurator Coponius, on occasion of a census levied by the emperor Augustus, asserting the popular doctrine that the Jews ought to acknowledge no dominion but that of God. He was destroyed, and his followers scattered by Cyrenius, then proconsul of Syria and Judaea. We also learn from Josephus that the scattered remnant of the party of Judas continued after his destruction to work on still in secret, and labored to maintain his free spirit and reckless principles among the people (Josephus, War, 2, 17, 7- 19). (See E. A. Schulze, Dissert. de Juda Galiloeo ejusque secta, Frankf. A.V. 1761; also in his Exercit. philosoph. fasc. non. p. 104.) SEE SICARII.

11. Son of Simon (Joh 6:71; Joh 13:2; Joh 13:26), surnamed (always in the other Gospels) ISCARIOT, to distinguish him from the other apostle of the same name. SEE JUDE. In addition to this epithet the Evangelists usually distinguish him by some allusion to his treachery toward his Master.

I. Signification of the Surname. — The epithet Iscariot (Ι᾿σκαριώτης) has received many interpretations more or less conjectural.

(1) From Kerioth (Jos 15:25), in the tribe of Judah, the Heb. קְרַיּוֹת

אַישׁ, Ish-Kerioth', passing into Ι᾿σκαριώτης in the same way as אַישׁ טוֹב — Ish-Tob, "a man of Tob" — appears in Josephus (Ant. 7, 6, 1) as ῎Ιστωβος. In connection with this explanation may be noticed the reading of some MSS. in Joh 6:71, ἀπὸ Καριώτου, and that received by Lachmann and Tischendorf, which makes the name Iscariot belong to. Simon, and not, as elsewhere, to Judas only. On this hypothesis, his position among the Twelve, the rest of whom belonged to Galilee (Act 2:7), would be exceptional; and this is perhaps an additional reason why this locality is noted. This is the most common and probable opinion. SEE KERIOTH.

(2) From Kartha (A.V. "Kartan," Jos 21:32), in Galilee (so Ewald, Gesch. Israels, 5, 321).

(3) As equivalent to Issacharite, or Ι᾿σαχαριώτης (Grotius on Mat 10:4; Hermann, Miscell. Groning. 3, 598).

(4) From the date trees (καριωτίδες) in the neighborhood of Jerusalem or Jericho (Bartolocci, Bibl. Rabbin. 3, 10; Gill, Comm. on Matthew 10, 4).

(5) From אסקוֹרטיא(=scortea, Gill, 1.c.), a leathern apron, the name being applied to him as the bearer of the bag, and = "Judas with the apron" (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Mat 10:4).

(6) From אסכרא, ascara = strangling (angina), as given after his death, and commemorating it (Lightfoot, 1. c.), or indicating that he had been subject to a disease tending to suffocation previously (Heinsius, in Suicer, Thes. s.v. Ι᾿ούδας). This is mentioned also as a meaning of the name by Origen, Tract. in Matt. 35.

II. Personal Notices. — Of the life of Judas, before the appearance of his name in the lists of the apostles. We know absolutely nothing. It must be left to the sad vision of a poet (Keble, Lyra Innocentium, 2, 13) or the fantastic fables of an apocryphal Gospel (Thilo, Cod. Apoc. N.T., Evang. Infant. c. 35) to portray the infancy and youth of the traitor. His call as an apostle implies, however, that he had previously declared himself a disciple. He was drawn, as the others were, by the preaching of the Baptist, or his own Messianic hopes, or the "gracious words" of the new teacher, to leave his former life, and to obey the call of the Prophet of Nazareth. What baser and more selfish motives may have mingled even then with his faith and zeal we can only judge by reasoning backwards from the sequel. Gifts of some kind there must have been, rendering the choice of such a man not strange to others, not unfit in itself, and the function which he exercised afterwards among the Twelve may indicate what they were. The position of his name, uniformly the last in the lists of the apostles in the Synoptic Gospels, is due, it may be imagined, to the infamy which afterwards rested on his name, but, prior to that guilt, it would seem that he externally differed in no marked particular from the other apostles, and he doubtless  exercised the same mission of preaching and miracles as the rest (Mat 10:4; Mat 26:14-47; Mar 3:19; Mar 14:10; Mar 14:43; Luk 6:16; Luk 22:3; Luk 22:47-48; Joh 6:71; Joh 12:4; Joh 13:2; Joh 13:26; Joh 14:22; Joh 18:2-3). A.D. 27.

The germs (see Stier's Words of Jesus, at the passages where Judas is mentioned) of the evil, in all likelihood, unfolded themselves gradually. The rules to which the Twelve were subject in their first journey (Mat 10:9-10) sheltered him from the temptation that would have been most dangerous to him. The new form of life, of which we find the traces in Luk 8:3, brought that temptation with it. As soon as the Twelve were recognized as a body, traveling hither and thither with their Master, receiving money and other offerings, and redistributing what they received to the poor, it became necessary that some one should act as the steward and almoner of the small society, and this fell to Judas (Joh 12:6; Joh 13:29), either as having the gifts that qualified him for it, or, as we may conjecture, from his character, because he sought it, or, as some have imagined, in rotation from time to time. The Galilaean or Judaean peasant (we have no reason for thinking that his station differed from that of the other apostles) found himself intrusted with larger sums of money than before (the three hundred denarii of Joh 12:5 are spoken of as a sum which he might reasonably have expected), and with this there came covetousness, unfaithfulness, embezzlement. It was impossible after this that he could feel at ease with one who asserted so clearly and sharply the laws of faithfulness, duty, unselfishness; and the words of Jesus, "Have I not chosen you Twelve, and one of you is a devil?" (Joh 6:70) indicate that even then, though the greed of immediate or the hope of larger gain kept him from "going back," as others did (Joh 6:66), hatred was taking the place of love, and leading him on to a fiendish malignity. The scene at Bethany (Joh 12:1-9; Mat 26:6-13; Mar 14:3-9) showed how deeply the canker had eaten into his soul. The warm out pouring of love calls forth no sympathy. He utters himself, and suggests to others, the complaint that it is a waste. Under the plea of caring for the poor he covers his own miserable theft.

The narrative of Matthew 16, Mark 14, places this history in close connection (apparently in order of time) with the fact of the betrayal. During the days that intervened between the supper at Bethany and the paschal or quasi-paschal gathering, he appeared to have concealed his treachery. He went with the other disciples to and fro from Bethany to Jerusalem, and looked on the acted parable of the barren and condemned  tree (Mar 11:20-24), and shared the vigils in Gethsemane (Joh 18:2). At the beginning of the Last Supper he is present, looking forward to the consummation of his guilt as drawing nearer every hour. All is at first as if he were still faithful. He is admitted to the feast. His feet are washed, and for him there are the fearful words, "Ye are clean, but not all." At some point during the meal (see below) come the sorrowful words which showed him that his design was known. "One of you shall betray me." Others ask, in their sorrow and confusion, "Is it I?" He, too, must ask the same question, lest he should seem guilty (Mat 26:25). He alone hears the answer. John only, and through him Peter, and the traitor himself, understand the meaning of the act which pointed out that he was the guilty one (Joh 13:26). After this there comes on him that paroxysm and insanity of guilt as of one whose human soul was possessed by the Spirit of Evil — "Satan entered into him" (Joh 13:27). The words, "What thou doest, do quickly," come as a spur to drive him on. The other disciples see in them only a command which they interpret as connected with the work he had hitherto undertaken. Then he completes the sin from which even those words might have drawn him back. He knows that garden in which his Master and his companions had so often rested after the weary work of the day. He comes accompanied by a band of officers and servants (Joh 18:3), with the kiss which was probably the usual salutation of the disciples. The words of Jesus, calm and gentle as they were, showed that this was what embittered the treachery, and made the suffering it inflicted more acute (Luk 22:48).

What followed in the confusion of that night the Gospels do not record. Not many students of the N.T. will follow Heumann and archbishop Whately (Essays on Dangers) in the hypothesis that Judas was "the other disciple" that was known to the high priest, and brought Peter in (comp. Meyer on Joh 18:15). It is probable enough, indeed, that he who had gone out with the high priest's officers should return with them to wait the issue of the trial. Then, when it was over, came the reaction. The fever of the crime passed away. There came back on him the recollection of the sinless righteousness of the Master he had wronged (Mat 27:3). He feels a keen remorse, and the gold that had tempted him to it becomes hateful. He will get rid of the accursed thing, will transfer it back again to those who with it had lured him on to destruction. They mock and sneer at the tool whom they have used, and then there comes over him the horror of great darkness that precedes self murder. He has owned his sin with "an  exceeding bitter cry." but he dares not turn, with any hope of pardon, to the Master whom he has betrayed. He hurls the money, which the priests refused to take, into the sanctuary (ναός) where they were assembled. For him there is no longer sacrifice or propitiation. He is "the son of perdition" (Joh 17:12). "He departed, and went and hanged himself" (Mat 27:5). He went "unto his own place" (Act 1:25). A.D. 29. See below.

With the exception of the stories already mentioned, there are but few traditions that gather round the name of Judas. It appears, however, in a strange, hardly intelligible way in the history of the wilder heresies of the 2d century. The sect of Cainites, consistent in their inversion of all that Christians in general believed, was reported to have honored him as the only apostle that was in possession of the true gnosis, to have made him the object of their worship, and to have had a gospel bearing his name (comp. Neander. Church Hist. 2, 153; Irenaeus, adv. Hoer. 1, 35; Tertullian, De Proesc. c. 47). For the apocryphal gospel (Epiphanius, Hoer. 38, 1), see Fabricius, Codex Apocr. 1, 352. See GOSPELS, SPURIOUS.

III. Our Lord's Object in his Selection as an Apostle. — The choice was not made, we must remember, without a prevision of its issue. "Jesus knew from the beginning... who should betray him" (Joh 6:64); and the distinctness with which that evangelist records the successive stages of the guilt of Judas, and his Master's discernment of it (Joh 12:4; Joh 13:2; Joh 13:27), leaves with us the impression that he, too, shrank instinctively (Benel describes it as "singularis antipathia," Gnomon N. Test. on Joh 6:64) from a nature so opposite to his own. We can hardly expect fully to solve the question why such a man was chosen for such an office, nor is it our province to sound all the depths of the divine purposes, yet we may, without presumption, raise an inquiry on this subject.

(1.) Some, on the ground of God's absolute foreknowledge, content themselves with saying, with Calvin, that the judgments of God are as a great deep, and with Ullmann (Sundlosig. Jesu, p. 97), that Judas was chosen in order that the divine purpose might be accomplished through him. SEE PREDESTINATION.

(2.) Others, less dogmatic in their views, believe, with Neander (Leben Jesu, § 77), that there was a discernment of the latent germs of evil, such  as belonged to the Son of Man, in his insight into the hearts of men (Joh 2:25; Mat 9:4; Mar 12:15), yet not such as to exclude emotions of sudden sorrow or anger (Mar 3:5), or astonishment (Mar 6:6; Luk 7:9), admitting the thought "with men this is impossible, but not with God." Did he, in the depth of that insight, and in the fullness of his compassion, seek to overcome the evil which, if not conquered, would be so fatal? It gives, at any rate, a new meaning and force to many parts of our Lord's teaching to remember that they must have been spoken in the hearing of Judas, and may have been designed to make him conscious of his danger. The warnings as to the impossibility of a service divided between God and mammon (Mat 6:19-34), and the destructive power, of the "cares of this world," and the "deceitfulness of riches" (Mat 12:22-23), the pointed words that spoke of the guilt of unfaithfulness in the "unrighteous mammon" (Luk 16:11), the proverb of the camel passing through the needle's eye (Mar 10:25), must have fallen on his heart as meant specially for him. He was among those who asked the question, Who, then, can be saved? (Mar 10:26). Of him, too, we may say that, when he sinned, he was "kicking against the pricks," letting slip his "calling and election," frustrating the purpose of his Master in giving him so high a work, and educating him for it (compare Chrysostom, Hon. on Matthew 26, 27, John 6).

(3.) But to most persons these will appear to be arbitrary or recondite arguments. Important reasons of a more practical kind, we may be sure, were not wanting for the procedure, and they are not very far to seek. The presence of such a false friend in the company of his immediate disciples was needed, first of all, to complete the circle of Christ's trials and temptations. He could not otherwise have known by personal experience some of the sharpest wounds inflicted by human perverseness and ingratitude, nor exhibited his superiority to the evil of the world in its most offensive forms. But for the deceit and treachery of Judas he would not have been in all things tempted like his brethren. Then thus only could the things undergone by his great prototype David find their proper counterpart. in him who was to enter into David's heritage, and raise from the dust David's throne. Of the things written in the Psalms concerning him — written there as derived from the depths of David's sore experience and sharp conflict with evil, but destined to meet again in a still greater than he — few have more affecting prominence given to them than those which relate to the hardened wickedness, base treachery, and reprobate condition  of a false friend, whose words were smooth as butter, but whose actions were drawn swords, who ate of his meat, but lifted up the heel against him (comp. Psa 41:9, with Joh 13:18; and SEE AHITOPHEL ).

Other prophecies also, especially two in Zechariah (Zechariah 10:12, 13; 13:6), waited for their accomplishment on such a course of ingratitude and treachery as that pursued by Judas. Further, the relation in which this false but ungenial and sharp sighted disciple stood to the rectitude of Jesus afforded an important reason for his presence and agency. It was well that those who stood at a greater distance from the Savior failed to discover any fault in him; that none of them, when the hour of trial came, could convict him of sin, though the most watchful inspection had been exercised, and the most anxious efforts had been made to enable them to do so. But it was much more that even this bosom friend, who had been privy to all his counsels, and had seen him in his most unguarded moments, was equally incapable of finding any evil in him; he could betray Jesus to his enemies, but he could furnish these enemies with no proof of his criminality; nay, with the bitterness of death in his soul, he went back to testify to them that, in delivering up Jesus, he had betrayed innocent blood. What more conclusive evidence could the world have had that our Lord was indeed without spot and blameless? Finally, the appearance of such a person as Judas among the immediate attendants of Jesus was needed as an example of the strength of human depravity — how it can lurk under the most sacred professions, subsist in the holiest company, live and grow amid the clearest light, the most solemn warnings, the tenderest entreaties, and the divinest works. The instruction afforded by the incarnation and public ministry of the Son of God would not have been complete without such a memorable exhibition by its side of the darker aspects of human nature; the Church should have wanted a portion of the materials required for her future warning and admonition; and on this account also there was a valid reason for the calling of one who could act the shameful part of Judas Iscariot.

IV. Motives of Judas in the Betrayal of his Master. — The Scripture account leaves these to conjecture (comp. Neander, Leben Jesu, § 264). The mere love of money may have been strong enough to make him clutch at the bribe offered him. He came, it may be, expecting more (Mat 27:15); he will take that. He has lost the chance of dealing with the three hundred denarii; it will be something to get the thirty shekels as his own. It may have been that he felt that his Master saw through his hidden guilt, and  that he hastened on a crisis to avoid the shame of open detection. Mingled with this there may have been some feeling of vindictiveness, a vague, confused desire to show that he had power to stop the career of the teacher who had reproved him. Had the words that spoke of "the burial" of Jesus, and the lukewarmness of the people, and the conspiracies of the priests, led him at last to see that the Messianic kingdom was not as the kingdoms of this world, and that his dream of power and wealth to be enjoyed in it was a delusion? (Ewald, Gesch. Israels, 5, 441-446). There may have been the thought that, after all, the betrayal could do no harm, that his Master would prove his innocence, or by some supernatural manifestation effect his escape (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. p. 886; and Whitby on Mat 27:4). Another motive has been suggested (compare Neander, Leben Jesu, l.c.; and Whately, Essays on Dangers to Christian Faith, discourse 3) of an entirely different kind, altering altogether the character of the act. Not the love of money, nor revenge, nor fear, nor disappointment, but policy, a subtle plan to force on the hour of the triumph of the Messianic kingdom, the belief that for this service he would receive as high a place as Peter or James, or John — this it was that made him the traitor. If he could place his Master in a position from which retreat would be impossible, where he would be compelled to throw himself on the people, and be raised by them to the throne of his father David, then he might look forward to being foremost and highest in that kingdom, with all his desires for wealth and power gratified to the full. Ingenious as this hypothesis is, it fails for that very reason. It attributes to the groveling peasant a subtlety in forecasting political combinations, and planning stratagems accordingly, which is hardly compatible with his character and learning, hardly consistent either with the pettiness of the faults into which he had hitherto fallen. It is characteristic of the wide, far reaching sympathy of Origen: that he suggests another motive for the suicide of Judas. Despairing of pardon in this life, he would rush on into the world of the dead, and there (γυμνῇ τ᾿ ψυχῇ) meet his Lord and confess his guilt, and ask for pardon (Tract. in Matt. 35; comp. also Theophanes, Hom. 27, in Suicer. Thes. s.v. Ι᾿ούδας). Of the other motives that have been assigned we need not care to fix on any one as that which singly led him on. Crime is, for the most part, the result of a hundred motives rushing with bewildering fury through the mind of the criminal.

V. The question has often been agitated whether Judas was present at the first celebration of the Lord's supper, or left the assembly before the  institution actually took place; but with no very decisive result. The conclusion reached on either side has very commonly been determined by doctrinal prepossessions rather than by exegetical principles. The general consensus of patristic commentators gives an affirmative to the question of his partaking of the commemorative meal, that of modern critics a negative answer (comp. Meyer, Comm. on Joh 13:36). Of the three synoptic evangelists, Matthew and Mark represent the charge of an intention to betray on the part of Judas as being brought against him between the paschal feast and the supper, while Luke does not mention it till both feasts were finished; yet none of them say precisely when he left the chamber. From this surely it may be inferred that nothing very material depended on the circumstance. If Judas did leave before the commencement of the supper, it was plainly not because he was formally excluded, but because he felt it to be morally impossible to continue any longer in such company. As, however, it seems certain, from Joh 13:30, that he left the moment Jesus brought home the charge to him, and gave him the son, and as it is next to certain that the feast then proceeding was not that of the supper, the probabilities of the case must be held to be on the side of his previous withdrawal. The requisitions of time, too, favor the same view; since, if Judas did not leave till so late as the close of both feasts, it is scarcely possible to conceive how he should have had time to arrange with the chief priests for proceeding with the arrest of Jesus that very night. The matter in this shape came alike on him and on them by surprise; fresh consultations, therefore, required to be held, fresh measures to be adopted; and these necessarily demanded time, to the extent at least of some hours.

VI. Alleged Discrepancy as to the Mode of Judas' Suicide. — We have in Acts 1 another account than the above of the circumstances of his death, which some have thought it difficult to harmonize with that given by Matthew. There, in words which may have been spoken by Peter (Meyer, following the general consensus of interpreters), or may have been a parenthetical notice inserted by Luke (Calvin, Olshausen, and others), it is stated,

(1) That, instead of throwing the money into the Temple, he bought (ἐκτήσατο) a field with it. As to this point, it has been said that there is a kind of irony in Peter's words, "This was all he got." A better explanation is, that what was bought with his money is spoken of as bought by him (Meyer, ad loc.).

(2) That, instead of hanging himself, "falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out." On this we have two methods of reconciliation:

(a) That ἀπήγξατο, in Mat 27:5, includes death by some sudden spasm of suffocation (angina pectoris?), such as might be caused by the overpowering misery of his remorse, and that then came the fall described in the Acts (Suicer, Thes. s.v. ἀπάγχω; Grotius, Hammond, Lightfoot, and others). By some this has even been connected with the name Iscariot, as implying a constitutional tendency to this disease (Gill).

(b) That the work of suicide was but half accomplished, and that, the halter breaking, he fell (from a fig tree, in one tradition) across the road, and was mangled and crushed by the carts and wagons that passed over him. This explanation appears, with strange and horrible exaggerations, in the narrative of Papias, quoted by OEcumenius on Acts 1, and in Theophylact. on Matthew 27. It is, however, but a reasonable supposition that (Judas being perhaps a corpulent man), the rope breaking or slipping, he fell (probably from some elevated place, see Hackett, Illustra. of Script. p. 266) with such violence that his abdomen burst with the fall.

(3) That for this reason, and not because the priests had bought it with the price of blood, the field was called Aceldama. But it may readily be supposed that the potter's field which the priests had bought was the same as that in which the traitor met so terrible a death. SEE ACELDAMA.

VII. On the question of Judas's final salvation, it is difficult to see how any dispute could well arise in view of his self murder (comp. 1Jn 3:15). But aside from this, two statements seem to mark his fate in the other world as distinctly a reprobate one.

(1.) His unmitigated remorse, as expressed in Mat 27:5. This passage has often been appealed to as illustrating the difference between μεταμελεία and μετανοία. It is questionable, however, how far the N. Test. writers recognize that distinction (compare Grotius, ad loc.). Still more questionable is the notion that Matthew describes his disappointment at a result so different from that which he had reckoned on. Yet this is nevertheless clearly an instance of "the sorrow of the world that worketh death" (2Co 7:10). SEE REPENTANCE.

(2.) His "going to his own place" (Act 1:25), where the words ἴδιος τόπος convey to our minds, probably were meant to convey to those who heard them the impression of some dark region in Gehenna. Lightfoot and Gill (ad loc.) quote passages from Rabbinical writers who find that meaning in the phrase, even in Gen 31:55, and Num 24:25. On the other hand, it should be remembered that many interpreters reject that explanation (compare Meyer, ad loc.), and that one great Anglican divine (Hammond, Comment. on N. Test. ad loc.) enters a distinct protest against it. Similarly Dr. Clarke (Commentary, ad loc.) argues against the whole of our conclusions respecting the violent death of Judas; but his reasoning, as well as that of the other critics named, is far from satisfactory.

VIII. Literature. — Special treatises on the character of Judas are the following: Zandt, Comment. de Juda proditore (Lips. 1769); Rau, Anmerk. üb. d. Charakter des. Judas (Lemgo, 1778); Schmidt, Apologie d. Judas, in his Exeget. Beitr. 1, 18; 2, 342; Lechtlen, De culpa Judoe (Argent. 1813); Daub, Judas Ischarioth (Heidelb. 1816); Schollmeyer, Jesus und Judas (Lüneb. 1836); Augusti, Theol. Bibl. 1, 497, 520; Ferenczy, De consilio proditionis Judae (Utr. 1829); Gerling, De Juda sacroe coenoe conviva (Hal. 1744); Hebenstreit, De Juda Iscar. (Viteb. 1712); Philipp, Ueb. d. Verräther Judas (Naumb. 1754); Rütz, D. Verrätherei d. Judas (Haag, 1789); Jour. Sac. Lit. July, 1863. On his death, see Casaubon, Exerc. antibar. 16, p. 527; Alberti, Observat. p. 222; Paulus, Comment. 3, 506; Barbatii Dissert. novissima Judoe Iscar. fata (Regiom. 1665); Götze, De suspendio Judoe (Jen. 1661); Riser, De morte Judoe (Viteb. 1668); Neunhöfer, De Juda lapsu extincto (Chemn. 1740); Oldendorp, De Juda in templo occiso (Hannov. 1754). For other monographs, see Volbeding, Index, p. 32, 54; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 191. SEE JESUS CHRIST.

12. A Jew residing at Damascus in the Straight street at the time of Paul's conversion, to whose house Ananias was sent (Act 11:11). A.D. 30. "The 'Straight Street' may with little question be identified with the 'Street of Bazaars,' a long, wide thoroughfare, penetrating from the southern gate into the heart of the city, which, as in all the Syro-Greek and Syro-Roman towns, it intersects in a straight line. The so called 'House of Judas' is still shown in an open space called 'the Sheykh's Place,' a few steps out of the 'Street of Bazaars:' it contains a square room with a stone floor, partly walled off for a tomb, shown to  Maundrell (Early Trav. Bohn, p. 494) as the 'tomb of Ananias.' The house is an object of religious respect to Mussulmans as well as Christians (Stanley, Syr. and Pal. p. 412; Conybeare and Howson, 1, 102; Pococke, 2, 119)." SEE DAMASCUS.

13. Surnamed BARSABAS, a Christian teacher sent from Jerusalem to Antioch along with Paul and Barnabas (Act 15:22; Act 15:27; Act 15:32). A.D. 47. He is supposed by some (see Grotius, Wolf, ad loc.) to have been one of the seventy disciples, and brother of Joseph, also surnamed Barsabas (son of Sabas), who was proposed, with Matthias, to fill up the place of the traitor Judas (Act 1:23); but others (Augusti, Uebers. d. Kathol. Br. 2, 86) identify him with Judas Thaddeus (but see Bertholdt, 5, 2681). Schott supposes that Barsabas means the son of Sabas, or Zabas, which he fancifully regards as an abridged form for Zebedee, and concludes that the Judas here mentioned was a brother of the elder James and of John. Judas and Silas are mentioned together (in the above deputation of the Church to determine the obligation of the Mosaic law) as "prophets" and "chief men among the brethren" at the metropolis, "perhaps a member of the Presbytery" (Neander, P. and Tr. 1, 123). After employing their prophetical gifts for the confirmation of the Syrian Christians in the faith, Judas went back to Jerusalem, while Silas either remained at Antioch (for the reading Act 15:34 is uncertain; and while some MSS., followed by the Vulgate, add μόνος Ι᾿ούδαςδὲ ἐπορεύθη, the best omit the verse altogether) or speedily returned thither. SEE PAUL.

14. Son of one Jairus, and leader of a company of Jews during the final siege of Jerusalem by the Romans, from which he escaped by an underground passage; he was afterwards slain while leading the defense of the castle of Machaerus against the Roman troops (Josephus, War, 7, 6, 5).

## Judas Light, Or Judas Of The Paschal[[@Headword:Judas Light, Or Judas Of The Paschal]]

             was the name of a wooden imitation of the candle which held the real paschal in the seventh branch standing upright, the rest diverging on either side. See Walcott; Sac. Archoeol. s.v.

## Judd, Bethel, D.D[[@Headword:Judd, Bethel, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Watertown, Connecticut, in the spring of 1776. He graduated from Yale College in 1797, and immediately entered upon his preparation for the ministry; was ordained deacon in 1798, and his ministerial life covered sixty years of activity. At different periods he was engaged in the dioceses of Connecticut, New York, Western New York, Maryland, North Carolina, and Florida, and was one of the early presidents of St. John's College, Annapolis, as well as rector of the Church in that city. Among the missionary stations 'was that of St. Augustine, Fla. During fifteen years he was rector of St. James's Church, New London, Connecticut, a charge which he resigned on being appointed president of the Episcopal Academy, Cheshire. He died at Wilmington, Delaware, April 8, 1858. He was a ripe scholar, and an earnest and effective preacher. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1858, page 342.

## Judd, Gaylord[[@Headword:Judd, Gaylord]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Watertown, Conn., Oct. 7, 1784, and converted in 1805. He was licensed as a local preacher in 1809, and thus labored faithfully for twelve years; entered the Genesee  Conference in 1821; was superannuated in 1841; and died at Candor, Tioga Co., N.Y., in 1859. He was a sound and evangelical preacher, and "had a good report of all men." Many souls were converted by his ministry, and his memory is precious in the Susquehanna Valley, the principal field of his labors. — Minutes of Conferences, 1859, 7, 162.

## Judd, Sylvester[[@Headword:Judd, Sylvester]]

             a Unitarian minister of some note, was born in Westhampton, Mass., July 23, 1813, and was educated at Yale College. He was of Orthodox parentage, but shortly after the completion of his collegiate studies he changed his religious opinions, and went to Cambridge Divinity School to prepare for ministerial duties in the Unitarian Church. He was called to Augusta, Maine, and there spent his life. He died in 1853, "at the very beginning of a course of high usefulness, of a life which seemed essential to the Church." Judd wrote several books having a moral end in view, and as a literary character enjoyed a good reputation for ability. See Life and Character of the Rev. S. Judd (Bost. 1854), p. 531; Christian Examiner, 1855, p. 63 sq.

## Judd, Willard[[@Headword:Judd, Willard]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Southington, Conn., Feb. 23, 1804. After teaching for a short time, he settled in Canaan, N.Y., and was licensed to preach in 1826. He then removed to Herkimer Co., and preached alternately in Salisbury and Oppenheim until Aug. 23, 1828, when he united with the Church in Salisbury. He continued his labors here with great success until 1835, when his health compelled him to abandon the ministry. In 1839 he accepted an appointment as classical teacher in Middlebury Academy, at Wyoming, which situation he held until his death in Feb. 1840. Mr. Judd published A Review of Professor Stuart's Work on Baptism (1836, and later revised and enlarged). A collection of several of his miscellaneous papers, with a brief Memoir of his life, was published after his death. — Sprague, Annals, 6, 750.

## Jude[[@Headword:Jude]]

             or, rather, JUDAS (Ι᾿ούδας, i.q. JUDAH; SEE JUDA ). There were two of this name among the twelve apostles — Judas, called also LEBBAEUS and THADDAEUS (Mat 10:4; Mar 3:18), and Judas Iscariot. Judas is likewise the name of one of our Lord's brethren (Mat 13:55;  Mar 6:3), but it is not agreed whether our Lord's brother is the same with the apostle of this name. Luke (Gospel, 6:16; Act 1:13) calls him Ι᾿ούδας Ι᾿ακώβου, which in the English Auth. Vers. is translated "Judas, the brother of James." This is defended by Winer (Gramm. of N.T. Dict.), Arnaud (Recher. Crit. sur l' Ep. de Jude), and accepted by Burton, Alford, Tregelles, Michaelis, etc. The ellipsis, however, between Ι᾿ούδας and Ιακώβου is supplied by the old Syriac translator (who was unacquainted with the Epistle of Jude, the writer of which calls himself Ι᾿ούδας ἀδελφὸς Ι᾿ακώβου, Jude, Act 1:1), with the word son, and not brother. Among our Lord's brethren are named (along with Judas) James and Joses (Mat 13:55; Mar 6:3). If, with Helvidius among the ancients (see Jerome, Contra Helvidium), and Kuinöl, Neander, and a few other modern commentators, we were to consider our Lord's brethren to be children of Joseph and the Virgin Mary, we should be under the necessity of supposing that there was a James, a Joses, and a Judas who were uterine brothers of our Lord, together with the apostles James and Judas, who were children of Mary, the sister or cousin of the Virgin (see Pearson, On the Creed, art. 4). Otherwise it remains for us to choose the opinion that our Lord's brethren were children of Joseph by a former wife (Escha or Salome, according to an apocryphal tradition), which was the sentiment of the majority of the fathers (still received in the Oriental Church), or the opinion adopted in the Western Church, and first broached by Jerome (Cont. Helvid.), that the brethren of our Lord were his cousins, as being children of Mary, the wife of Cleophas, who must therefore be considered as the same with Alphaeus. If we consider James, the brother of our Lord, to be a different person from James, the son of Alphseus, and not one of the Twelve, Jude, the brother of James, must consequently be placed in the same category; but, if they are one and the same, Jude must be considered as the person who is numbered with our Lord's apostles. The most plausible solution of the whole difficulty is by means of the following hypotheses: Alphoeus, otherwise called Clopas, was the brother of Joseph, the reputed father of Christ, and married Mary (not necessarily a blood relative of the Virgin); dying without issue, he left his wife, thenceforth designated as Mary, the wife (i.e. widow) of Clopas, to his brother Joseph, who had by her several children, namely; James, Judas, Simon, and Joses (and perhaps others, including sisters), the eldest of whom (James) was especially. designated as the son of Alphaeus, as being his heir. (Deu 25:5). The first two of these (being probably older than Jesus) were the James and Judas, or Jude, mentioned among the apostles,  as also the authors of the epistles bearing their respective names, being half brothers of Christ, as the reputed son of the common parent Joseph. SEE ALPHEUS; SEE JAMES; SEE JOSEPH; MARY.

We are not informed as to the time of the vocation of the apostle Jude to that dignity. Indeed, the only circumstance relating to him which is recorded in the Gospels consists in the question put by him to our Lord (Joh 14:22): "Judas saith unto him (not Iscariot), Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself to us, and not unto the world?" Nor have we any account given of his proceedings after our Lord's resurrection, for the traditionary notices which have been preserved of him rest on no very certain foundation (Lardner's History of the Apostles). There may be some truth in the tradition which connects him with the foundation of the church at Edessa; though here again there is much confusion, and doubt is thrown over the account by its connection with the worthless fiction of "Abgarus, king of Edessa" (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 1, 13; Jerome, Comm. in Matthew 10). Nicephorus (Hist. Eccl. 2, 40) makes Jude die a natural death in that city after preaching in Palestine, Syria, and Arabia. The Syrian tradition speaks of his abode at Edessa, but adds that he went thence to Assyria, and was martyred in Phoenicia on his return; while that of the West makes Persia the field of his labors and the scene of his martyrdom. Jude the apostle is commemorated in the Western Church, together with the apostle Simon (the name, also, of one of our Lord's brethren), on the 8th of October. Eusebius gives us an interesting tradition of Hegesippus (Hist. Eccl. 3, 20, 32) that two grandsons of Jude, "who, according to the flesh, was called the Lord's brother" (comp. 1Co 9:5), were seized and carried to Rome by order of Domitian, whose apprehensions had been excited by what he had heard of the mighty power of the kingdom of Christ; but that the emperor having discovered by their answers to his inquiries, and the appearance of their hands, that they were poor men, supporting themselves by their labor, and having learned the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom, dismissed them in contempt, and ceased from his persecution of the Church, whereupon they returned to Palestine, and took a leading place in the churches, "as being at the same time confessors and of the Lord's family" (ώς ¨ν δὴ μάρτυρας ὁμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γένεος ὄντας τοῦ Κυρίου), and lived till the time of Trajan. Nicephorus (1, 23) tells us that Jude's wife was named Mary. For further discussion, see Bertholdt, Einl. 5, 2679; 6, 31, 79; Perionii Vitoe Apostol. p. 166; Assemani. Biblioth. Orient. 3, 2, 13; 1, 302, 611; Bayer, Hist. Osrhoen. et  Edessen. p. 104; Credner, Einl. 1, 611; De Wette, Einl. ins N.T. 1). 340; Harenberg, in Miscell. Lips. nov. 3, 373; Michaelis, Einl. 2, 1489; and the monographs cited by Volbeding, Index, p. 32. On the pretended Gospel of Thaddaeus, see Kleuker, Apokr. N.T. p. 67 sq. SEE LEBBAEUS.

## Jude, Epistle Of[[@Headword:Jude, Epistle Of]]

             The last in order of the catholic epistles.

I. Author. — The writer of this epistle styles himself, 1Co 9:1, "Jude, the brother of James" (ἀδελφὸς Ι᾿ακώβου), and has usually been identified with the apostle Judas Lebbaeus or Thaddeus, called by Luke (Luk 6:16) ἀδελφὸς Ι᾿ακώβου, A.V. "Judas, the brother of James." It has been seen above that this mode of supplying the ellipsis, though not altogether 'in accordance with the usus loquendi, is, nevertheless, quite justifiable, although there are strong reasons for rendering the words "Judas, the son of James." Jerome, Tertullian, and Origen among the ancients, and Calmet, Calvin, Hammond, Hänlein, Lange, Vatablus, Arnaud, and Tregelles among the moderns, agree in assigning the epistle to the apostle. Whether it were the work of an apostle or not, it has from very early times been attributed to "the Lord's brother" of that name (Mat 13:55; Mar 6:3): a view in which Origen, Jerome, and (if indeed the Adumbrationes be rightly assigned to him) Clemens Alexandrinus agree; which is implied in the words of Chrysostom (Hom. 48 in Joan.), confirmed by the epigraph of the Syriac versions, and is accepted by most modern commentators — Arnaud, Bengel, Burton, Hug, Jessien, Olshausen, Tregelles, etc. The objection that has been felt by Neander (P1. and Tr. 1, 392) and others, that if he had been "the Lord's brother" he would have directly styled himself so, and not merely "the brother of James," has been anticipated by the author of the "Adumbrationes (Bunsen, Analect. Ante-Nicoen. 1, 330), who says, "Jude, who wrote the catholic Epistle, brother of the sons of Joseph, an extremely religious man, though he was aware of his relationship to the Lord, did not call himself his brother; but what said he? 'Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ' as his Lord, but 'brother of James.'" We may easily believe that it was through humility, and a true sense of the altered relations between them and him who had been "declared to be the Son of God with power.... by the resurrection from then dead" (comp. 2Co 5:16), that both Jude and James forbore to call themselves the brethren of Jesus. The arguments concerning the authorship of the epistle are ably summed up by Jessien (De Authent.  Ep. Jud. Lips. 1821.) and Arnaud (Recher. Critiq. sur l'Epist. de Jude, Strasb. 1851, transl. in the Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. July 1869); and, though it is by no means clear of difficulty, the most probable conclusion is that the author was Jude, one of the brethren of Jesus, and brother of James, as also the apostle, the son of Alphaeus. SEE BRETHREN OF OUR LORD.

II. Genuineness and Canonicity. — Although the Epistle of Jude is one of the so called Antilegomena, and its canonicity was questioned in the earliest ages of the Church, there never was any doubt of its genuineness among those by whom it was known. It was too unimportant to be a forgery; few portions of holy Scripture could, with reverence be it spoken, have been more easily spared; and the question was never whether it was the work of an impostor, but whether its author was of sufficient weight to warrant its admission into the canon. This question was gradually decided in its favor, and the more widely it was known the more generally it was received as canonical, until it took its place without further dispute as a portion of the volume of holy Scripture. SEE ANTILEGOMENA.

This epistle is not cited by any of the apostolic fathers; the passages which have been adduced as containing allusions to it (Hermas, Past. Vis. 4, 3; Clem. Rom., Ep. ad Corinthians ch. 11; Polycarp, Ep. ad Phil. ch. 3) presenting no certain evidence of being such. It is, however, formally quoted by Clement of Alexandria (Poedag. 3, 239, ed. Sylburg.; Strom. 3, 431), and Eusebius testifies (Hist. Eccles. 6, 14) that he treated it in his Hypotyposes; it is also treated in the Adumbrationes, ascribed to Clement, and preserved in a Latin version. Tertullian refers to the epistle as that of Jude the apostle (De Habit. Mulieb. ch. 3). It appears in the Muratori Fragment among the canonical books. Origen repeatedly refers to it, and occasionally as the work of the apostle Jude (Hom. in Mat 13:55, in Opp., ed. De la Rue, 3, 403; Com. in Ep. ad Rom., in Opp. 4, 519; Hom. in Jos., in Opp. 2, 411; De Princip., in Opp. 1, 138, etc.); though in one place he speaks as if doubts were entertained by some as to its genuineness (in Mat 22:23, in Opp. 3, 814). It is not in the Peshito, and does not appear to have been known to the Syrian churches before the 4th century, near the close of which it is quoted by Ephraem Syrus (Opp. Syr. 1, 136). Eusebius ranks it among the Antilegomena, but this rather because it was not universally known than because where known it was by any regarded with suspicion (Hist. Eccles. 2, 23; 3, 25). By Jerome it is referred to as the work of an apostle (in Titus 1; Ep. ad Paulin. 3), and he states that, though suspected by some, in consequence of containing a quotation from  the apocryphal book of Enoch, it had obtained such authority as to be reckoned part of the canonical Scriptures (Catal. Script. Eccles.). From the 4th century onwards, the place thus conceded to it remained unquestioned (Westcott, Canon of the N. Test.). Thus the epistle is quoted by Malchian, a presbyter of Antioch, in a letter to the bishops of Alexandria and Rome (Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 7, 30), and by Palladius, the friend of Chrysostom (Chrysostom, Opp. 13, Dial. cc, 18, 20), and is contained in the Laodicene (A.D. 363), Carthaginian (397), and so called Apostolic catalogues, as well as in those emanating from the churches of the East and West, with the exception of the Synopsis of Chrysostom, and those of Cassiodorus and Ebed Jesu.

Various reasons might be assigned for delay in receiving this epistle, and the doubts long prevalent respecting it. The uncertainty as to its author, and his standing in the Church; the unimportant nature of its contents, and their almost absolute identity with 2 Peter 2; and the supposed quotation of apocryphal books, would all tend to create a prejudice against it, which could only be overcome by time, and the gradual recognition by the leading churches of its genuineness and canonicity.

At the Reformation the doubts on the canonical authority on this epistle were revived, and have been shared in by modern commentators. They were more or less entertained by Grotius, Luther, Calvin, Bergen, Bolten, Dahl, Michaelis, and the Magdeburg Centuriators. It has been ably defended by Jessien, De Authentia Ep. Judoe, Lips. 1821.

There is nothing, however, in the epistle itself to cast suspicion on its genuineness; on the contrary, it rather impresses one with the conviction that it must have proceeded from the writer whose name it bears. Another, forging a work in his name, would hardly have omitted to make prominent the personality of Judas, and his relation to our Lord, neither of which comes before us in this epistle (Bleek, Einl. in. d. N. Test. p. 557). SEE CANON.

III. Time and Place of Writing. — There are few, if any, external grounds for deciding these points, and the internal evidence is but small.

1. The question of date is connected by many with that of its relation to 2 Peter (see below), and an earlier or later period has been assigned to it according as it has been considered to have been anterior or posterior to that epistle. Attempts have also been made to prove a late date for the  epistle, from an alleged quotation in it from the apocryphal book of Enoch (2Pe 2:13); but it is by no means certain that the passage is a quotation from the now extant book of Enoch, and scholars have yet to settle when the book of Enoch was written; so that from this nothing can be inferred as to the date of this epistle.

From the character of the errors against which it is directed, however, it cannot be placed very early; though I there is no sufficient ground for Schleiermacher's opinion that "in the last time" (ἐν έσχάτῳ χρόνῳ, 2Pe 2:18; comp. 1Jn 2:18, ἐν έσχάτῳ χρόνῳ) forbids our placing it in the apostolic age at all. Lardner places it between A.D. 64 and 66, Davidson before A.D. 70, Credner A.D. 80, Calmet, Estius, Witsius, and Neander, after the death of all the apostles but John, and perhaps after the fall of Jerusalem; although considerable weight is to be given to the argument of De Wette (Einleit. in N.T. p. 300), that if the destruction of Jerusalem had already taken place, some warning would have been drawn from so signal an instance of God's vengeance on the "ungodly." From the allusion, however to the preaching of the apostles, we may infer that it was among the later productions of the apostolic age; for it was written while persons were still alive who had heard apostles preach, but when this preaching was beginning to become a thing of the past (1Jn 2:17). On the other hand, again, if the author were really the brother of Jesus, especially an elder brother, we cannot well suppose him to have lived much beyond the middle of the first century. We may therefore conjecturally place it about A.D. 66.

2. There are still less data from which to determine the place of writing. Burton, however, is of opinion that inasmuch as the descendants of "Judas, the brother of the Lord," if we identify him with the author of the epistle, were found in Palestine, he probably "did not absent himself long from his native country," and that the epistle was published there, since he styles himself "the brother of James," an expression most likely to be used in a country where James was well known" (Eccles. Hist. 1, 334). With this locality will agree all the above considerations as to date.

IV. Persons to whom the Epistle is addressed. — These are described by the writer as the called who are sanctified in God the Father, and kept for Jesus Christ." From the resemblance of some parts of this epistle to the second of Peter, it has been inferred that it was sent to the same parties in Asia Minor, and with a view to enforcing the apostle's admonitions; while others, from the strongly Jewish character of the writing, infer that it was  addressed to somebody of Jewish Christians in Palestine. From the fact that the parties addressed seem to have been surrounded by a large and wicked population, some have supposed that they may have dwelt in Corinth, while others suggest one of the commercial cities of Syria. The supposition that the parties addressed dwelt in Egypt is mere conjecture. But the address (1Jn 2:1) is applicable to Christians generally, and there is nothing in the body of the epistle to limit its reference and though it is not improbable that the author had a particular portion of the Church in view, and that the Christians of Palestine were the immediate objects of his warning, the dangers described were such as the whole Christian world was exposed to, and the adversaries the same which had everywhere to be guarded against.

V. Object, Contents, and Errors inveighed against. — The purpose which the writer had in view is stated by himself. After the inscription, he says that, intending to write "of the common salvation," he found himself, as it were, compelled to utter a solemn warning in defense of the faith, imperiled by the evil conduct of corrupt men (1Jn 2:3). Possibly there was some observed outbreak which gave the occasion. The evil for a while had been working in secret — "certain men crept in unawares" (1Jn 2:4) — but now the canker showed itself. The crisis must be met promptly and resolutely. Therefore the writer denounces those who turned the grace of God "into lasciviousness," virtually denying God by disobeying his law. He alarms by holding out three examples of such sin and its punishment — the Israelites that sinned in the wilderness; the angels that "kept not their first estate;" and the foul cities of Sodom and Gomorrah (1Jn 2:5-7). He next describes minutely the character of those whom he censures, and shows how of old they had been prophetically marked out as objects of deserved vengeance (1Jn 2:8-16). Then, turning to the faithful, he reminds them that the apostles had forewarned them that evil men would rise in the Church (1Jn 2:17-19); exhorts them to maintain their own steadfastness (1Jn 2:20-21), and to do their utmost in rescuing others from contamination (1Jn 2:22-23); and concludes with an ascription of praise to him who alone could keep his people from falling (1Jn 2:24-25). The whole was thoroughly applicable to a time when iniquity was abounding, and the love of many waxing cold (Mat 24:12)..

The design of such a train of thought is obviously to put the believers to whom the epistle was addressed on their guard against the misleading efforts of certain persons to whose influence they were exposed. Who these persons were, or to what class of errorists they belonged, can only be  matter of conjecture. Some, indeed (De Wette, Schwegler, Bleek), think the persons alluded to held no peculiar opinions, and were simply men of lax morals; but, from the manner in which the writer refers to them, it is evident that they were, to use the words of Dorner (Entwickelungsgesch. 1, 104, E.T. 1, 72), "'not merely practically corrupt, but teachers of error as well." Their opinions seem to have been of an antinomian character (vers. 4, 18, 19), but there is nothing to connect them, except in a very vague and distant way, with any of the later gnostic systems. The writer formally charges them with "denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ," language which De Wette admits usually applies to error of doctrine, but which here he, without any reason, would understand of feeling and conduct. The licentious courses in which they indulged led Clement of Alexandria to think that they were the prototypes of the Carpocratians and such like: "Of these, and such as these," he says," I think that Jude spoke prophetically in his epistle" (Strom. 3, 431, Sylb.); but this does not imply that they had formed a system like that of the Carpocratians, but only that the notions and usages of the one adumbrated those of the other. Perhaps there have been in all ages persons who have sought by perverted doctrine to gain a sanction for sensual indulgence. and such undoubtedly were found disturbing the peace and corrupting the purity of the churches of Christ in different places as early as the second half of the 1st century. The persons against whom Jude writes, were apparently of this class, but in their immorality the practical element was more prominent than the speculative.

VI. Style. — The main body of the epistle is well characterized by Alford (Gk. Test. 4, 147) as an impassioned invective, in the impetuous whirlwind of which the writer is harried along, collecting example after example of divine vengeance on the ungodly; heaping epithet upon epithet, and piling image upon image, and, as it were laboring for words and images strong enough to depict the polluted character of the licentious apostates against whom he is warning the Church; returning again and again to the subject, as though all language was insufficient to give an adequate idea of their profligacy, and to express his burning hatred of their perversion of the doctrines of the Gospel.

The epistle is said by De Wette (Einleit. ins. N.T. p. 300) to be tolerably good Greek, though there are some peculiarities of diction which have led Schmid (Einleit. 1, 314) and Bertholdt (6, 3194) to imagine an Aramaic original.  VII. Relation between the Epistle of Jude and 2 Peter. — The larger portion of this epistle (Mat 24:3-16) closely resembles in language and subject a part of the second Epistle of Peter (2Pe 2:1-19). In both the heretical enemies of the Gospel are described in terms so similar as to preclude all idea of entire independence. Jude's known habit of quotation would seem to render the supposition most probable that he has borrowed from Peter. Dr. Davidson, however (Introd. to the N. Test. 3, 607), maintains the priority of Jude. As Jude's Epistle apparently emanated from Palestine, and (if the above date be correct) from Jerusalem, it may in some sort be regarded as an echo of Peter's admonitions uttered not long before at the Roman capital. This question will be more fully examined under SEE PETER, SECOND EPISTLE OF.

VIII. Apocryphal Quotations. — This epistle presents one peculiarity, which, as we learn from Jerome, caused its authority to be impugned in very early times — the supposed citation of apocryphal writings (2Pe 2:9; 2Pe 2:14-15);

1. The former of these passages, containing the reference to the contest of the archangel Michael and the devil "about the body of Moses," was supposed by Origen to have been founded on a Jewish work called the "Assumption of Moses" (Α᾿νάληψις Μωσέως), quoted also by OEcumenius (2, 629). Origen's words are express, "Which little work the apostle Jude has made mention of in his epistle" (De Princip. 2, 2; vol. 1, p. 138); and some have sought to identify the book with the פְּטַירִת משֶׁה"The Demise of Moses," which is, however, proved by Michaelis (4, 382) to be a modern composition. Attempts have also been made by Lardner, Macknight, Vitringa, and others, to interpret the passage in a mystical sense, by reference to Zec 3:1-2; but the similarity is too distant to afford any weight to the idea. There is, on the whole, little question that the writer is here making use of a Jewish tradition, based on Deu 34:6, just as facts unrecorded in Scripture are referred to by Paul (2Ti 3:8; Gal 3:19), by the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 2:2; Heb 11:24); by James (Jam 5:17), and Stephen (Act 7:22-23; Act 7:30). (See further, Zirkel, De Mosis ad Superos translatio, Wirceb. 1798.) SEE MOSES, ASSUMPTION OF.

2. As regards the supposed quotation from the book of Enoch, the question is not so clear whether Jude is making a citation from a work already in the hands of his readers — which is the opinion of Jerome (1.c.)  and Tertullian (who was, in consequence, inclined to receive the book of Enoch as canonical Scripture), and has been held by many modern critics — or is employing a traditionary prophecy not at that time committed to writing (a theory which the words used, "Enoch prophesied, saying," ἐπροφητευσεν... Ε᾿νὼχ λἐγων, seem rather to favor), but afterwards embodied in the apocryphal work already named. This is maintained by Tregelles (Horne's Introd. 10th edit., 4, 621), and has been held by Cave, Hofmann (Schriftbeweis, 1, 420), Lightfoot (2, 117),Witsius, and Calvin (comp. Jerome, Comm. in Jph. c. 5, p. 647, 8; in Tit. c. 1, p. 708). The present book of Enoch actually contains (ch. 2 of The Book of Enoch, in AEthiopic and English, by Dr. Laurence, 3d ed. Lond. 1838) the very words cited by Jude; but some modern critics maintain that they were inserted in that book out of Jude's epistle. SEE ENOCH, BOOK OF.

But why should not an inspired author appropriate a piece of an apocryphal writing? If it contained elements of truth, or was simply apposite to his purpose, why should he not use it? He does not (as some allege) attribute to it any inspired authority, nor ever vouch for its accuracy. It is never objected in derogation of the apostle Paul that, both in speech and writing, he cited heathen authors, sometimes with a special reference (Act 17:28; 1Co 15:33; Gal 5:23; Tit 1:12). It has also been asserted that in various parts of the New Testament there are allusions (if not formal citations) to several of the books commonly called apocryphal, and to other Jewish productions (see Gough's N. Test. Quotations, p. 276-296). Common proverbs, we know, have been introduced into Scripture (1Sa 24:13; 2Pe 2:22, where the former part only of the proverb cited is from the Old Testament).

But there is no decisive proof that Jude could have seen the so called book of Enoch. For, though this has been ascribed in part to the Maccabaean times, and is said to have assumed its present shape prior to our Lord's advent (see Westcott, Introduct. p. 93, note), yet this is a theory on which critics are by no means agreed. One of the latest who has investigated the question, Prof. Volkmar, of Zurich (Zeitschrift der deutsch. morgenl. Gesellschaft, 1860), maintains that it was composed by one of the disciples of Rabbi Akiba, in the time of the sedition of Barchochebas, about A.D. 132. Dr. Alford is convinced by Volkmar's arguments, and infers hence that "the book of Enoch was not only of Jewish, but of distinctly antichristian origin" (Proleg. to Jude, p. 196). We are authorized, then, in believing that Jude merely incorporated into his epistle the tradition of Enoch's prophecy,  which was afterwards embodied in the book as we now have it. SEE TRADITION.

IX. Commentaries. — Special exegetical helps on the whole Epistle of Jude exclusively are the following, of which we designate the most important by an asterisk prefixed: Didymus Alexandrinus, In Ep. Judoe (in Bibl. Max. Patr. 5; and Bibl. Patr. Gallandii, 6); Bede, Expositio (in Opp. 5); Luther, Auslegung (Wittenb. 1524, 4to and 8vo; etc.); Maffe, Explanatio (Ven. 1576, 8vo); Ridley, Exposition (Lond. n. d. 16mo); De Bree, Enarratio (Sagunt. 1582; 4to); Radeus, In Judoe ep. (Antw. 1584, Gen. 1599, 8vo); Danaeus, Commentarius [includ. Ep. John] (Geneva, 1585, 8vo); Feuardent, Commentarius (Colon. 1595, 8vo); Junius, Notoe (Lugd. Bat. 1599, 8vo; also in Opp. 1, 1654); Willet, Commentarius (Lond. 1603, Cambr. 1614, fol.; also Catholicon, in "Harmonie," etc.); Turnbull, Sermons (London, 1606, 4to); Lancelott, Exegesis (Antw. 1613, 1626, 8vo); Boulduc, Commentaria (Paris, 1620, 4to); Pareus, Commentarius. (Francof. 1626, 4to); Rost, Commentarius (Rostock, 1627, 4to); Stumpf, Explicatio (Coburg; 1627, 8vo);. Otes, Sermons (London, 1633, 4to); Gerhard, Adnotationes (Jen. 1641, 1660, 1665, 4to); Du Bois, Explicatio (Paris, 1644, 8vo); Jenkyn, Exposition (Lond. 1652-54, 2 pts. in 1 vol. 4to; Glasgow, 1783; Lond. 1839, 8vo); Calovius, Explicatio (Vitemb. 1654, 1719, 4to) Manton, Lectures (London, 1658, 4to); Broughton, Exposition (Lond. 1662, fol.; also in Works, p. 402); Wandalin, Prodromus (Hafniae, 1663, 4to); Rappolt, Observationes (Lipsiae, 1675, 4to); Grelot. Commentarius (L.B. 1676, 4to); Verryn, Commentarius (L. Bat. 1677, 4to); Visscher, Verklaaring (Amst. 1681, 4to; also in German, Bremen, 1744, 4to); Titelmann [Schenck], Commentarius (Marp. 1693, 8vo); Antonio, Verklaaring [includ. 1 Peter] (Leoward. 1693, 1697, 4to; also in German, Brem. 1700, fol.); Martin, Commentarius (Lipsiae, 1694, 1727, 4to); Fecht, Expositio (Rost. 1696, 4to); Nemeth, Explicatio (1700, 4to); Dorsche, Commentarius (fragment. in Gerhard's Commentatio. Francf. et Lips. 1700 4to) Perkins, Exposition (in Works, Cambridge, 1701, etc. 3, 479); Szattmar, Explicatio (Franec. 1702, 4to); Witsius. Commentarius (L.B. 1703, 4to; also in Meletemata, p. 323); Feustking, Commentarius (Vitemb. 1707, fol.); Quade, In Epistolam et vitam Judoe (Gryph. 1709, 4to); Creyghton, Ontleeding. (Haarlem, 1719, 4to); Weiss, Commentatio (Helmstadt, 1723, 4to); Walther, Exegesis (Guelpherb. 1724, 4to); Buckner, Erklärung (Erfurt, 1727, 4to); Reimmann, Entsiegelung (Brunsw. 1731, 4to); Van Seelen, Judas antifanaticus (Lub. 1732, 4to);  Semler, Commentatio [on var. read.] (Hal. 1747, 1784, 4to); Schmidt, Observationes (Lipsiae, 1768, 4to); Herder, Briefe zweener Brüder Jesu (Lemgo, 1775, 8vo); Pomarius, Commentarius (Vitemb. 1784, 8vo); Hasse, Erläuterung (Jen. 1786, 8vo); Hartmann, Commentatio (Cothen, 1793, 4to); Kahler, Anmerkungen (Rint. 1798, 8vo); \*Hanlein, Commentarius (Erlangen, 1799, 1801, 1804, 8vo); Harenberg, Expositio (in Miscell. Lips. nov. 3, 379 sq.); Elias, Dissertatio (Ultraj. 1803, 8vo); Dahl, De αὐθεντίᾷ, etc. [including 2 Peter] (Rost. 1807, 8vo); Laurmann, Notoe (Gron. 1818, 8vo); \*Jessien, Commentatio. [introductory] (Lipsiae, 1820, 8vo); Muir, Discourses (Glasg. 1822, 8vo); \*Arnaud, Sur l'authenticite, etc. (Strasb. 1835, 8vo); Scharling, Commentarius [includ. Jaines] (Havn. 1841, 8vo); Brun, Introduction (in French, Strasb. 1842, 8vo); Bickersteth, Exposition (London, 1846, 12mo); Macgillivray, Lectures (Lond. 1846. 8vo); \*Stier, Auslegung (Berl. 1850, 8vo); \*Rampf, Betrachtung (Salzburg, 1854, 8vo); Gardiner, Commentary (Boston, 1856, 12mo); Ritschl, Antinomisten, etc. (in the Stud. u. Krit. 1861, p. 103 sq.); Schott, Erläuterung (Erlang. 1863, 8vo). SEE EPISTLES, CATHOLIC.

## Judea[[@Headword:Judea]]

             SEE JUDAEA

## Judeo-Polish Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Judeo-Polish Version Of The Scriptures]]

             SEE RUSSIA, VERSIONS OF (20).

## Judex, Matthaeus[[@Headword:Judex, Matthaeus]]

             a German theologian, and one of the principal writers of the Centuries of Magdeburg (q.v.), was born at Dippoldsforest, in Saxony, September 22, 1528. He was educated at Wittenberg University, where he took his master's degree in Oct. 1549. Shortly after he became minister of the church of St. Ulric, at Magdeburg, and left this position in 1559 to become professor of divinity at the University at Jena; but only eighteen months later he was ousted from the chair by order of the duke of Saxony, on account of his opposition to the Synergists, who were in great favor at court. As a cause for his removal the authorities assigned his publication of De fuga Papatus. He then removed to Magdeburg, but, like the other authors of the Centuries, he had to endure persecution. He was finally obliged to quit Magdeburg, and spent the remainder of his life at Wismar. He died May 15, 1564. See Bayle, Hist. Dict. s.v.

## Judge[[@Headword:Judge]]

             (שׁוֹפֵט, shophet', usu. in the plur.,שׁוֹפְטַי, shophetim', rulers rather than magistrates, from שָׁפִטdifferent from, דַּיןto try a cause, see Gesenius, s.v.; compare Bertholdt's Theolog. Journ. 7, 1; Werner, in Rudelbach's Zeitschr. 1844, 3, 17; Sept., N. Test. Act 13:20, and Josephus, Ant. 6,  5, 4, κριταί; in Dan 3:2-3, a diff. Chald. term is employed,

אֲדִרְגּ זְרַין, adargazerin', chief judges: in two passages, Exo 21:6; Exo 22:8, the Hebrew magistrates are called,אלֵַֹהי, elohim', gods, compare Psa 82:1; Psa 82:6; Joh 10:34; but see Gesenius, s.v.). Besides being the general title of any magistrate, this name is applied to those persons who at intervals presided over the affairs of the Israelites during the four and a half centuries which elapsed from the death of Joshua to the accession of Saul, as recounted in the book of Judges, and as alluded to by the apostle Paul in Act 13:2. These judges were fifteen in number:

1. Othniel; 2. Ehud; 3. Shamgar; 4. Deborah and Barak; 5. Gideon; 6. Abimelech; 7. Tola; 8. Jair; 9. Jephthah; 10. Ibzan; 11. Elon; 12. Abdon; 13. Samson; 14. Eli; 15. Samuel.

For an account of the events of each judgeship, see the judges in their alphabetical place; for a discussion of the length of the entire period, and the adjustment of the different epochs, SEE CHRONOLOGY. The history appears to coincide with a time of mutual collision between the surrounding nations. SEE JUDGES, BOOK OF.

I. Earliest Forms and Characteristics of the Magisterial Office among the Hebrews. — The administration of justice in all early Eastern nations, as among the Arabs of the desert to this day, rests with the patriarchal seniors, the judges being the heads of tribes, or of chief houses in a tribe. (The expression נְשַׂיא בֵּיתאּאָב Num 25:14, is remarkable, and seems to mean the patriarchal senior of a subdivision of the tribe: comp. 1Ch 4:38; Jdg 5:3; Jdg 5:15). Such, from their elevated  position, would have the requisite leisure, would be able to make their decisions respected, and through the wider intercourse of superior station would decide with fuller experience and riper reflection. Thus, in the book of Job (29:7, 8, 9), the patriarchal magnate is represented as going forth "to the gate" amid the respectful silence of elders, princes, and nobles (compare 32:9). The actual chiefs of individual tribes are mentioned on various occasions, one as late as the time of David, as preserving importance in the commonwealth (Num 7:2; Num 7:10-11; Num 17:6, or 17 in Heb. text; 34:18; Jos 22:14; so perh. Num 16:2; Num 21:18). Whether the princes of the tribes mentioned in 1Ch 27:16; 1Ch 28:1, are patriarchal heads, or merely chief men appointed by the king to govern, is not strictly certain; but it would be foreign to all ancient Eastern analogy to suppose that they forfeited the judicial prerogative before they were overshadowed by the monarchy, and in David's time this is contrary to the tenor of history. During the oppression of Egypt the nascent people would necessarily have few questions at law to plead, and the Egyptian magistrate would take cognizance of theft, violence, and other matters of police. Yet the question put to Moses shows that "a prince" and "a judge" were connected even then in the popular idea (Exo 2:14; compare Num 16:13). When the people emerged from this oppression into national existence, the want of a machinery of judicature began to press. The patriarchal seniors did not instantly assume the function, having probably been depressed by bondage till rendered unfit for it, not having become experienced in such matters, nor having secured the confidence of their tribesmen. Perhaps for these reasons Moses at first took the whole burden of judicature upon himself, then at the suggestion of Jethro (Exo 18:14-24) instituted judges over numerically graduated sections of the people. These were chosen for their moral fitness, but from Deu 1:15-16, we may infer that they were taken from among those to whom primogeniture would have assigned it. Save in offenses of public magnitude, criminal cases do not appear to have been distinguished from civil. The duty of teaching the people the knowledge of the law which pertained to the Levites, doubtless included such instruction as would assist the judgment of those who were thus to decide according to it. The Levites were thus the ultimate sources of ordinary jurisprudence, and perhaps the "teaching" aforesaid may merely mean expounding the law as applicable to difficult cases arising in practice. Beyond this it is not possible to indicate any division of the provinces of deciding on points of law as distinct from points of fact. The judges mentioned as standing before  Joshua in the great assemblies of the people must be understood as the successors of those chosen by Moses, and had doubtless been elected with Joshua's sanction from among the same general class of patriarchal seniors (Jos 4:2; Jos 4:4; Jos 22:14; Jos 24:1).

The judge was reckoned a sacred person, and secured even from verbal injuries. Seeking a decision at law is called "inquiring of God" (Exo 18:15). The term "gods" is actually applied to judges (Exo 21:6; compare Psa 82:1; Psa 82:6). The judge was told, "Thou shalt not be afraid of the face of men, for the judgment is God's;" and thus, while human instrumentality was indispensable, the source of justice was upheld as divine, and the purity of its administration only sank with the decline of religious feeling. In this spirit speaks Psalms 82 — a lofty charge addressed to all who judge; compare the qualities regarded as essential at the institution of the office (Exo 18:21), and the strict admonition of Deu 16:18-20. But besides the sacred dignity thus given to the only royal function, which, under the theocracy, lay in human hands, it was made popular by being vested in those who led public feeling, and its importance in the public eye appears from such passages as Psa 69:12 (comp. Psa 119:23); Psalms 82; Psa 148:11; Pro 8:15; Pro 21:4-5; Pro 21:23. There could have been no considerable need for the legal studies and expositions of the Levites during the wanderings in the wilderness, while Moses was alive to solve all questions, and while the law which they were to expound was not wholly delivered. The Levites, too, had a charge of cattle to look after in that wilderness like the rest, and seem to have acted also, being Moses' own tribe, as supports to his executive authority. But then few of the greater entanglements of property could arise before the people were settled in their possession of Canaan. Thus they were disciplined in smaller matters, and under Moses' own eye, for greater ones. When, however, the commandment, "Judges and officers shalt thou make thee in all thy gates" (Deu 16:18), came to be fulfilled in Canaan, there were the following sources from which those officials might be supplied: 1st, the ex- officio judges, or their successors, as chosen by Moses; 2dly, any surplus left of patriarchal seniors when these were taken out (as has been shown from Deu 1:15-16) from that class; and, 3dly, the Levites. On. what principle the non-Levitical judges were chosen after divine superintendence was interrupted at Joshua's death is not clear. A simple way, would have been for the existing judges in every town, etc., to choose their own colleagues, as vacancies fell, from among the limited number of  persons who, being heads of families, were competent. Generally speaking, the reputation for superior wealth, as some guarantee against facilities for corruption, would determine the choice of a judge, and, taken in connection with personal qualities, would tend to limit the choice to probably a very few persons in practice.

The supposition that judicature will always be provided for is carried through all the books of the Law (see Exo 21:6; Exodus 22; Lev 19:15; Num 35:24; Deu 1:16; Deu 16:18; Deu 25:1). All that we know of the facts of later history confirms the supposition. The Hebrews were sensitive as regards the administration of justice; nor is the free spirit of their early commonwealth in anything more manifest than in the resentment which followed the venal or partial judge. The fact that justice reposed on a popular basis of administration largely contributed to keep up this spirit of independence, which is the ultimate check on all perversions of the tribunal. The popular aristocracy (if we may so term it) of heads of tribes, sections of tribes, or families, is found to fall into two main orders of varying nomenclature, and rose from the capite censi, or mere citizens, upward. The more, common name for the higher order is "princes," and for the lower, "elders" (Jdg 8:14; Exo 2:14; Job 29:7-9; Ezr 10:8). These orders were the popular element of judicature. On the other hand, the Levitical body was imbued with a keen sense of allegiance to God as the Author of Law, and to the Covenant as his embodiment of it, and soon gained whatever forensic experience and erudition those simple times could yield; hence they brought to the judicial task the legal acumen and sense of general principles which complemented the ruder lay element. Thus the Hebrews really enjoyed much of the virtue of a system which allots separate provinces to judge and jury, although we cannot trace any such line of separation in their functions, save in so far as has been indicated above. To return to the first or popular branch; there is reason to think, from the second concurrence of phraseology amid much diversity, that in every city these two ranks of "princes" and' "elders" had their analogies, and that a variable number of heads of families and groups of families, in two ranks, were popularly recognized, whether with or without any form of election, as charged with the duty of administering justice. Succoth (Jdg 8:14) may be taken as an example. Evidently the ex-officio judges of Moses' choice would have left their successors when the tribe of Gad, to which Succoth pertained (Jos 13:27), settled in its territory and towns: and what would be more simple than that the whole number of judges in that tribe should be allotted to its towns in  proportion to their size? As such judges were mostly the head men by genealogy, they would fall into their natural places, and symmetry would be preserved. The Levites also were apportioned, on the whole, equally among the tribes; and if they preserved their limits, there were probably few parts of Palestine beyond a day's journey from a Levitical city.

One great hold which the priesthood had, in their jurisdiction, upon men's ordinary life was the custody in the sanctuary of the standard weights and measures, to which, in cases of dispute, reference was doubtless made. It is, however, reasonable to suppose that in most towns sufficiently exact models of them for all ordinary questions would be kept, since to refer to the sanctuary at Shiloh, Jerusalem, etc., in every case of dispute between dealers would be nugatory (Exo 30:13; Num 3:47 Eze 45:12). Above all these, the high priest in the ante-regal period was the resort in difficult cases (Deu 17:12), as the chief jurist of the nation, and one who would, in case of need, be perhaps oracularly directed; yet we hear of none acting as judge save Eli, nor is any judicial act recorded of him though perhaps his not restraining his sons is meant to be noticed as a failure in his, judicial duties. Now the judicial authority of any such supreme tribunal must have wholly lapsed at the time of the events recorded in Judges 19. It should not be forgotten that in some cases of "blood" the "congregation" themselves were to "judge" (Num 35:24), and that the appeal of Jdg 20:4-7 was thus in the regular course of constitutional law. It is also a fact of some weight, negatively, that none of the special deliverers called judges was of priestly lineage, or even became as much noted as Deborah, a woman. This seems to show that any central action of the high priest on national unity was null, and of this supremacy, had it existed in force, the judicial prerogative was the main element. Difficult cases would include cases of appeal, and we may presume that, save so far as the authority of those special deliverers made itself felt, there was no judge in the last resort from Joshua to Samuel. Indeed, the current' phrase of those deliverers that they "judged" Israel during their term, shows which branch of their authority was most in request, and the demand of the people for a king was, in the first instance, that he might "judge them," rather than that he might "fight their battles" (1Sa 8:5; 1Sa 8:20).

II. Peculiar Traits and Functions of the "Judges" in the Period designated by their Rule. — The station and office of these shophetim are involved in great obscurity, partly from the want of clear intimations in the  history in which their exploits and government are recorded, and partly from the absence of parallels in the history of other nations by which our notions might be assisted. The offices filled by Moses and Joshua, whose presence was so essential for the time and the occasion, were not at all involved in the general machinery of the Hebrew government. They were specially appointed for particular services, for the performance of which they were invested with extraordinary powers; but when their mission was accomplished, society reverted to its permanent institutions and its established forms of government. As above seen, every tribe had its own hereditary chief or "prince," who presided over its affairs, administered justice in all ordinary cases, and led the troops in time of war. His station resembled that of the Arabian emirs, or rather, perhaps, of the khans of the Tartar tribes inhabiting Persia and the countries further east. He was assisted in these important duties by the subordinate officers, the chiefs of families, who formed his council in such matters of policy as affected their particular district, supported his decisions in civil or criminal inquiries, and commanded under him in the field of battle (Numbers 26; Numbers 27; Jos 7:16-18). This was, in fact, the old patriarchal government, to which the Hebrews were greatly attached. It was an institution suited to the wants of men who live dispersed in loosely connected tribes, and not to the wants and exigencies of a nation. It was in principle segregative, not aggregative and although there are traces of united agreement through a congress of delegates, or rather of national chiefs and elders of the tribes, this was an inefficient instrument of general government, seeing that it was only applicable or applied to great occasions, and could have no bearing on the numerous questions of an administrative nature which arise from day to. day in every state, and which there should somewhere exist the power to arrange and determine. This defect of the general government it was one of the objects of the theocratical institutions to remedy. Jehovah had taken upon himself the function of king of the chosen people, and he dwelt among them 11 his palace tabernacle. Here he was always ready, through his priest, to counsel them in matters of general interest, as well as in those having reference only to particular tribes; and to his court they were all required by the law to repair three times every year. Here, then, was the principle of a general administration, calculated and designed to unite the tribes into a nation by giving them a common government in all the higher and more general branches of administration, and a common center of interest for all the political and ecclesiastical relations of the community. It was on this footing that the law destined the government of the Hebrews to  proceed, after the peculiar functions of the legislator and the conqueror had been fulfilled. SEE THEOCRACY.

The fact is, however, that, through the perversity of the people, this settlement of the general government on theocratical principles was not carried out in its proper form and extent. and it is in this neglect we are to seek the necessity for those officers called judges who were from time to time raised up to correct some of the evils which resulted from it. It is very evident from the whole history of the judges that, after the death of Joshua, the Israelites threw themselves back upon the segregative principles of their government by tribes, and all but utterly neglected and for a long period did utterly neglect, the rules and usages on which the general government was established. There was, in fact, no human power adequate to enforce them. They were good in themselves, they were gracious, they conferred high privileges, but they were enforced by no sufficient authority. No one was amenable to any tribunal for neglecting the annual feasts, or for not referring the direction of public affairs to the divine King. Omissions on these points involved the absence of the divine protection and blessing, and were left to be punished by their consequences. The man who obeyed in this and' other things was blessed; the man who did not was not blessed; and general obedience was rewarded with national blessing, and general disobedience with national punishment. The enormities and transgressions into which the people fell in consequence of such neglect, which left them an easy prey to idolatrous influences, are fully recorded in the Book of Judges. The people could not grasp the idea of a divine and invisible king; they could not bring themselves to recur to him in all those cases in which the judgment of a human king would have determined the course of action, or in which his arm would have worked for their deliverance. Therefore it was that God allowed them judges — in the persons of faithful men, who acted for the most part as agents of the divine will — regents of the invisible King, and who, holding their commission directly from him or with his sanction, would be more inclined to act as dependent vassals of Jehovah than kings, who, as members of royal dynasties, would come to reign with notions of independent rights and royal privileges; which would draw away their attention from their true place in the theocracy. In this greater dependence of the judges upon the divine King we see the secret of their institution. The Israelites were disposed to rest upon their separate interests as tribes, and, having thus allowed the standing general government to remain inoperative through  disuse, they would, in case of emergency, have been disposed "to make themselves a king like the nations" had their attention not been directed to the appointment of officers whose authority. could rest on no tangible right apart from character and services, which, with the temporary nature of their power, rendered their functions more accordant with the principles of the theocracy than those of any other public officers could be. It is probably in this adaptation to the peculiar circumstances of the Hebrew theocracy that we shall discover the reason of our inability to find any similar office among other nations. In being thus peculiar it resembled the dictatorship among the Romans, to which office, indeed, that of the judges has been compared, and perhaps this parallel is the nearest that can be found. But there is this great difference. that the dictator laid down his power as soon as the crisis which had called for its exercise had passed away, and in no case could this unwonted supremacy be retained beyond a limited time (Livy, 9, 34); but the Hebrew judge remained invested with his high authority the whole period of his life, and is therefore usually described by the sacred historian as presiding to the end of his days over the tribes of Israel, amid the peace and security which his military skill and counsels had, under the divine blessing, restored to the land.

It is usual to consider the judges as commencing their career with military exploits to deliver Israel from foreign oppression, but this is by no means invariably the case. Eli and Samuel were not military men, Deborah judged Israel before she planned the war against Jabin; and of Jair, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, it is at least uncertain whether they ever held any military command. In many cases it is true that military achievements were — the means by which they elevated themselves to the rank of judges; but in general the appointment may be said to have varied with the exigencies of the times, and with the particular circumstances which in times of trouble would draw the public attention to persons who appeared suited by their gifts and influence to advise in matters of general concernment, to decide in questions arising between tribe and tribe, to administer public affairs, and to appear as their recognized head in their intercourse with their neighbors and oppressors. As we find that many of these judges arose during times of oppression, it seems to us that this last circumstance, which has never been taken into account, must have had a remarkable influence in the appointment of the judge. Foreigners could not be expected to enter into the peculiarities of the Hebrew constitution, and would expect to receive the proposals, remonstrances, or complaints of the people through some  person representing the whole nation, or that part of it to which their intercourse applied. The law provided no such officer except in the high priest; but as the Hebrews themselves did not recognize the true operation of their theocracy, much less were strangers likely to do so. On the officer they appointed to represent the body. of the people, under circumstances which compelled them to deal with foreigners mightier than themselves, would naturally devolve the command of the army in war, and the administration of justice in peace. This last was among. ancient nations, and it is still in the East, regarded as the first and most important duty of a ruler, and the interference of the judges was probably confined to the cases arising between different tribes, for which the ordinary magistrates would find it difficult to secure due authority to their decisions.

In nearly all the instances recorded the appointment seems to have been by the free, unsolicited choice of the people. The election of Jephthah, who was nominated as the fittest man for the existing emergency, probably resembled that which was usually followed on such occasions; and probably, as in his case, the judge; in accepting the office, took care to make such stipulations as he deemed necessary. The only cases of direct divine appointment are those of Gideon and Samson, and the last stood in the peculiar position of having been from before his birth ordained "to begin to deliver: Israel." Deborah was called to deliver Israel, but was already a judge. Samuel was called by the Lord to be a prophet, but not a judge, which ensued from the high gifts which the people recognized as dwelling in him; and as to Eli, the office of judge seems to have devolved naturally, or, rather, ex-officio, upon him; and his case seems to be the only one in which the high priest appears in the character which the theocratical institutions designed for him.

The following clear summary of their duties and privileges is from Jahn (Bibl. Archäol. 2, 1, § 22 sq.; Heb. Commonwealth, Stowe's transl., § 23): "The office of judges or regents was held during life, but it was not hereditary, neither could they appoint their successors. Their authority was limited by the law alone; and in doubtful cases they were directed to consult the divine King through the priest by Urim and Thummim (Num 27:21). They were not obliged in common cases to ask advice of the ordinary rulers; it was sufficient if these did not remonstrate against the measures of the judge. In important emergencies, however, they convoked a general assembly of the rulers, over which they presided and exercised a powerful influence. They could issue orders, but not enact  laws; they could neither levy taxes nor appoint officers, except perhaps in the army. Their authority extended only over those tribes by whom they had been elected or acknowledged; for it is clear that several of the judges presided over separate tribes. There was no income attached to their office, nor was there any income appropriated to them, unless it might be a larger share in the spoils, and those presents which were, made them as testimonials of respect (Jdg 8:24). They bore no external marks of dignity, and maintained no retinue of courtiers, though some of them were very opulent. They were not only simple in their manners, moderate in their desires, and free from avarice and ambition. but noble and magnanimous men, who felt that whatever they did for their country was above all reward, and could not be recompensed; who desired merely to promote the public good, and who chose rather to deserve well of their country than to be enriched by its wealth. This exalted patriotism, like everything else connected with politics in the theocratical state of the Hebrews; was partly of a religious character, and these regents always conducted themselves as the officers of God; in all their enterprises they relied upon him, and their only care was that their countrymen should acknowledge the authority of Jehovah, their invisible king (Jdg 8:22 sq.; compare Hebrews 11). Still they were not without faults, neither are they so represented by their historians; they relate, on the contrary, with the utmost frankness, the great sins of which some of them were guilty. They were not merely deliverers of the state from a foreign yoke, but destroyers of idolatry, foes of pagan vices, promoters of the knowledge of God, of religion, and of morality; restorers of theocracy in the minds of the Hebrews, and powerful instruments of divine Providence in the promotion of the great design of preserving the Hebrew constitution, and by that means of rescuing the true religion from destruction.... By comparing the periods during which the Hebrews were oppressed by their enemies with those in which they were independent and governed by their own constitution, it is apparent that the nation in general experienced much more prosperity than adversity in the time of the judges. Their dominion continued four hundred and fifty years; but the whole time of foreign oppression amounts only to one hundred and eleven years, scarcely a fourth part of that period. Even during these one hundred and eleven years the whole nation was seldom under the yoke at the same time, but, for the most part, separate tribes only were held in servitude; nor were their oppressions always very severe; and all the calamities terminated in the advantage and glory of the people as soon as they abolished idolatry and returned to their king, Jehovah. Neither was the  nation in such a state of anarchy at this time as has generally been supposed. There were regular judicial tribunals at which justice could be obtained, and when there was no supreme regent, the public welfare was provided for by the ordinary rulers" (Rth 4:1-11; Jdg 8:22; Jdg 10:17-18; Jdg 11:1-11; 1Sa 4:1; 1Sa 7:1-2).

See generally Buddei Hist. V.T. 1, 939 sq.; Zeltner, De adolescentia reip. Israel. (Altorf, 1696); Bauer, Heb. Gesch. 2, 34 sq.; Hess, Gesch. Josua's u. d. Heerführer (Zur. 1779), 2; Paulus, Theol.-exeget. Conservator. 2, 180 sq.; Döring, Das Zeitalter der Richter (Freiburg, 1833); Ewald. Isr. Gesch. 2, 362 sq.; Stanley, Hist. of Jewish Church, lect. 13.

III. The Judicial Office in later Periods among the Hebrews. — The magisterial functions of the priesthood being, it may be presumed, in abeyance during the period of the judges, seem to have merged in the monarchy. The kingdom of Saul suffered too severely from external foes to allow civil matters much prominence. Hence of his only two recorded judicial acts, the one (1Sa 11:13) was the mere remission of a penalty. popularly demanded; the other the pronouncing of a sentence (1Sa 14:44-45),which, if it was sincerely intended, was overruled in turn by the right sense of the people. In David's reign it was evidently the rule for the king to hear causes in person, and not merely be passively, or even by deputy (though this. might also be included), the "fountain of justice" to his people. For this purpose, perhaps, it was prospectively ordained that the king should "write him a copy of the law," and "read therein all the days of his life" (Deu 17:18-19). The same class of cases which were reserved for Moses would probably fall to his lot, and the high priest. was, of course, ready to assist the monarch. This is further presumable from the fact that no officer analogous to a chief justice ever appears under the kings. It has been supposed that the subjection of all Israel to David's sway caused an influx of such cases, and that advantage was artfully taken of this by Absalom (2Sa 15:1-4); but the rate at which cases were disposed of can hardly have been slower among the ten tribes after David had become their king, than it was during the previous anarchy. It is more probable that during David's uniformly successful wars wealth and population increased rapidly, and civil cases multiplied faster than the king, occupied with war, could attend to them, especially when the summary process customary in the East is considered. Perhaps the arrangements mentioned in 1Ch 23:4; 1Ch 26:29. (compare 5:32, "rulers" probably including judges), of the 6000 Levites  acting as "officers and judges," and amongst them specially "Chenaniah and his sons," with others, for the trans-Jordanic tribes, may have been made to meet the need of suitors. In Solomon's character, whose reign of peace would surely be fertile in civil questions, the "wisdom to judge" was the fitting first quality (1Ki 3:9; comp. Psa 72:1-4). As a judge Solomon shines "in all his glory" (1Ki 3:16, etc.).

No criminal was too powerful for his justice, as some had been for his father's (2Sa 3:39, 1Ki 2:5-6; 1Ki 2:33-34). The examples of direct royal exercise of judicial authority are 2Sa 1:15; 2Sa 4:9-12, where sentence is summarily executed, and the supposed case of 2Sa 14:1-21. The denunciation of 2Sa 12:5-6, though not formally judicial, is yet in the same spirit. Solomon similarly proceeded in the cases of Joab and Shimei (1Ki 2:34; 1Ki 2:46; compare 2Ki 14:5-6). It is likely that royalty in Israel was ultimately unfavorable to the local independence connected with the judicature of the "princes" and "elders" in the territory and cities of each tribe. The tendency of the monarchy was doubtless to centralize, and we read of large numbers of king's officers appointed to this and cognate duties (1Ch 23:4; 1Ch 26:29-32). If the general machinery of justice had been, as is reasonable to think, deranged or retarded during a period of anarchy, the Levites afforded the fittest materials for its reconstitution. Being to some extent detached, both locally, and by special duties, exemptions, etc., from the mass of the population, they were, more easily brought to the steady routine which justice requires, and, what is no less important, were, in case of neglect of duty, more at the mercy of the king (as shown in the case of the priests at Nob, 1Sa 22:17). Hence it is probable that the Levites generally superseded the local elders in the administration of justice. But subsequently, when the Levites withdrew from the kingdom of the ten tribes, judicial elders probably again filled the gap. Thus they conducted the mock trial of Naboth (1Ki 21:8-13). There is in 2Ch 19:5, etc., a special notice of a reappointment of judges by Jehoshaphat, and of a distinct court, of appeal, perhaps, at Jerusalem, composed of Levitical and of lay elements. In the same place (as; also in a previous one, 1Ch 26:32) occurs a mention of "the king's matters" as a branch of jurisprudence.

The rights of the prerogative having a constant tendency to encroach, and needing continual regulation, these may have grown probably into a department somewhat like the English Exchequer.  One more change is noticeable in the pre-Babylonian period. The "princes" constantly appear as a powerful political body, increasing in influence and privileges, and having a fixed center of action at Jerusalem, till, in the reign of Zedekiah, they seem to exercise some of the duties of a privy council, and especially a collective jurisdiction. (2Ch 28:21; Jer 26:10; Jer 26:16). These "princes" are probably the heads of great houses in Judah and Benjamin, whose fathers had once been the pillars of local jurisdiction, but who, through the attractions of a court, and probably also under the constant alarm of hostile invasion, became gradually residents in the capital, and formed an oligarchy which drew to itself, amidst the growing weakness of the latter monarchy, whatever vigor was left in the state, and encroached on the sovereign attribute of justice. The employment in offices of trust and emolument would tend also in the same way, and such chief families would probably monopolize such employment. Hence the constant burden of the prophetic strain, denouncing the neglect, the perversion, the corruption of judicial functionaries (Isa 1:17; Isa 1:21; Isa 5:7; Isa 10:2; Isa 28:7; Isa 56:1; Isa 59:4; Jer 2:8; Jer 5:1; Jer 7:5; Jer 21:12; Eze 22:27; Eze 45:8-9; Hos 5:10; Hos 7:5; Hos 7:7; Amo 5:7; Amo 5:15; Amo 5:24; Amo 6:12; Hab 1:4, etc.). Still, although far changed from its broad and simple basis in the earlier periods the administration of justice had little resembling the set and rigid system of the Sanhedrim of later times. This last change arose from the fact that the patriarchal seniority, degenerate and corrupted as it became before the, captivity, was by that event broken up, and anew basis of judicature had to be sought for. SEE SANHEDRIM.

4. Judicial Customs. — With regard to the forms of procedure, little. more is known than may be gathered from the two examples, Rth 4:2, of a civil, and 1Ki 21:8-14, of a criminal character; to which, as a specimen of royal summary jurisdiction, may be added the well known "judgment" of Solomon. Boaz apparently empanels, as it were, the first ten "elders" whom he meets " in the gate," the well known site of the Oriental court, and cites the other party by "Ho, such a one;" and the people appear to be invoked as attesting the legality of the proceeding. The whole affair bears an extemporaneous aspect, which may, however, be merely the result of the terseness of the narrative. In Job 9:19, we have a wish expressed that a "time to plead" might be "set" (comp. the phrase of Roman law, diem dicere). In the case of the involuntary homicide seeking the city of refuge, he was to make out his case to the satisfaction of its elders (Jos 20:4), and this failing, or the congregation deciding against his  claim to sanctuary there (though how its sense was to be taken does not appear), he was not put to death by act of public justice, but left to the "avenger of blood" (Deu 19:12). The expressions between "blood and blood;" between "plea and plea" (Deu 17:8), indicate a presumption of legal intricacy arising, the latter expression seeming to imply something like what we call a "cross suit." We may infer from the scantiness, or, rather, almost entire absence of direction as regards forms of procedure, that the legislator was content to leave them to be provided for as the necessity for them arose, it being impossible by any jurisprudential devices to anticipate chicane. It is an interesting question how far judges were allowed to receive fees of suitors; Michaelis reasonably presumes that none were allowed or customary, and it seems, from the words of 1Sa 12:3, that such transactions would have been regarded as corrupt. There is another question how far advocates were usual. There is no reason to think that, until the period of Greek influence, when we meet with words based on συνήγορος and παράκλητος, any professed class of pleaders existed. Yet passages abound in which the pleading of the cause of those who are unable to plead their own is spoken of as, what it indeed was, a noble act of charity; and the expression has even (which shows the popularity of the practice) become a basis of figurative allusion (Job 16:21; Pro 22:23; Pro 23:11; Pro 31:9; Isa 1:17; Jer 30:13; Jer 51:36). The blessedness of such acts is forcibly dwelt upon, Job 29:12-13.

There is no mention of any distinctive dress or badge as pertaining to the judicial officer. A staff or scepter was the common badge of a ruler or prince, and this they probably bore (Isa 14:5; Amo 1:5; Amo 1:8). They would, doubtless, be more than usually careful to comply with the regulations about dress laid down in Num 15:38-39; Deu 22:12. The use of the "white asses" (Jdg 5:10) by those who "sit in judgment" was perhaps a convenient distinctive mark for them when journeying where they would not usually be personally known.

For other matters relating to some of the processes of law, SEE OATH; SEE OFFICER; SEE TRIAL; SEE WITNESS, etc.

## Judges, Book Of[[@Headword:Judges, Book Of]]

             the third in the list of the historical compositions of the O.T. (counting the Pentateuch as one), or the seventh of the separate books. Its close  connection with the book of Joshua is an important element in the controversial criticism of both.

I. Title and Order. — In the original Hebrew, as well as in all the translations, this book bears the name of Judges (שׁוֹפְטַים, Sept. Κριταί, Vulgate liber Judicum), and this name has obviously been given to it because chiefly relating the transactions connected with the deliverance and government of Israel by the men who bear this title in the Hebrew polity. The period of history contained in this book, however, reaches from Joshua to Eli, and is thus more extensive than the time of the judges. A considerable portion of it also makes no mention of them, though belonging to their time. The Book of Ruth was originally a part of this book, but about the middle of the 5th century after Christ it was placed in the Hebrew copies immediately after the Song of Solomon. In the Sept. it has preserved its original position, but as a separate book. The chronological relation of these books corresponds with the order in which they are arranged, namely, after the Book of Joshua. See below, § 6.

II. Contents. — The book may most properly be divided into three parts, the middle one of which alone is in strictly chronological order.

1. The Introduction (Jdg 1:1 to Jdg 3:6), containing preliminary information on certain points requisite to be known, or else general statements which give a key to the course of the history properly so called, and to the writer's mode of presenting it. The first chapter is chiefly geographical, containing a statement of what the several tribes had done or failed to do the second chapter, together with the opening verses of the third, are predominantly moral and reflective; or, otherwise the first gives the political relations of Israel to the Canaanites, and the second gives the religious relation of Israel to the Lord. This part may therefore be subdivided into two sections, as follows:

a. Jdg 1:1 to Jdg 2:5, which may be considered as a first introduction, giving a summary of the results of the war carried on against the Canaanites by the several tribes on the west of Jordan after Joshua's death, and forming a continuation of Joshua 12. It is placed first, as in the most natural position. It tells us that the people did not obey the command to expel the people of the land, and contains the reproof of them by a prophet.

b. Jdg 2:6 to Jdg 3:6. This is a second introduction, standing in nearer relation to the following history. It informs us that the people fell into  idolatry after the death of Joshua and his generation, and that they were punished for it by being unable to drive out the remnant of the inhabitants of the land, and by falling under the hand of oppressors. A parenthesis occurs (Jdg 2:16-19) of the highest importance, as giving a key to the following portion. It is a summary view of the history: the people fall into idolatry; they are then oppressed by a foreign power; upon their repentance they are delivered by a judge, after whose death they relapse into idolatry..

2. Body of the History (Jdg 3:7 -chap. 16). The words "And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord," which had already been used in Jdg 2:11, are employed to introduce the history of the thirteen judges comprised in this book. An account of six of these thirteen is given at greater or less length. The account of the remaining seven is very short, and merely attached to the longer narratives. These narratives are as follows:

(1) The deliverance of Israel by Othniel, Judges 3 L7-11.

(2) The history of Ehud and (in 31) that of Shamgar, Jdg 3:12-31.

(3) The deliverance by Deborah and Barak, ch. 4-5.

(4) The whole passage in 6-10:5. The history of Gideon and his son Abimelech is contained in chap. 1-9, and followed by the notice of Tola (Jdg 10:1-2) and Jair (Jdg 10:3; Jdg 10:5). This is the only case in which the history of a judge is continued by that of his children. But the exception is one which illustrates the lesson taught by the whole book. Gideon's sin in making the ephod is punished by the destruction of his family by Abimelech, with the help of the men of Shechem, who, in their turn, become the instruments of each other's punishment. In addition to this, the short reign of Abimelech would seem to be recorded as being an unauthorized anticipation of the kingly government of later times.

(5) Jdg 10:6 -ch. 12. The history of Jephthah (10:6-12:7), to which is added the mention of Ibzan (12, 8-10), Elon (11, 12), Abdon (13-15).

(6) The history of Samson, consisting of twelve exploits, and forming three groups connected with his love of three Philistine women, Judges 13-16. We may observe in general on this portion of the book that it is almost entirely a history of the wars of deliverance: there are no sacerdotal allusions in it; the tribe of Judah is not alluded to after the time of Othniel;  and the greater part of the judges belong to the northern half of the kingdom.

A closer inspection, however, discloses a more interior, and therefore truer arrangement of this, the main part of the book, and one better calculated to bring out the theocratic government of God, which, as we have seen in the preceding article; was the cardinal idea of the office known as that of "the Judges." Moses had been commissioned by the Angel of the Covenant, who went before the people in all their marches (Exo 3:1-6; Exo 13:21; Exo 14:19, etc.), and to fit him for his office Moses was filled with the Spirit of the Lord, which was given to him in a measure apparently not given to any mere man after him. But the Spirit; which was communicated in a certain degree to men for various tasks in connection with the Church and people, was especially communicated from Moses, in whom the fullness resided (fullness such as was possible under the Old Testament dispensation), to the seventy elders who assisted him in the administration, and to Joshua, who was called to be his successor (Num 11:17; Num 11:25; Num 27:16; Num 27:18; Num 27:20). Agreeably to this the true grouping of the events in the time of the judges must be looked for in connection with the coming forth of the Angel of the Covenant, and the corresponding mission of the Spirit of the Lord into the hearts of his instruments. (No arguing is needed to establish thee erroneousness of our translation, "an angel of the Lord" [2:1; 6:11]; "an angel of God" [13:6, 9, 13]. The only possible rendering is, "the Angel of the Lord," "the Angel of God;" and this is amply confirmed by the attributes of Godhead which appear in the narratives.) Yet, while we notice these epochs of special manifestation, we must remember that God was always present with his people, at the head of their government, and working in a more ordinary manner in calling out agents for preserving and recovering the visible Church and holy nation. Besides, there was the standing method of consulting him by Urim and Thummim, through the high priest; and there was his way of extraordinarily addressing the people by prophets; of both of these there are recorded instances in this book, although the prophetical agency is rare and feeble till the time of Samuel (1Sa 3:1; 1Sa 3:19-21), with whom the succession of prophets began (Act 3:24).

Now the appearance of the Angel of the Lord. and the mission of the Spirit in a special manner is four times noticed in the body of the history, and nowhere else, except in the poetical allusion in Jdg 5:23.

(1.) The Angel of Jehovah went up from Gilgal to Bochim, and reproached the people for neglecting his work of redemption; threatening to help them no more; yet in. reality, by the utterance of this threat, suggesting that his free grace would help them, as in fact they immediately gained a victory over their own sinful selves (Jdg 2:15). The outward victory over oppressors was soon gained by Othniel (Jdg 3:10) when "the Spirit of the Lord came," literally was, "upon him, and he judged Israel, and went out to war."

(2.) The Angel of the Lord came and gave a mission to Gideon to deliver Israel (Jdg 6:11, etc.), and to fit him for it (Jdg 6:34), "the Spirit of the Lord came upon," literally clothed, "Gideon, and he blew the trumpet."

(3.) A passage (Jdg 10:10-16) is so similar to the account of the Angel at Bochim that we do not know how to avoid the impression that it is the Angel himself who speaks in that immediate manner which is peculiar to this book; certainly there is no, hint of any prophet in the case, and a message like this from the Urim and Thummim is nowhere on record in Scripture. The closing words that, after having refused to "save" them (not merely "deliver," as in our version) on the repentance of the people, "his soul was grieved for the misery of Israel," suggest the same interpretation, in the light of the commentary (Isa 63:8-9): "So he said, Surely they are my people, children that will not lie; so he was their Savior. In all their affliction he was afflicted, and the Angel of his Presence saved them." Upon this, Jephthah was called to lead the people; and as on the two earlier occasions (Jdg 11:29), "The Spirit of the Lord came," literally was, "upon Jephthah."

(4.) The Angel of the Lord appeared to the parents of Samson, announcing the birth of their son, who was to begin to "deliver," or rather "save,"' Israel (Jdg 13:3-23). This, occurs with the usual correspondence (Jdg 13:24-25), "The child grew, and the Lord blessed him; and the Spirit of the Lord, began to move him at times;" while of him alone, as one peculiarly chosen by the Lord and given to him from his birth, it is said repeatedly afterwards, that "the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him."

This arrangement suggests the four periods of history noted in the table given below (§ 9). The appearance of the angel of the Lord and the mission of the Spirit, however, belong not to the very commencement of the period, but rather to the continuance or close of a term of sin and disgrace.  Perhaps in Gideon and Jephthah's cases the appearance of the angel and the mission of the Spirit were almost contemporaneous; but in the first case and in the last there must have been some distance of time between them, not now ascertainable, but possibly amounting to several years, and determined in each case by the particulars of the crisis which demanded these manifestations.

3. An Appendix (Judges 17-21). This part has no formal connection with the preceding, and has often, but unnecessarily, been assumed to have been added by a later hand. No mention of the judges occurs in it. It contains allusions to "the house of God," the ark, and the high priest. The period to which the narrative relates is simply marked by the expression "when there was no king in Israel" (Jdg 19:1; comp. 18:1). It records two series of incidents:

a. The conquest of Laish by a portion of the tribe of Dan, and the establishment there of the idolatrous worship of Jehovah already instituted by Micah in Mount Ephraim (Judges 17, 18). The date of this occurrence is not marked, but it has been thought to be subsequent to the time of Deborah, as her song contains no allusion to any northern settlements of the tribe of Dan.

b. The almost total extinction of the tribe of Benjamin by the whole people of Israel, in consequence of their supporting the cause of the wicked men of Gibeah, and the means afterwards adopted for preventing its becoming complete (ch. 19-20. The date is in some degree marked by the mention of Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron (Jdg 20:28), and by the proof of the unanimity still prevailing among the people.

III. Design. — The above analysis clearly indicates a unity of plan on the part of the writer. His leading object he distinctly intimates in Jdg 2:11-23, namely, in enforcement of the central idea of the theocracy, to prove that the calamities to which the Hebrews had been exposed since the death of Joshua were owing to their apostasy from Jehovah, and to their idolatry. "They forsook the Lord, and served Baal. and Ashtaroth" (Jdg 2:13), for which crimes they were deservedly punished and greatly distressed (Jdg 2:15). Nevertheless, when they repented and obeyed again the commandments of the Lord, he delivered them out of the hand of their enemies by the shophetim whom he raised up, and made them prosper (Jdg 2:16-23). To illustrate this theme, the author collected  the most important elements of the Hebrew history during the period between Joshua and Eli. Some episodes occur, but in arguing his subject he never loses sight of his leading theme, to which, on the contrary, he frequently recurs while stating facts, and shows how it applied to them; the moral evidently being, that the only way to happiness was to shun idolatry and obey the commandments of the Lord. The appendix further illustrates the lawlessness and anarchy prevailing in Israel after Joshua's death.

Yet the words of the passage in which the author thus discloses his main object must not be pressed too closely, as if implying a perfect remedy of each political ruin. It is a general view, to which the facts of the history correspond in different degrees. Thus the people is contemplated as a whole; the judges are spoken of with the reverence due to God's instruments, and the deliverances appear complete. But it would seem that the people were in no instance under exactly the same circumstances, and the judges in some points fall short of the ideal. Thus Gideon, who in some respects is the most eminent of them, is only the head of his own tribe, and has to appease the men of Ephraim by conciliatory language in the moment of victory over the Midianites; and he himself is the means of leading away the people from the pure worship of God. In Jephthah we find the chief of the land of Gilead still affected to some extent by personal reasons (Jdg 11:9): his war against the Ammonites is confined to the east side of Jordan, though its issues probably also freed the western side from their presence, and it is followed by a bloody conflict with Ephraim. Again, Samson's task was simply "to begin to deliver Israel" (Jdg 13:5): and the occasions which called forth his hostility to the Philistines are of a kind which place him on a different level from Deborah or Gideon. This shows that the passage in question is a general review of the collective history of Israel during the time of the judges, the details of which, in their varying aspects, are given. faithfully as the narrative proceeds.

This view of the author's design may lead us to expect that we have not a complete history of the times a fact which is clear from the book itself. We have only accounts of parts of the nation at any one time. We may easily suppose that there were other incidents of a similar nature to those recorded in ch. 17-21. Indeed, in the history itself there are points. which are obscure from want of fuller information, e.g. the reason for the silence about the tribe of Judah (see also Jdg 8:18; Jdg 9:26). Some suppose even that the number of the judges is not complete, but there is no reason for this opinion. Bedan (1Sa 12:11) is probably the same as  Abdon. Ewald (Gesch. 2, 477) rejects the common explanation that the word is a contracted form of Ben-Dan, i.e. Samson. Jael (Jdg 5:6) need not be the name of an unknown judge, or a corruption of Jair, as Ewald thinks, but is probably the wife of Heber. "The days of Jael" would carry the misery of Israel up to the time of the victory over Sisera, and such an expression could hardly be thought too great an honor at that time (1sa see 5:24). Had the writer designed to give a full and connected history of the Hebrews in the period between Joshua and the kings, he would doubtless have described the state of the domestic affairs and of the government in the several tribes, the relation in which they stood to each other, and the extent of power exercised by a judge, with other particulars such as do not appear in the narrative.

IV. Sources of the Materials. — Parts of the work are undoubtedly taken from ancient records and genealogies, others from traditions and oral information. From ancient authentic documents are probably copied the song of Deborah (Judges 5), the beautiful parable of Jotham 9:8-15), and the. beginning of Samson's epinician, or triumphal poem (Jdg 15:16). See also chap. 14:14, 18; 15:7. In their genealogies the Hebrews usually inserted also some historical accounts, and from this source may have been derived the narrative of the circumstances that preceded the conception of Samson, which were given as the parents related them to others (Judges 42). These genealogies were sometimes further illustrated by tradition, and several incidents in the history of Samson appear to have been derived from this kind of information. But on many points tradition offered nothing, or the author rejected its information as not genuine, and unworthy of belief. Thus it is that of Tola, Jair, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, the author gives only the number of years that they governed and the number of their children, but relates none of their transactions (Jdg 10:1-5; Jdg 12:8-9; Jdg 12:11; Jdg 12:13). In some instances the very words of the ancient documents which the author used seem to have been preserved, and this proves the care with which he composed. Thus, in the first division of our book, but nowhere else, rich and powerful men are described as men riding on ass-colts (Jdg 10:4; Jdg 12:14, etc.); also in the song of Deborah (Jdg 5:9-10). In the appendix also of this book, but nowhere else, a priest has the honorary title of father given him (Jdg 17:10; Jdg 18:19). But, though the author sometimes retained the words of his sources, still the whole of the composition is written in a particular style, distinguishing it from all other books of the Old Testament.  The idea of the Israelites being overcome by their enemies he expresses often in this way: "The anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and he sold them into the hands of their enemies" (Jdg 2:14; Jdg 3:8; Jdg 4:2; Jdg 10:7). A courageous and valiant warrior is described as a person upon whom rests the spirit of Jehovah, or as a person whom the spirit of Jehovah clothed (Jdg 6:34; Jdg 9:29; Jdg 14:6; Jdg 14:19; Jdg 15:14, etc.).

Stähelin (Krit. Untersuch. p. 106) thinks that 3:7-16: present the same manner and diction throughout, and that there is no need to suppose written sources. So Hävernick (Einleitung, 1, 1, p. 68 sq., 107) only recognizes the use of documents in the appendix. Other critics, however, trace them throughout. Bertheau (On Jud qes, p. 28-32) says that the difference of the diction in the principal narratives, coupled with the fact that they are united in one plan, points to the incorporation of parts of previous histories. Thus, according to him, the author found the substance of 4:2-24 already accompanying the song of Deborah; in ch. 6-9 two distinct authorities are used a life of Gideon, and a history of Shechem and its usurper; in the account of Jephthah a history of the tribes on the east of Jordan is employed, which meets us again in different parts of the Pentateuch and Joshua; and the history of Samson is taken from a longer work on the Philistine wars. Ewald's view is similar (Gesch. 1, 184 sq.; 2, 486 sq.).

V. Unity. — This has already been pretty fully vindicated in the above remarks on the design of the writer (§ 3). The attacks that have been made upon the unity of the book are rested on very trifling grounds. The chief one is the existence of the appendix, though it is not difficult to see the two great reasons for this part of the book assuming such a form: the one, that the historical development according to plan was not to be interrupted; the other, that the two events which it narrates are to be looked on less as single events than as permanent influences. The permanence of the worship at Dan is expressly mentioned (Jdg 18:30-31), and "the captivity of the land" for the twenty years before Samuel assumed office is traced to it with tolerable distinctness. The permanence of the moral evil which came out at Gibeah is not so plainly intimated; on the contrary, it might have been. supposed to be eradicated by the vengeance taken on Benjamin. Yet the evil to be found in the whole tribes is indicated by their share in the terrible chastisement; and there is a hint of the continuance of some equally potent mischievous influence in the similar slaughter of the tribe of Ephraim by Jephthah. The prophet Hosea in so many words informs us that  the days of Gibeah never ceased in Israel, and that the root of the evil had not been taken away (Hos 9:9; Hos 10:9). There have been, indeed, some very unsuccessful efforts to establish a difference of the words in use and the style of composition in the appendix and in the body of the book, but there has been little appearance of success in the undertaking. Even these objectors have frequently admitted a resemblance and unity between the appendix and the introduction, on account of which some of them have gone so far as to say that both these may belong to a later editor, who prefixed and annexed his new materials to a previously existing work, the history of the judges strictly so called. The argument from internal chronological data will be examined below (§ 7). The attempts to discover contradictions in the book, with a view to show a plurality of authors, have also signally failed.

VI. Relation to other Books of Scripture. — This is somewhat connected with the topics discussed under the preceding and following heads. The coincidences with the two adjoining Biblical books, however, are so striking as to call for a distinct notice.

1. Relation to the Book of Joshua. — Joshua 15-21 must be compared with Judges 1 in order to understand fully how far the several tribes failed in expelling the people of Canaan. Nothing is said in chap. 1 about the tribes on the east of Jordan, which had already been mentioned (Jos 13:13), nor about Levi (see Jos 13:33; Jos 21:1-42). The carrying on of the war by the tribes singly is explained by Jos 24:28. The book begins with a reference to Joshua's death, and 2:6-9 resumes the narrative, suspended by 1-2:5, with the same words as are used in concluding the history of Joshua (24:28-31). In addition to this, the following passages appear to be common to the two books: Jdg 1:10-15; Jdg 1:20-21; Jdg 1:27; Jdg 1:29, compared with Jos 15:14-19; Jos 15:13; Jos 15:63; Jos 17:12; Jos 16:10. A reference to the conquest of Laish (Judges 18) occurs in Jos 19:47.

2. Relation to the Books of Samuel and Kings. — We find in Jdg 1:28; Jdg 1:30; Jdg 1:33; Jdg 1:35, a number of towns upon which, "when Israel was strong," a tribute of bond service was levied: this is supposed by some to refer to the time of Solomon (1Ki 9:13-22). The conduct of Saul towards the Kenites (1Sa 15:6), and that of David (l Samuel 30:29), is explained by 1:16. A reference to the continuance of the Philistine wars is implied in Jdg 13:5. The allusion to Abimelech (2Sa 11:21)  is explained by ch. 9. Chapters 17-21 and the book of Ruth are more independent, but they have a general reference to the subsequent history.

3. The question now arises whether this book forms one link in a historical series, or whether it has a closer connection either with those that precede or follow it. We cannot infer anything from the agreement of its view and spirit with those of the other books. The object of the writer was to give an account only of the "Judges" proper. Hence the history ceases with Samson, excluding Eli and Samuel; and then at this point two historical pieces are added — ch. 17-21 and the book of Ruth, supplemental to the general plan — and to each other. This is less well explained by Ewald's supposition that the books from Judges to 2 Kings form one work. In this case the histories of Eli and Samuel, so closely united between themselves, are only deferred on account of their close connection with the rise of the monarchy. Judges 17-21 is inserted both as an illustration of the sin of Israel during the time of the judges, in which respect it agrees with ch. 1- 16, and as presenting a contrast with the better order prevailing in the time of the kings. Ruth follows next, as touching on the time of the judges, and containing information about David's family history which does not occur elsewhere. The connection of these books, however, is denied by De Wette (Einleit. § 186) and Thenius (Kurzgef. Exeg. Handb. Samuel p. 15, König, p. 1). Bertheau, on the other hand, thinks that one editor may be traced from Genesis to 2 Kings, whom he believes to be Ezra, in agreement with Jewish tradition.

VII. Authorship and Date. — The only guide to the time when the book was written is the expression "unto this day," which we frequently find in it (Jdg 2:6-16 :), and the last occurrence of which (Jdg 15:19) implies some distance from the time of Samson. But Jdg 1:21, according to the most natural explanation, would indicate a date, for this chapter at least, previous to the taking of Jebus by David (2Sa 5:6-9). Again, we should at first sight suppose Jdg 1:28; Jdg 1:30; Jdg 1:33; Jdg 1:35, to belong to the time of the judges; but these passages are taken by many modern critics as pointing to the time of Solomon (comp. 1Ki 9:21). The first portion of the book (chap. 1-16) was originally, as Ewald thinks (Gesch. 1, 202), the commencement of a larger work reaching down to above a century after Solomon (see also Davidson, Introduction, p. 649), but this is equally gratuitous. The author of the second division always describes the period of which he speaks thus: "In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own  eyes" (Jdg 17:6; Jdg 18:1; Jdg 19:1; Jdg 21:25); but this expression never once occurs in the first division. Hence many modern critics conclude that the author of the first sixteen chapters of our book was different from him who composed the appendix (see Bertholdt, Historischkritische Einleitung in die sämmtlichen Schriften des A. und N.T. p. 876; Eichhorn's Einleitung in das A. Test. 3, § 457; S. Davidson, in Horne's Introd., new ed., 2, 648; but Keil the contrary, Einleit. p. 182). The authorship of the first sixteen chapters has been assigned to Joshua, Samuel, and Ezra. That they were not written by Joshua appears from the difference of the method of relating subjects, as well as from the difference of the style. In the book of Joshua there is a continual reference to the law of Moses, which is much less frequent in the book of Judges; and in Joshua, again, there are no such inferences from history as are common in Judges (Jdg 3:1; Jdg 3:4; Jdg 8:27; Jdg 9:56).

The style of the book of Joshua is neater than that of Judges; the narration is more clear and the arrangement is better (compare Jdg 1:10-11; Jdg 1:20, with Jos 14:6-15, and Jdg 15:13-19; also Jdg 2:7-10, with Jos 24:29-31). That the book of Judges was composed by Samuel, although an invention of the Talmudists, unsupported by any external evidence, is nevertheless the most plausible authorship that has been assigned to it, at least so far as relates to the first division. The opinion that this portion was written by Ezra will not be entertained by any one who attentively peruses the original; for it has a phraseology of its own, and certain favorite ideas, to which it constantly reverts, but of which there is not a trace in Ezra. If Ezra had intended to continue the history of the Hebrews from Joshua down to Eli in a separate work, he would not have given a selection of incidents to prove, a particular theme, but a complete history. The orthography of the book of Ezra, with many phrases characteristic of his age, do not appear in the book of Judges. The prefix שׁ occurs, indeed (Jdg 5:7; Jdg 6:17; Jdg 7:12; Jdg 8:26); but this cannot be referred to in proof that the language is of the time of Ezra, for it belonged to the dialect of North Palestine, as Ewald and others have proved. Other verbal peculiarities may be explained in a similar manner (see Ottmar, in Henke's Magazin, vol. 4; De Wette, Lehrbuch der Einleitung in die Bibel, Berlin, 1833-39). The first sixteen chapters must have been written under Saul, whom the Israelites made their king in the hope of improving their condition. Phrases used in the period of the judges may be traced in them, and the author must consequently have lived near the time when they were yet current. He says that in his time "the Jebusites dwelt with then children of Benjamin in Jerusalem" (Jdg 1:21): now  this was the case only before David, who conquered the town and drove out the Jebusites. Consequently, the author of the first division of the book of Judges must have lived and written before David, and yet he was acquainted with a regal form of government, which can only point to the reign of Saul. If he had lived under David, he would have mentioned the capture of Jerusalem by that monarch, as the nature of his subject did not allow him to pass it over in silence. The omission, moreover, of the history not only of Samuel, but also of Eli, indicates an author who, living in an age very near that of Eli, considered his history as generally known, because so recent.

The exact date of the appendix is more difficult to determine, but its author certainly lived in an age considerably later than that of the recorded events. That in his time the period of the events which he relates had been long forgotten is, however, hardly a fair inference from the frequent chronological formula, "In those days there was no king in Israel" (Jdg 17:6); and it is gratuitous to suppose that certain particulars of his narrative could no longer be ascertained, and that this caused him to omit the name of the Levite whose history is given in ch. 19. In his time, indeed, the house of God was no longer in Shiloh (Jdg 18:31); and it will be recollected that it was David who brought the ark to Jerusalem. But it must be borne in mind that it had frequently changed places during the Philistine war, and it remained a long time away from Shiloh even after Eli's death. The author knew that the posterity of Jonathan were priests of the graven image in Dan, or Laish, "until the day of the captivity of the land" (Jdg 18:30). This latter circumstance has been assumed by Le Clerc and others to prove that the appendix was not published until after the Babylonian captivity, or at least until after that of Israel by Shalmaneser and Esar-haddon. It cannot be understood of the domination of the Philistines over the Israelites, which would very improperly be called "the captivity of the land," this expression always implying the deportation of the inhabitants of a country.

But we may reasonably suppose that this expression was added by a later editor. The circumstance that the author, in mentioning Shiloh, adds, "which is in the land of Canaan" (Jdg 21:12), and that the topographical description of the site of Shiloh is given (Jdg 21:19), has led some interpreters to assert that the author of the appendix must have been a foreigner, as to an Israelite such remarks would have appeared trivial (see Briefe einiger Hollandischen Gottesgelehrten über R. Simon's kritische Geschichte des A.T., edited by Le Clerc at  Zurich, p. 490). The inference is certainly specious, but, from an examination of the contexts, it appears that in the first passage Shiloh is opposed to Jabesh in Gilead, a town without the land of Canaan, and that this led the author to add to Shiloh that it was in Canaan; while the second passage describes, not the site of Shiloh, but of a place in its neighborhood, where an annual feast was celebrated, when the daughters of Shiloh came out to dance, to sing, and to play on instruments of music; the author thus heightening the interest of his narrative by giving a clearer idea of the circumstances of the festival. Neither of these passages, therefore, authorizes the inference that he was a foreigner. Under these circumstances, many have been content to conjecture that the latter portion of the book was compiled perhaps by Ezra, out of historical documents originating with the various prophetical characters that appeared from time to time during the earlier period of the Hebrew commonwealth, chiefly perhaps Samuel. But if the above reasoning is correct, especially that relating to the unity of the entire book, we do not see why Samuel himself may not have added the appendix, substantially in its present form, to the former part of the history.

VIII. Canonicity and Credibility. — The book was published at a time when the events related were generally known, and when the veracity of the author could be ascertained by a reference to the original documents. Several of its narratives are confirmed by the books of Samuel (comp. Jdg 4:2; Jdg 6:14; with 1Sa 12:9-12; Jdg 9:53 with 2Sa 11:21). The Psalms not only allude to the book of Judges (compare Psa 83:11 with Jdg 7:25), but copy from it entire verses (compare Psa 58:8-9; Psa 97:5, with Jdg 5:4-5). Philo and Josephus knew the book, and made use of it in their own compositions. The New Testament alludes to it in several places (comp. Mat 2:13-23 with Jdg 13:5; Jdg 16:17; Act 13:20; Heb 11:32).

This external evidence in support of the authority of the book of Judges is corroborated by many internal proofs of its authenticity. All its narratives are in character with the age to which they belong, and agree with the natural order of things. We find here that shortly after the death of Joshua the Hebrew nation had, by several victories, gained courage and become valorous (ch. 1 and 19), but that it afterwards turned to agriculture, preferred a quiet life, and allowed the Canaanites to reside in its territory in consideration of a tribute imposed on them, when the original plan was that they should be expelled. This changed their character entirely: they became  effeminate and indolent a result which we find in the case of all nations who, from a nomadic and warlike life, turn to agriculture. The intercourse with their heathen neighbors frequently led the uncultivated Hebrews into idolatry; and this, again, further prepared them for servitude. They were consequently overpowered and oppressed by their heathen neighbors. The first subjugation, indeed, by a king of Mesopotamia, they endured but eight years; but the second, more severe, by Eglon, lasted longer: it was the natural consequence of the public spirit having gradually more and more declined, and of Eglon having removed his residence to Jericho with a view to closely watching all their movements (Josephus, Ant. 5, 5). When Ehud sounded the trumpet of revolt, the whole nation no longer rose in arms, but only the inhabitants of Mount Ephraim (Jdg 3:27); and when Barak called to arms against Sisera, many tribes remained quietly with their herds (Jdg 5:14-15; Jdg 5:26; Jdg 5:28). Of the 30,000 men who offered to follow Gideon, he could make use of no more than 300, this small number only being, as it would seem, filled with true patriotism and courage. Thus the people had sunk gradually, and deserved for forty years to bear the yoke of the Philistines, to whom they had the meanness to deliver Samson, who, however, loosed the cords with which he was tied, and killed a large number of them (Judges 15). It is impossible to consider such a historical work, which perfectly agrees with the natural course of things, as a fiction: at that early period of authorship, no author could, from fancy, have depicted the character of the Hebrews so conformably with nature and established facts. All in this book breathes the spirit of the ancient world. Martial law we find in it, as could not but be expected, hard and wild. The conquered people are subjected to rough treatment, as is the case in the wars of all uncivilized people; the inhabitants of cities are destroyed wholesale (Jdg 8:16-17; Judges 20). Hospitality and the protection of strangers received as guests is considered the highest virtue: a father will rather resign his daughter than allow violence to be done to a stranger who stops in his house for the night (ch. 19; comp. Genesis 19).

In the state of oppression in which the Hebrews often found themselves during the period from Joshua to Eli; it was to be expected that men, filled with heroism; should now and then rise up and call the people to arms in order to deliver them from their enemies. Such valiant men are introduced by our author, and he extols them, indeed, highly; but, on the other hand, he is not silent respecting their faults, as may be seen in the instances of Ehud, whom he reports to have murdered a king to recover liberty for his  country (Jdg 3:16 sq.); of Gideon, who is recorded to have punished the inhabitants of Succoth and Penuel cruelly for having refused bread to his weary troops (Jdg 8:16-17); and of Jephthah, whose inconsiderate vow deprives him of his only daughter (Jdg 11:34). This cannot be a fiction; it is no panegyric on Israel to describe them in the manner the author has done. Now this frank, impartial tone pervades the whole work. It begins with displaying the Israelites as a refractory and obstinate people, and the appendix ends with the statement of a crime committed by the Benjamites, which had the most disastrous consequences. At the same time, due praise is bestowed on acts of generosity and justice, and valiant feats are carefully recorded.

But are not the exploits of its heroes exaggerated in our book, like those of Sesostris, Semiramis, and Hercules? Their deeds are, no doubt, often splendid; but they do not surpass belief, provided we do not add to the narrative anything which the original text does not sanction, nor give to particular words and phrases a meaning which does not belong to them. Thus, when we read that "Shamgar slew of the Philistines 600 men" (3:31), it would perhaps have been correct if the Hebrew וִיִּך ְhad been rendered by "put to flight;" and it should further be recollected that Shamgar is not stated to have been alone and unassisted in repelling the enemy: he did it, no doubt, supported by those brave men whose leader he was. It frequently happens that to the leader is attributed what has been performed by his followers. Nor can it offend when, in the passage quoted above, it is said that Shamgar repelled the Philistines with an ox goad; for this was exactly the weapon which an uncultivated Oriental warrior, who had been brought up to husbandry, would choose in preference to other instruments of offense. From the description which travelers give of it, it appears to have been well suited to such a purpose. SEE GOAD. It is chiefly the prodigious strength of Samson, however, which to very many readers seems exaggerated, and surpassing all belief. He is, e.g., reported to have, unarmed, slain a lion (Jdg 14:5-6); to have caught 300 jackals (שׁוּעָלַים), bound their tails to one another, put a firebrand between two tails, and let them go into the standing corn of the Philistines, which was thus burned up (Jdg 15:4-5; Jdg 15:8); to have broken, with perfect ease, the new cords, with which his arms were bound, etc. (Jdg 15:14; Jdg 16:7-9; Jdg 16:11). Now there is in these and other recorded feats of Samson nothing which ought to create difficulty, for history affords many instances of men of extraordinary strength, of whom Goliath among the Philistines is  not the least remarkable; and for others we refer to T. Ludolf, Historia, AEthiopitoe 1, 10; to the Acta Dei per Francos, 1, 75, 314; and to Schillinger, Missionsbericht, 4, 79. Lions were also slain by other persons unarmed, as by David (1Sa 17:36) and Benaiah (2Sa 23:20). It were easy to show that, when properly understood, his other exploits do not necessarily exceed the limits of human power. Extraordinary indeed they were, but, even if regarded as not alleged by the Scripture itself to have been supernatural, they are far from fabulous. Considering the very remote period at which our book was written — considering also the manner of viewing and describing events and persons which prevailed with the ancient Hebrews, and which very much differs from that of our age — taking, moreover, into account the brevity of the narratives, which consist of historical fragments; we may well wonder that there do not occur in it more difficulties, and that not more doubts have been raised as to its historical authority (see Herder, Geist der Hebraischen Poesie, 2, 250, 59; Eichhorn, Repertorium der Biblischen und Morgenländischen Literatur, 8, 78). For a further elucidation of the above and other difficulties, see the several subjects in their alphabetical places.

IX. Chronological Difficulties. — The time commonly assigned to the period contained in this book is 299 years. But this number is not derived directly from it. The length of the interval between Joshua's death and the invasion of Chushan-rishathaim, and of the time during which Shamgar was judge, is not stated. The dates which are given amount to 410 years when reckoned consecutively; and Act 13:20 would show that this was the computation commonly adopted, as the 450 years seem to result from adding 40 years for Eli to the 410 of this book. But a difficulty is created by 11:26, and in a still greater degree by 1Ki 6:1, where the whole period from the exodus to the building of the Temple is stated at 480 years (Septuag. 440). One solution questions the genuineness of the date in 1 Kings. Kennicott pronounces against it (Diss. Genesis 80, § 3) because it is omitted by Origen when quoting the rest of the verse. It is also urged that Josephus would not have reckoned 592 years for the same period if the present reading had existed in his time. But it is defended by Thenius (ad loc.), and is generally adopted, partly on account of its agreement with Egyptian chronology. Most of the systems therefore shorten the time of the judges by reckoning the dates as inclusive or contemporary. But all these combinations are arbitrary. The same may be said of Keil's scheme, which is one of those least open to objection. He reckons the dates successively  as far as Jair, but makes Jephthah and the three following judges contemporary with the 40 years of the Philistine oppression (comp. 10:6- 13:1) and by compressing the period between the division of the land and Chushan-rishathaim into 10 years; and the Philistine wars to the death of Saul into 39, he arrives ultimately at the 480 years. Ewald and Bertheau have proposed ingenious but unsatisfactory explanations — differing in details, but both built upon the supposition that the whole period from the exodus to Solomon was divided into 12 generations of 40 years; and that, for the period of the judges, this system has become blended with the dates of another more precise reckoning.

But the whole theory of the parallel or contemporaneous rule of two or more judges, upon which all these shortenings of the period in question proceed, is purely arbitrary. There is nothing in the book of Judges to warrant the supposition that the national unity was completely broken up, so that there ever were two independent judges ruling different parts of Israel: such a schism first appeared, in the days of Ishbosheth and Jeroboam, and then our attention is strongly called to it. The Ammonitish oppression is distinctly stated to have extended far beyond the eastern tribes, into Judah, and Benjamin, and Ephraim, all being included in that "Israel which they oppressed." Nor is there anything in the history which suggests the restriction of Jephthah's jurisdiction to the east of Jordan. On the contrary, Mizpeh of Gilead (Jdg 11:29) seems to be distinguished from Mizpeh simply so called, where he took up his house (Jdg 11:34), where he uttered all his words before the Lord (Jdg 11:11), and where the children of Israel had assembled themselves together and encamped (Jdg 10:17); and it will be difficult to assign a reason for thinking that this was not the Mizpeh in Benjamin, where at Other times the people of the Lord were used to meet in those days (Jdg 20:1; 1Sa 7:5-6; 1Sa 10:17). Jephthah successors, whose rule must also be made contemporary with the Philistine oppression during 40 years, had no special connection whatever with the eastern tribes. Ibzan belonged to Bethlehem, and was buried there; Elon stood in the same relation to the tribe of Zebulon, and Abdon to Pirathon in the land of Ephraim. So far as we know, these are fair specimens of the connections which the judges had with the different localities of the land of Israel, and there is no ground for restricting the rule of one of them more than that of another to a part of the land. We are pretty sure that this was not the case with Deborah and Barak, nor with Gideon, nor, certainly, with Samuel; why imagine it with  any of the rest? What time could be suggested less likely for such a revolution in the constitution of Israel than the close of 55 years of peaceful government under two successive judges, in whose administration there was so little to record for the instruction of posterity? Or, if there had been a threatening of such disintegration of the commonwealth, would it not be prevented by the nomination of the high priest Eli to the office of judge? Yet that other supposition of Eli's last 20 years falling under the first 20 of the Philistines compels us to suppose that his first 20 were contemporaneous with Jair's government, down to whose death Keil admits that there is no trace of division: hence he is driven to the desperate resource of denying that Eli was a judge at all, except in the sense in which every high priest might be called by this name. But, had Eli been only a judge during the Philistine servitude, we should expect this to be stated; as in Samson's case. Neither is it easily credible that four judges, Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, should rule the eastern tribes in uninterrupted succession, without attempting to drive out the Philistines, and support Samson in his marvelous struggle.

In order to weaken the force of Paul's statement in Act 13:20, which confirms the consecutiveness of the judgeships, recourse has been had to a various reading of that passage, by which it may be rendered, "When he had destroyed seven nations in the land of Canaan, he divided their land to them by lot in about 450 years, and after that he gave them judges until Samuel the prophet." This reading has the support of our four oldest manuscripts.(Alexandrian, Vatican, Ephraem palimpsest, and Sinaitic), and of the Vulgate, and it has been adopted by Lachmann, Tregelles, and others, but not by Tischendorf (7th ed.), Alford, or Meyer. But the various readings of the passage are in such a form as suggests that there had been tampering with the text by the scribes, plainly for the very reason that they felt the chronological difficulty; and no one would have altered the text into the present form, for which there is the authority of the versions generally, and of the fathers who quote it, so as to create a difficulty for themselves. The sense, too, is very unsatisfactory, the 450 years being then understood to run from the birth of Isaac to the division of the land, a computation for which no reason can be given, aid which ill agrees with the other statements of time in the context, where there is surely a chronological sequence. It would certainly conflict with the 430 years assigned to the sojourn in Egypt (Exo 12:41), a period computed, as Gal 3:17 shows, from the call of Abraham, when he was seventy-  five years old (Gen 12:4), to the Exode (comp. Gen 15:16). Keil, indeed, makes the inconsistency even worse for himself by reckoning these 430 years from Jacob's descent into Egypt. SEE CHRONOLOGY, vol. 2, p. 302.

We are compelled, therefore, to understand the periods of oppression and judgeship as immediately successive, and then, arranging them in four periods, as suggested in § 2 above, we may tabulate the whole of the middle part of the history as on the following page.

X. Commentaries. — The following are the special exegetical helps on the whole book of Judges, alone, the most important of Which we designate by an asterisk prefixed: Origen, Selecta (in Opp. 2, 457; also in Bibl. Patr. Gallandii, 14); Ephraem Syrus, Explanatio (in Opp. 4, 308); Theodoret, Quoestiones (in Opp. 1, 1); Isidorus Hispalensis, Commentaria (in Opp. 1); Bede, Quoestiones (in Opp. p. 8); Rupertus Tuitiensis, In Jud. (in Opp. 1, 331); Irimpertus, Commentarii (in Pez. Thesaur. 4, 1, 127); Rabbi Tanchum, Commentarii (from the Arabic, by Schnurrer, Tubing. 1791, 8vo; by Haarbrucher, Hal. 1842, 8vo); Bafiolas, פֵּרוּשׁ [including Joshua, etc.] (Leira, 1494, folio; also in the Rabbinical Bibles, etc.) Bucer, Commentarius (Paris, 1554, 1563, fol.); Borrhäus [Cellarius], Conmmentarius [includ. Joshua, etc.] (Basil. 1557, folio): Lavater. Homilioe (Tigur. 1561, 1571, 1582, 1609 fol.) Ferus. Enarrationes [including Exodus, etc.] (Colon. 1572 1574 8vo); Strigel, Scholia (Lipsiae, 1575, 1586, 8vo); Chytraeus, Commentarius (Francof. 1589, 8vo) Peter Martyr, Commentarius (Tigur. 1561, Lond. 1565, 1576, 1582, Heidelb. 1590, folio); Montanus, Commentarius (Antw. 1592, 4to); Heling, Periocha (Norib. 1593, 1594, 8vo); Alscheich, מִרְאוֹת, etc. [includ. Joshua, etc.] (Venice, 1601, 1620; Prague, 1620; Offenb. 1719, fol.); Felibien, Commentarii [includ. Joshua, etc.] (Paris, 1604, 4to); Ibn-Chajim, לֵב אִהֲדֹן [includ. Joshua] (Ven. 1609, fol.; also in Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible); Serarius, Explanatio [includ. Ruth] (Mogunt. 1609, folio); Rogers, Lectures (Lond. 1615, fol.); Drusius, Commentarius [includ. Joshua, etc.] (Franec. 1618, 4to); Magalianus, Explanationes (Lugd. 1626, folio); Bonfrere, Commentarius [includ. Joshua, etc.] (Paris, 1631, 1659, folio); Villaroel, Commentarii (Madr. 1636, fol.); Freyre, Commentarii (Olyssip. and Mach. 1642, 4to); Jackson, Commentary [includ. Ruth, etc.]. (Cambr.  1646, 2 vols. 4to); De Vega, Commentarii (Lugd. 1663 sq., 3 vols. fol.); De Naxera, Commentarii (Lugd. 1664, 3 vols. fol.); \*Osiander, Commentarius (Tub. 1682, fol.); \*S. Schmidt, Commentarius (Argent. 1684, 1691, 1706, 4to); Moldenhauer, Zeitrechnung, etc. (Hamb. 1766, 8vo); also Erläuterung [includ. Joshua, etc.] (Quedlinb. 1774, 8vo); Rosenmüller, Scholia (Lipsiae, 1835, 8vo); Studer, Erklärung (Berne, 1835, 1842, 8vo); Herzfeld, Chronologia, etc. (Berol. 1836, 8vo); \*Bertheau, Erklärung [includ. Ruth] (Lpz. 1845, 8vo); Bush, Notes (N. York, 1852, 12mo); Noble, Sermons (London, 1856, 8vo); Cummings, Readings [includ. Joshua] (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Rördam, Vers. Syriaco- hexapl, etc. (Havniae, 1859, 4to); Fritzsche, Secundum Sept., etc. (Turici, 1867, 8vo); \*Bachmann, Erklärung (Berlin, 1867-70, vol. 1, 8vo). SEE OLD TESTAMENT.

## Judghanites[[@Headword:Judghanites]]

             SEE JUDAH JUDGHAN.

## Judging, Rash[[@Headword:Judging, Rash]]

             the act of carelessly, precipitately, wantonly, or maliciously censuring others. This is an evil which abounds too much among almost all classes of men. "Not content with being in the right ourselves, we must find all others in the wrong. We claim an exclusive possession of goodness and wisdom; and from approving warmly of those who join us, we proceed to condemn, with much acrimony, not only the principles, but the characters of those from whom we differ. We rashly extend to every individual the severe opinion which we have unwarrantably conceived of a whole body. This man is of a party whose principles we reckon slavish, and therefore his whole sentiments are corrupted. That man belongs to a religious sect which we are accustomed to deem bigoted, and therefore he is incapable of any generous and liberal thought. Another is connected with a sect which we have been taught to account relaxed, and therefore can have no sanctity. We should do well to consider,

1. That this practice of rash judging is absolutely forbidden in the sacred Scriptures (Mat 7:1).

2. We thereby authorize others to requite us in the same kind.

3. It often evidences our pride; envy, and bigotry.

4. It argues a want of charity, the distinguishing feature of the Christian religion.

5. They who are most forward in censuring others are often most defective themselves." See Barrow's Works, vol. 1. ser. 20; Blair's Sermons, ser. 10, vol. 2; Saurin's Sermons, ser. 4, vol. 5.

## Judgment[[@Headword:Judgment]]

             considered as a technical and scientific term of logic, is an act of the mind by which something is affirmed. In this restricted sense it is one of the simplest acts or operations of which we are conscious in the exercise of our rational powers. The intellectual faculty called judgment is the power of determining anything to be true or false. In every instance of memory or perception there is involved some judgment, some feeling of relationship, of space, or time, or similarity, or contrast. Consciousness necessarily involves a judgment; and, as every act of mind is an act of consciousness, every act of mind consequently involves a judgment. It is a process not only subsequent to the acquisition of knowledge, but "involved as a condition of the acquisitive process itself." There is not only included what is popularly understood as comparison (when the properties of bodies are compared), but that elementary faculty, that fundamental law or innate idea, which, in the first instance, makes us cognizant of the property. Hence Sir William Hamilton's division into derivative and primitive cognitions, the derivative being of our own fabrication, formed from certain rules, and being the tardy result of perception and memory, of attention, reflection, abstraction. These are derived from experience, and, as such, are contingent; and as all experience is contingent, all the knowledge derived from experience is contingent also. But, as there are conditions of the mind which are not contingent, which are necessary, which we cannot but think, which thought supposes as its fundamental condition, these are denominated primitive cognitions; these primitive and general notions being the root of all principles, the foundation of the whole edifice of science. For the discovery of this great truth we are indebted to Leibnitz, who, in controverting Locke's view of innate ideas, asserted the existence of a principle of human knowledge independent of and superior to that which is afforded by the senses. Kant, adopting Leibnitz' view, furnishes a test by which these two elements are distinguished from each other: the former, being contingent, are fluctuating and uncertain; they may be in the mind, or they may not. Every fresh scene in which we are placed  completely alters the sensations, and the particular sensational judgments of which we are conscious. On the contrary, our primitive judgments are steady, abiding, unalterable. These primitive judgments, he asserts, are of two kinds, analytic and synthetic. An analytic judgment is simply a declaration of something necessarily belonging to a given notion, as that every triangle has three sides. A synthetic judgment may be a declaration of something which does not actually belong to a notion, but which our minds are led, by some kind of evidence or other, to attribute to it, as "Every event has an efficient cause." Here we do more than analyze the expression; we attribute altogether a fresh notion to it, and form a judgment by which our knowledge is extended. Both these judgments are found in the pure sciences, and form the very principles upon which they are pursued. It may be well to remark, however, that Comte, Herbert Spencer, Mill, etc., following Locke; deny the existence of these primitive judgments altogether, even the axioms which stand at the head of mathematical reasoning. So far from being mental and subjective, they are truly inductive, derived from observation; only that observation is so constant, and that induction is so easy and immediate, that we fall easily into an impression that these laws are intuitive, whereas they are, in fact, experimental. For instance, the axioms and postulates which are the basis of Euclid's Geometry are not metaphysical — written on the intellect, and, drawn out of the brain — they are only statements of laws observed and experienced. See Watts, Logic, ch. 4, p. 231; Locke, On the Understanding, 1, 222, 256; 2, 271, 278; Duncan, Logic, p. 145; Reid, On the Intellectual Powers, p. 497, etc. (E. de P.)

## Judgment Day[[@Headword:Judgment Day]]

             a term generally used to designate that important day which is to terminate the present dispensation of grace; at the end of the world, when time shall be no more, and the eternal state of all men be unchangeably fixed (2Pe 3:7).

I. Proof of a general Judgment. — The arguments for this are these:

1. The justice of God requires it; for it is evident that this attribute is not clearly displayed in the dispensation of things in the present state (2Th 1:6-7; Luk 14:14).

2. The accusations of natural conscience are testimonies in favor of this belief (Rom 2:15; Dan 5:5-6; Act 24:25).

3. It may be concluded, from the relation men stand in to God, as creatures to a Creator. He has a right to give them a law, and to make them accountable for the breach of it (Rom 14:12).

4. The resurrection of Christ is a certain proof of it. See Act 17:31; Rom 14:9; Rom 14:5. The Scripture, in a variety of places, sets it beyond all doubt (Jud 1:14-15; 2Co 5:10; Matthew 25; Rom 14:10-11; 2Th 1:7; 2Th 1:10; 1Th 4:16-17). SEE JUDGMENT, LAST.

II. The Judge. — The Bible declares that God will judge the world by Jesus Christ (Act 17:31). The triune God will be the Judge, as to original authority, power, and right of judgment; but according to the economy settled between the three divine persons the work is assigned to the Son (Rom 14:9-10), who will appear in his human nature (Joh 5:27; Act 17:3]), with great power and glory (1Th 4:16-17); visible to every eye (Rev 1:7); penetrating every heart. (1Co 4:5; Rom 2:16); with full authority over all (Mat 28:18) and acting with strict justice (2Ti 4:8). As far the concern of others in the judgment, angels will be no otherwise concerned than as attendants. gathering the elect, raising the dead. etc. But not as advising or judging. Saints are said to judge the world! not as cojudges with Christ, but as approvers of his sentence and as their holy lives ands exhortations will rise up in judgment against their wicked neighbors (1Co 6:2-3).

III. The Persons that will be judged. — These will be men and devils. The righteous will probably be tried first as represented in Matthew 25. They will be raised first though perhaps not a thousand years before the rest, as some have supposed [see Millennium]; since the resurrection of all the bodies of the saints is spoken of as in a moment in the twinkling of an eye at the last trump, in order to their meeting the Lord in the air, and being with him, not on earth, but forever in heaven (1Co 15:52; 1Th 4:16-17).

IV. The Rule of Judgment. — We are informed that the books will be opened (Rev 20:12);

1. The book of divine omniscience (Mal 3:5 or remembrance (Mal 3:15);

2. The book of conscience (Rom 2:16);

3. The book of Providence (Rom 2:4-5);  4. The book of the Scriptures, law, and Gospel (Joh 12:48; Rom 2:12; Rom 2:16);

5. The book of life (Luk 10:20; Rev 3:5; Rev 20:12; Rev 20:15).

V. The Time of Judgment.-The soul will be either happy or miserable immediately after death, but the general judgment will not be till after the resurrection (Heb 9:27). There is a day appointed (Act 17:3), but it is unknown to men. SEE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

VI. The Place.-This is also uncertain. Some suppose it will be in the air, because the judge will come in the clouds of heaven, and the living saints will then be changed, and the dead saints raised, and both be caught up to meet the Lord in the air (1Th 4:16-17). Others think it will be on the earth, on the new earth, on which they will descend from the air with Christ. The place where, however, is of no consequence, when compared with the state in which we shall appear. As the Scriptures represent it as certain (Ecc 11:9), universal (2Co 5:11), righteous (Rom 2:5), decisive (1Co 15:52), and eternal as to its consequences (Heb 6:2), let us be concerned for the welfare of our immortal interests, flee to the refuge set before us, improve our precious time, depend on the merits of the Redeemer, and adhere to the dictates of the divine Word, that we may be found of him in peace. See Bates, Works, p. 449; Hopkins and Stoddard, On the Last Judgment; Gill, Body of Divinity, 2, 467, 8vo; Boston, Fourfold State; 'Hervey, Works, new edition, 1, 72, 75; 2, 28, 223; 4, 155. SEE RESURRECTION.

## Judgment hall[[@Headword:Judgment hall]]

             SEE PRAETORIUM.

## Judgment seat[[@Headword:Judgment seat]]

             (βῆμα, properly a step, hence a rostrum or stage for speakers; as a "throne," e.g. Herod's in the theater at Caesarea, Act 12:21), an elevated seat or tribunal (in Jam 2:6, the term is κριτήριον, a court of justice), especially of the Roman governor (Mat 27:19; Joh 19:13; Act 18:12; Act 18:16-17; Act 25:6; Act 25:10; Act 25:17); hence of the final bar of God (Rom 14:10; 2Co 5:10). SEE PAVEMENT.

## Judgment, Right Of Private[[@Headword:Judgment, Right Of Private]]

             The Church of Rome denies the right as claimed by Protestants on the following grounds: that the Church, being assisted by the Spirit of God in searching the Scriptures, having the promise of the presence of Jesus to the end of the world, and having the possession of the unwritten word as a commentary on the written, is the only safe interpreter of holy Scripture, and the supreme judge by whose definitive sentence all controversies with regard to the meaning of particular passages or the general doctrine of holy Scripture must be determined. It makes a distinction, however, between the learned exegesis, as applied to the sacred writings, and that interpretation which emanates from the Church. The interpretation of the Church does not descend to the details which must claim the attention of the scientific exegetist. Thus, for example, she does not hold it her duty, nor include it in  the compass of her rights, to determine when, by whom, and for what object. the book of Job was written; or what particular inducement engaged St. John to publish his Gospel, or St. Paul to address an epistle to the Romans; in what order of time the epistles of the apostle followed each other, etc. As little does she undertake to explain particular words and verses, their bearings one on the other, or the connection existing between larger portions of the sacred book. Antiquities, in the widest sense of the word, fall not within the domain of her interpretation; in short, that interpretation extends only to doctrines of faith and morals. Within these limits she declares it to be the duty of Christians to acquiesce in this infallible determination, and that it is presumption and impiety, and a sin for which they deserve everlasting punishment, to oppose their own private judgment, which cannot of itself attain the truth, to the decision of the Church, which cannot err.

To this extraordinary claim Protestants agree in opposing this principle, that the holy Scriptures are the only rule of faith. But, while there is a general agreement as to this, i.e. to receive the Scriptures as a sufficient rule of faith, and as the only authoritative rule, there are wide diversities of opinion concerning the power reserved to the Church as to the doctrines of religion. The extreme view is that the Church at no time possesses the right of intermeddling in articles of faith. The essential articles of faith are so few, so simple, and so easily gathered out of clear and explicit passages, that it is impossible for any man who has the exercise of his reason to miss them; that no harm can arise from allowing any man to interpret the Scriptures as he pleases; and that, as Scripture may be sufficiently understood for. purposes of salvation without any foreign assistance, all creeds and confessions of faith composed and prescribed by human authority are an encroachment upon the prerogative of the supreme Teacher, and an invasion of the right of private judgment. Such furthermore maintain that all divisions among Christians have grown out of the attempt of the Church to force upon Christians uniformity of belief as to the doctrines of holy Scripture.

This view of the right of private judgment is generally held by the followers of Socinus, and among its ablest champions at the present day are some of the leading minds of the Church of England, who, on account of their peculiar views, are denominated Moderate, Catholic, Broad Church, by the friends of that party; Latitudinarian, or Indifferent, by its enemies. Believing that the superficial differences between Christians are as nothing  in comparison with their essential agreement, they are willing that the portals of the Church should be flung as wide open as the gates of heaven. This is clearly set forth by the late Dr. Arnold: "All societies of men, whether we call them states or churches, should make their bond to consist in a common object and a common practice rather than in a common belief; in other words, their end should be good rather than truth. We may consent to act together, but we cannot consent to believe together; many motives may persuade us to the one: we may like the object, or we may like our company, or we may think it safest to join them, or most convenient, and any one of these motives is quite sufficient to induce a unity of action, action being a thing in our own power. But no motives can persuade us to believe together; we may wish a statement to be true, we may admire those who believe it, we may find it very inconvenient not to believe it; all this helps us nothing; unless our own mind is freely convinced that the statement or doctrine is true, we cannot by possibility believe it.

"Such a union of action appears historically to have been the original bond of the Christian Church. Whoever was willing to receive Christ as his Master, to join his people, and to walk according to his rules, was admitted to the Christian society. We know that in the earliest Church there existed the strangest varieties of belief, some Christians not even believing that there would be a resurrection of the dead. Of course it was not intended that such varieties should be perpetual; a closer union of belief was gradually effected; but the point to observe is that the union of belief grew out of the union of action; it was the result of belonging to the society rather than a previous condition required for belonging to it, for no human power can presume to inquire into the degree of a man's positive belief. A general, hearty belief in Christianity is to be regarded by the Church, not as its starting point, but as its highest perfection. To begin with a strict creed and no efficient Christian institutions is the sure way to hypocrisy and unbelief; to begin with the most general confession of faith imputed, that is, as a test of membership, but with vigorous Christian institutions, is the way most likely to lead not only to a real and general belief, but also to a lively perception of the highest points of Christian faith. In other words, intellectual objections to Christianity should be tolerated when they are combined with moral obedience; tolerated, because in this way they are most surely removed; whereas a corrupt or disorganized Church, with a minute creed, encourages intellectual objections; and if it proceeds to put them down by force, it does often violate the right of conscience, punishing  an unbelief which its own evil had provoked, and, so far as human judgment can see, has in a great measure justified. In primitive usage, a heretic was not properly he who did not believe what the Church taught, but he who willfully withdrew himself from its society, refusing to conform to its system, and setting up another system of his own."

To most Protestants, however, this plan seems very defective. Regarding the Christian Church as a society created by divine institution, it possesses all the authority which Christ meant to convey through his apostles to their successors, and of the exercise of which the apostles have left examples. They deem it to be incontrovertible that these successive teachers in the Christian Church were intended to be interpreters and expounders of the sacred book; that they are invested with authority in relation to the doctrines of holy Scripture; and that, as a mere acknowledgment of the truth of Scripture is not a sufficient security or soundness of faith, it is lawful for the Church to employ additional guards to that "form of sound words" which it is required to hold fast and to defend. It is one thing to say that the Bible is the rule of faith, and another to say that it is the judge to determine what that rule is. The latter it can as little be as the code of civil law can exercise the functions of the judge; it forms indeed, the rule of judgment, but it does not itself pronounce judgment. Hence the twentieth article of the Church of England declares that "the Church hath authority in matters of faith." So the Westminster Confession "It belongeth to synods and councils ministerially to determine controversies of faith." See Rogers. Reason and Faith; Wilson, Apostolic Fathers; Elliot, Delineation of Romanism (see Index); Litton, Church, of Christ, p. 7 sq. (E. de P.)

## Judgment, The Last[[@Headword:Judgment, The Last]]

             the sentence that will be passed on our actions at the last day when the everlasting designs of God concerning this lower creation shall be accomplished, an end put to time and the destinies of the human race fixed for eternity. This is one of the peculiar doctrines of revelation, a doctrine of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. There were, indeed, some hints of it in the Old Testament; but it is in the New Testament that we have it frequently and particularly declared and described, with the circumstances with which it will be attended. It is a doctrine, too, which is entirely agreeable to reason, which fully concurs with revelation in directing our minds to a state of retribution, there being no alternative, if we hold not the truth of a judgment to come, but the holding that the creation is not under a moral  government. For, on the one hand, there is no doubt that we live under a retributive government, and that cognizance is taken of our actions by an invisible but ever present Being, whose attributes render him the determined foe of vice, and the steadfast upholder of righteousness. On the other hand, there has been an irresistible demonstration, from the experience of all ages, that no accurate proportion is at present maintained between conduct and condition. The wicked triumph in their iniquity, while virtue is despised; her humble votaries are borne down by the gloom of adversity, or reared in the midst of sorrows and tears. In every age of the world, therefore, men have been perplexed by what seemed opposite evidences as to the superintending care of a wise and beneficent Being. The only way to escape the difficulty is an appeal to the future; for either the idea is erroneous of one living under a moral government at all, or that moral government must have another scene of display where its impartiality shall be vindicated, and every discrepancy removed. See Fuller, Works, 2, 78, 106, 152, 211, 367, 392, 437, 841, 859, 871, 883, 906; Dwight, Theology; Irving, Argument for Judgment to come. SEE JUDGMENT DAY. (E. de P.)

## Judgments Of God[[@Headword:Judgments Of God]]

             1. This expression is of frequent occurrence in the Scriptures, and its sense is generally determined by the connection. When God's judgments are spoken of, the term may denote either the secret decisions of the divine will (Psa 10:5 a; 36:6), or the declarations of God's will revealed in the Scriptures (Exo 21:1; Deu 7:12; Neh 9:13; Psa 119:7-175), or the inflictions of punishment on the wicked (Exo 6:6; Exo 12:12; Pro 19:29; Eze 25:11; Rev 16:7). The Scriptures give us many awful instances of the display of divine justice in the punishment of nations, families, and individuals for their iniquities. See Genesis 7; Gen 19:25; Exodus 15; Jdg 1:6-7; Act 12:23; Est 5:14, with 7:10; 2 Kings 11; Lev 10:1-2; Act 5:1-10; Isa 30:1-5; 1Sa 15:9; 1Ki 12:25; 1Ki 12:33.

2. In a less legitimate application, the strange trials to which those suspected of guilt were put in the Middle Ages, conducted with many devout ceremonies by the ministers of religion, and pronounced to be the judgments of God! The ordeal consisted of various kinds: walking blindfold amid burning ploughshares, holding in the hand a red-hot bar, and plunging the arm into boiling water. The popular affirmations, "I will put my hand into the fire to confirm this," appears to be derived from this solemn custom. Challenging the accuser to single combat, when frequently the stoutest champion was allowed to supply their place; swallowing a morsel of consecrated bread; sinking or swimming in a river for witchcraft, or weighing a witch; stretching out the arms before the cross, till the champion soonest wearied dropped his arms and lost his estate, which was decided by the very short chancery suit called the judicium crucis.

Those who were accused of robbery were put to trial by a piece of barley bread, on which the mass had been said, and, if they could not swallow it, were declared guilty. Probably the saying, "May this piece of bread choke me," comes from this custom. Among the proofs of guilt was that of the bleeding of a corpse. If a person was murdered, it was believed that at the touch or approach of the murderer the blood gushed out of the body in various parts. By the side of the bier, if the slightest change was observable in the eyes, the mouth, feet; or hands of the corpse, the murderer was conjectured to be present; and it is probable that many innocent spectators have suffered death in consequence.  It is well to mark, in extenuation of these absurd practices of our rude ancestors, that these customs were a substitute for written laws which that barbarous period had not; and as no community can exist without laws, the ignorance of the people had recourse to these customs, which, bad and absurd as they were, served to close controversies which otherwise might have given birth to more destructive practices. Ordeals are, in truth, the rude laws of a barbarous people who have not yet obtained a written code, and not advanced enough in civilization to enter into refined inquiries, the- subtle distinctions and elaborate investigations which a court of law demands.

It is a well-established fact, however, that they were acquainted in those times with secrets to pass unhurt these singular trials. This was especially the case with ordeals of fire and boiling water. Doubtless the more knowing ones possessed those secrets and medicaments which they had at hand to pass through these trials in perfect security. See Jortin, Remarks on Eccles. Hist. 3, 246, sq. SEE ORDEAL. (E. de P.)

## Judicature, Courts Of[[@Headword:Judicature, Courts Of]]

             SEE JUDGE; SEE COURT; SEE TRIAL; SEE TRIBUNAL; SEE COUNCIL, etc.

## Judices Electi[[@Headword:Judices Electi]]

             select judges, is a term applied to a number of judges occasionally selected to hear an appeal from an excommunicated presbyter or deacon against his own bishop. The Council of Sardica allowed an appeal to the metropolitan; and in such a case the metropolitan had three ways of proceeding-either to select a number of judges, generally twelve, to hear the case; or to refer the matter to a provincial synod; or to hear the causes himself without a synod. It is, however, doubtful whether a metropolitan had power to depose a bishop.

## Judicial Blindness Or Hardness[[@Headword:Judicial Blindness Or Hardness]]

             a term employed to express a state of moral incorrigibility. So we read, Mar 3:5, "Being grieved for the blindness — hardness — of their hearts." So Rom 11:25, "Blindness — hardness — in part hath happened to Israel." Eph 4:18, "Because of the blindness — hardness — of their hearts." 2Co 3:14, "Their minds were  blinded — hardened;" and elsewhere. This expression is of special interest to the theologian on account of two questions connected with it.

1. Is it an infliction of God? — From such passages as Isa 6:10, some have said that God commands the prophet to do a certain thing to this peoples and then punishes the people: nay, this appears stronger still, where the passage is quoted, as (Joh 12:40), He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts; which seems to be contradictory to Mat 13:15, where: the people themselves are said to have closed their own eyes; and so Act 28:27. These seeming contradictions are very easily reconciled. God, by giving plenty and abundance, affords the means of the people's abusing his goodness, and, becoming both over fat with food and intoxicated with drink; and thus his very beneficence may be said to make their heart fat, and their eyes heavy, while at the same time the people, by their own act, their overfeeding, become unwieldy, indolent, bloated, over fat at heart, and, moreover, so stupefied by liquor and strong drink, that their eyes and ears may be useless to them: with wide open eyes, "staring, they may stare, but not perceive; and listening, they may hear, but not understand; and in this lethargic state they will continue, preferring it to a more sedate, rational condition, and refusing to forbear from prolonging the causes of it, lest at any sober interval they should see truly with their eyes and hear accurately with their ears, in consequence of which they should be shocked at themselves, be converted, be changed from such misconduct, and I should heal them — should cure these delusory effects of their surfeits and dissoluteness. Comp. Isa 5:11; Isa 28:7. This is equally true in spiritual matters. In short, the expressions in question are to be understood in the same sense as the hardening of Pharaoh's heart under a perversion by his own willfulness of the providences of God (Rom 9:17-18). SEE PREDESTINATION.

2. Is this state hopeless? — That shiners may, by a course of persistent opposition to God, so far destroy or deaden their conscience as to be beyond the hope (but not absolutely the power) of divine grace, is a fearful fact, and one corroborated by the Holy Scriptures (1Ti 4:2; Rom 1:28; 2Th 2:11, Heb 6:6). But this condition, again, is not so much the result of God's determination as of their own inveterate perversity. SEE UNPARDONABLE SIN.

## Judicium Dei[[@Headword:Judicium Dei]]

             SEE JUDGMENTS OF GOD.

## Judith[[@Headword:Judith]]

             (Heb. Yehudith,' יְהוּדַית, Jewess; Septuag. Ι᾿ουδίθ), the name of two females; properly the feminine form of יְהוּדַי, Judoeus (comp. Jer 36:14; Jer 36:21); but in the passage of Genesis it is generally taken as the correlative of Judah. i.e. "praised."

1. The daughter of Beeri, the Hittite and one of the first two wives of Esau (Gen 26:34). She is elsewhere more correctly called AHOLIBAMAH, the daughter of Anah the Horite (Gen 36:2-14). SEE ESAU.

2. The heroine of the apocryphal book which bears her name, who appears as an ideal type of piety (Jdt 8:6), beauty (Jdt 11:21), courage, and chastity (Jdt 16:22 sq.). Her supposed descent from Simeon (Jdt 9:2), and the manner in which she refers to his cruel deed (Gen 34:25 sq.), mark the conception of the character, which evidently belongs to a period of stern and perilous conflict. The most unscrupulous daring (ch. 13) is combined with zealous ritualism (Jdt 12:1 sq.), and faith is turned to action rather than to supplication (Jdt 8:31 sq.). Clement of Rome (Ep. 1:55) assigns to Judith the epithet given to Jael'(Ι᾿οτδεὶθ ἡ μακαρία); and Jerome sees in her exploit the image of the victory of the Church over the power of evil (Ep. 79:11, p. 508; Judith... in typo Ecclesiae diabolum capite truncavit; compare Ep. 22:21, p. 105). According to the Greek text, Judith was the rich widow of Manasses of Bethulia; to which the Vulgate adds that she was the daughter of Merari, or more properly Beari (בארי), as the Hebrew recension has it; the latter also places her in the days of Maccabaeus, which is undoubtedly correct. SEE JUDITH, BOOK OF.

## Judith, Book Of[[@Headword:Judith, Book Of]]

             one of the most interesting of the apocryphal books, which has called forth a greater variety of opinions among interpreters since the days of the Reformation than almost any other of the Deutero-canonical productions. Its historical bearings are especially important.  I. Title and Position of the Book. — The book is named after its heroine, יְהוּדַית=Jewess. St. Jerome's opinion, that it is so called because Judith was the authoress of it (Comment in Agg. 1, 6), is rightly rejected by every scholar. In the MSS. of the Alexandrine version, the Vulgate, and in Wycliffe's translation, Judith is placed between Tobit and Esther. This is followed by Coverdale, the Geneva version, the Bishops' Bible, and the A.V., where, from the nature of the division, it is put between Tobit and the apocryphal Esther. In the Vatican copies it is placed between Tobit and the Wisdom of Solomon; in the Zurich Bible, between Baruch and the apocryphal Esther; while Luther puts it at the head of the apocryphal books.

II. Design and Contents of the Book. — The object of this book evidently is to show that as long as God's people walk in his commandments blamelessly, no matter how distressing the circumstances in which they may temporarily be placed, the Lord will not suffer the enemy to triumph over them, but will in due time appear for their deliverance, and cause even those who are not Jews to acknowledge that the God of Israel is the only true God. In its external form this book bears the character of the record of a historical event, describing the complete defeat of the Assyrians by the Jews through the prowess of a woman.

In the twelfth year of his reign, Nebuchadnezzar, or, as he is called in the Greek, Nabuchodonosor, king of Assyria in Nineveh, assisted by the nations who dwelt in the hill country, by Euphrates, Tigris, Hydaspes, and by the plain of Arioch, king of the Elyrmeans, made war against Arphaxad, king of Media, who had fortified himself in Ecbatana (Jdt 1:1-7); and, despite the inhabitants of the countries of the west, Persia, Libanus, anti-Libanus, Carmel, Galaad, Galilee, Esdraelon, Samaria, etc., refusing their aid (Jdt 1:8-12), conquered Arphaxad, and returned home. to Nineveh in the seventeenth year of his reign (Jdt 1:13-16). The following year, determined to carry out his resolution to wreak his vengeance on those nations who refused their aid, he dispatched his chief general Holofernes, at the head of 120,000 infantry and 12,000 cavalry (Jdt 2:1-22), who soon subdued Mesopotamia, Syria, Libya, Cilicia, and Idumsma (Jdt 2:23; Jdt 3:8), and marched on Judaea (Jdt 3:8-10). The inhabitants of the seacoast made a voluntary submissions, which, however, did not prevent their territories from being laid waste, their sacred groves burned, and their idols destroyed, in order that divine honors should be paid only to Nebuchadnezzar. Holofernes,  having finally encamped in the plain of Esdraelon (Jdt 1:3), remained inactive for a whole month or two, according to the Latin version. But the children of Israel, who had newly returned from the captivity, having heard of Holofernes' atrocities, and being afraid of his despoiling the Temple, determined to resist the enemy, and prepared for war under the direction of their high priest Joachim, or Eiiakim, and the senate. They at once took possession of the high mountains arid fortified villages (Jdt 4:1-5). while the inhabitants of Beth-llia and Betomestham, according to the colimand of the high priest Joachim, guarded the passes of the mountains near Dothlaim (Jdt 4:6-8); and, having made all the necessary preparations, they held a solemn fast and prayed to God for protection (Jdt 4:9-15). Enraged, as well as astonished at their audacity in preparing to fight against him, Holofernes made inquiries of the chiefs of Ammon and Moab who this people was (Jdt 5:1-4). Achior, the leader of the Ammonites, then gives him the history of the Jews, and tells him that no. power could vanquish them unless they sin against their God (Jdt 5:5-21).

The proud army, however, becomes exceedingly angry with this statement (Jdt 6:1-9), and Holofernes orders Achior to be thrown into the Jewish camp, in order that he may be destroyed in the general destruction which was impending over the people whom he described as invincible (Jdt 6:10-13). The Jews pick him up, and lead him to the governor of Bethulia, to whom he relates this, and who comforts him (Jdt 6:14-21). The next day Holofernes marches against Bethulia, takes the mountain passes, seizes all the supplies of water (Jdt 7:1-7), and lays siege to the city (Jdt 7:8-19), which lasts forty days, when the famishing people urge upon the governor Ozias to surrender it, and he decides to do so unless relieved within five days (Jdt 7:20-32). The pious widow Judith, however, denounces. this decision as tempting the Almighty (Jdt 8:1-31), and conceives a plan for delivering the people (Jdt 8:32-36). With this view she entreats the governor and elders to give up all idea of surrender, and to permit the gates of the city to be opened for her. Having prayed to the God of her fathers for the overthrow of the enemy (Jdt 9:1-14), she arrays herself in rich attire, an, a accompanied by her maid, who carries a bag of provision, goes to the camp of Holofernes (Jdt 10:1-11).,The guards, seeing this beautiful woman, and hearing her story, conduct her to the general (Jdt 10:12-23), whom she tells that the Jews would now be vanquished, because they had sinned against God in eating the victuals consecrated to the Temple (Jdt 11:1-15); that she had fled from the impending destruction, and would show him the access to the city, only requesting that she should be permitted to go out of the camp to pray in the night  (Jdt 11:16-19). Holofernes, smitten with her charms, gives her a sumptuous entertainment, and invites her to remain alone with him within the tent that night (Jdt 12:1-20). When heavily asleep in consequence of having drunk too freely, Judith seizes his falchion, strikes off his head, gives it to her maid outside, who puts it in the bag which contained the provisions; they both leave the camp as usual under the pretence of devotion, and return to Bethulia, displaying the head of Holofernes, amidst the rejoicings and thanksgivings of the people (Jdt 13:1-20). Achior, hearing of this wonderful deliverance, is at once converted to, Judaism, while Judith counsels the Israelites to surprise the enemy next morning (Jdt 14:1-10), who,. being panic stricken at the loss of their general, are soon discomfited, leaving immense spoil in the hands of the Jews (Jdt 14:11 to Jdt 15:11). The women of Israel then express their gratitude to their sister (Jdt 15:12-13), while Judith bursts forth in a sublime song of praise to the God of their salvation (Jdt 16:1-17), whereupon all of them go up to Jerusalem to worship the Lord with sacrifices and feastings (Jdt 16:18-20). Judith afterwards returns to her native place, Bethulia, manumits her maid, and dies at the advanced age of 105 years, greatly lamented by all the nation, whose peace no enemy dared to disturb for a long time (Jdt 16:21-25). The Jews enjoying a profound and happy peace, a yearly festival (according to the Vulgate) is instituted in honor of the victory.

III. Original Language, Versions, Condition of the Texts, etc. — That this book was originally written in Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic is distinctly declared by St. Jerome, who says that "Judith is read by the Jews among the Hagiographa... and, being written in Chaldee (Chaldaeo sermone conscriptus), is reckoned among the histories," and that he had used a Chaldee codex to correct — thereby the vitiated readings of the MSS. (Proef. ad Jud.). This is, moreover, corroborated by the byzantine historian John Malalas (fl. circa A.D. 880), who, having embodied the contents of Judith in his Chronographia, remarks, Ταῦτα δὲ ἐν ταῖς ῾Εβραϊκαῖς ἐμφέρεται γραφαῖς (1, 203, ed. Oxon. 1691). Besides, the Greek contains unmistakable indications that it was made from a Hebrew or Aramaean original, e.g. giving the Hebrew use of the relative ἐν ῳ διέτριβεν ἐν αὐτῷ (Jdt 10:2), ων τὸπλῆθος αὐτῶν (Jdt 16:4), the literal rendering of במחנה, ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ (Jdt 12:7), which has occasioned so much difficulty to interpreters, but which is easy enough when it is borne in mind that the Hebrew preposition בsignifies at, by, near; the many Hebraisms (Jdt 1:7; Jdt 1:16; Jdt 2:5; Jdt 2:7; Jdt 2:18; Jdt 2:23; Jdt 3:3; Jdt 3:10; Jdt 4:2; Jdt 4:6; Jdt 4:11; Jdt 4:13; Jdt 5:9; Jdt 5:12; Jdt 5:14; Jdt 5:16; Jdt 5:18; Jdt 7:15; Jdt 7:18; Jdt 9:8; Jdt 10:7; Jdt 10:23; Jdt 11:5; Jdt 11:16; Jdt 12:13; Jdt 12:20; Jdt 14:19); and the mistranslations of the Hebrew (Jdt 1:8; Jdt 2:2; Jdt 3:1; Jdt 3:9-10; Jdt 5:15; Jdt 5:18; Jdt 8:27; Jdt 15:11). Gesenius, and especially Movers, have been very successful in their efforts to correct the present geographical errors by the supposition of a Hebrew original. Betani (Jdt 1:9) the latter conceives to be Beth-anoth (Joshua 15), and the two seas (Jdt 1:12) the two arms of the Nile. For χαλλαίων he reads χαλδαίων, and considers Rasses to be an oversight for Tarshish. Origen was therefore misinformed when he was told that Judith did not exist in the Hebrew (περὶ Τωβία ἡμᾶς ἐχρῆν ἐγνωκέναι ὅτι τῷ Τωβίᾷ οὐ χρῶνται οὐδέ τῇ Ι᾿ουδίθ, οὐδέ γὰρ ἔχουσι αὐτὰ καὶ ἐν Α᾿ποκρύφοις ῾Εβραϊσταί, ὠς ἀπ᾿ αὐτῶν μαθόντες ἐν ἐγνώκαμεν, Ep. ad Afric., sec. 13). The Old Latin and the Syriac versions were made from the Septuagint, which, however, does not represent a fixed Hebrew or Aramaean original text, as may be seen from the various recensions of it differing greatly from each other. This is, moreover, corroborated by the fact that the Old Latin, the MSS. of which also deviated greatly from each other, and which St. Jerome corrected according to an Aramaean codex, differs materially from the Sept., sometimes having more than the latter (comp. Vulg. Jdt 4:8-15 with Sept. Jdt 4:10; Vulg. Jdt 5:11-12 with Sept. Jdt 5:11-16; Vulg. Judith 5:26-29 with Septuag. 5, 23-25; Vulg. Jdt 6:15-19 with Sept. Jdt 6:19; Vulg. Jdt 7:18-20 with Sept. Jdt 7:29), sometimes less (comp. Vulg. Jdt 7:9 sq., with Sept. Jdt 7:8-15; Vulg. Jdt 5:11 sq., with Sept. 5,:17-22; Vulg. Jdt 9:5-7; Jdt 9:11 sq., with Sept. Jdt 9:7; Jdt 9:10). Sometimes the names are different (comp. Jdt 1:6; Jdt 1:8-9; Jdt 4:5; Jdt 8:1), and sometimes the numbers (Jdt 1:2; Jdt 2:1; Jdt 7:2, etc.). A very minute collation of the variations between the Vulgate and the Sept.' is given by Capellus, Commentarii et Notoe Criticoe in V. T. (Amstel. 1689), p. 574, etc.; and Eichhorn, Einleitung in die apokryphischen Schriften, p. 318, etc. There are also extant several Hebrew recensions of Judith. Three of these have been published by Jellinek in his Beth Ha-Midrash, vols. 1 and 2, Leipzig, 1853, and the one which comes nearest to the Greek and Latin versions certainly removes all the difficulties against the historical character of the book contained in those versions. They are called מעשה יהודית מדרש לחנוכה(Beth Ha-Midrash, 1, 130-136), and מעשה יהודית (Jdt 2:12-22). Other Hebrew editions (מִעֲשֵׂה יְהוּדַית) have been published at Berlin (1766, 8vo), Venice (s.a. 8vo), and Frankfort-on-the-Main (ed. S., London, 1715, 8vo). Coverdale and the Bishops' Bible, following Luther and the Zurich Bible, have translated from the Vulgate, while the Geneva version, which is followed by the A.V. has a translation of the Greek text.  IV. Historical Character of the Book. — There are three theories about the nature of this book:

a. Up to the time of the Reformation, the view that this book records actual history was universally entertained among Christians. The difference of opinion which obtained during those fifteen centuries, and which still exists among the defenders of its historical character, is about the precise time when these events occurred, involving as a necessary consequence the identification of the principal characters, etc. The limits of the range of time within which they have alternately been placed are B.C. 784-A.D. 117. The most ancient opinion, however, is, that the circumstances here described occurred after the Babylonian captivity, which is supported by the book itself (comp. Jdt 4:3; Jdt 5:18-19, Sept.; Jdt 5:22-23,Vulg.). Still, as it does not tell who this Nebuchadnezzar was, the advocates of this view have tried to identify him with every Persian monarch in succession. Thus, St. Augustine (De Civ. Dei, 18, 16), and others, take him to be Cambyses; Julius Africanus and Georgius. Syncellus regard him as Xerxes: Mercator, Estius, etc., make him to be Darius Hystaspis; while Sulpicius Severus and others identify him with Artaxerxes Ochus (comp. Suidas, s.v. Judith; Bellarmine, De Verb. Dei, 1, 12; Scholz, Einleitung in die Heiligen Schriften, 2, 588 sq.). Against this view, however, is to be urged, that,

1. All these monarchs inherited the provinces which are described in this book as having been conquered for them by Holofernes, thus precluding the identity of any one of them with Nebuchadnezzar.

2. Nineveh, which is here mentioned as the capital of Nebuchadnezzar's, or the Assyrian empire, was destroyed before the Babylonian captivity, and no Assyrian or Median kingdom existed during the post-exilian period.

3. The Persians, Syrianis, Phoenicians, Cilicians, and Egyptians are described as subject to the Assyrians, which could not have been the case after the captivity of Judah, when the Assyrian empire was wholly extinguished, and the Persians, instead of being subject to the Assyrians, had made themselves lords over them, and all the other nations of the East, from the Hellespont to the River Indus.

4. There is no point of time except the Maccabaean period when the events here recorded could possibly have occurred, since the Jews were subject to the Persians for 207 years, then were under the dominion of Alexander the Great, and finally under the Ptolemies and the kings of Syria till they  obtained their independence through Judas Maccabaeus, B.C. 164. The only time to which they could possibly be referred is that of Antiochus Epiphanes, but this supposition is inconsistent with the fact that the Jews had but recently returned from captivity, and restored the worship of God in the Temple. The geographical inconsistencies are equally embarrassing.

To escape these difficulties, and more especially to obtain a point of time suitable for these events, Usher, Lloyd, Calmet, Montfaucon, Prideaux, Whiston, Wolff, etc., maintain that they occurred before the exile, either in the reign of Zedekiah, Manasseh, Amon, Josiah, or Jehoiakim. The general opinion, however, is, that the story is to be placed under Manasseh, and, as Calmet, Montfaucon, Prideaux, Whiston, and others will have it, after this monarch's return from Babylon. According to them, the events recorded in the book of Judith, and the collateral circumstances, occurred in the following order of time

A.M.B.CBirth of Judith3285719Manasseh begins to rein3306693He is taken prisoner to Babylon and sent back to Judaea3328676War between Nebuchadnezzar and Arphaxad3347657Victory of Nebuchadnezzar over Arphaxad3347657Expedition of Holofernes and siege of Bethulia3348656Death of Manasseh3361643Amon, his son, begins to reign3361643Amon is murdered for his wickedness3363641Josiah, his son, succeeds him, being eight years old3363641Death of Judith, aged 105 years3390614Battle of Megiddo and death of King Josiah3394610The last siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar3414590Destruction of Jerusalem and captivity of the Jews3416588The Nebuchadnezzar of this book is, according to this theory, Saosduchinus, who succeeded his father Esarhaddon in the kingdom of Assyria and Babylon in the 31st year of Manasseh's reign, and Arphaxad is Deioces, king of Media. But this pre-exilian view again incurs the following objections:

(1.) It makes Judith to be sixty-three years old at the time when she is described as "a fair damsel" (ἡ παιδίσκη ἡ καλή) captivating Holofernes (Jdt 12:13) and ravishing the hearts of many who desired to marry her (Jdt 16:22). Calmet, however, is not disconcerted by supposing that Judith might in this case be sixty-three or sixty years old, "being then what we call a fine woman, and having an engaging air and person," "likely," adds Du Pin, "to charm an old general."

(2.) It is absolutely inconsistent with chap. Jdt 16:23, where we are expressly told that "there was none that made the children of Israel afraid in the days of Judith, nor a long time after her death." For even if we take the words "a long time after her death" to mean no more than twenty years, this would bring Judith's death to twenty years before the disastrous battle of Megiddo, wherein Josiah was mortally wounded, whereas this hypothesis places her death only four years before that calamitous event. This inconsistency is still more glaring according to the calculations of Prideaux, who maintains that Judith could not have been more than forty-five years of age when she captivated Holofernes, as this carries down her death to the 4th year of Zedekiah, when the state of the Jews had been exceedingly disturbed for several years by the Babylonians; and actually brings the period involved in the "long time after her death" beyond the total subversion of the Jewish state.

(3.) Judith affirms that there was no Jew to be found in any. city who worshipped idolatry (Jdt 8:17-18), which is incompatible with the reign of Manasseh, Amon, and the first eight years of Josiah (comp. 2Ch 33:14-17).

(4.) Holofernes, the chief officer of the Assyrian army, who had only recently invaded. Judaea and taken Manasseh prisoner, must surely have known something about the Jews, yet he is described as being utterly ignorant of the very name of this Jewish: monarch, as not knowing the people and the city of Jerusalem, and being obliged to ask for some information about them from the Amoritish chief (Jdt 5:1-3).

(5.) The Jewish state is represented as being under the government of a high priest and a kind of Sanhedrim (Jdt 6:6-14; Jdt 15:8), which is only compatible with the post-exilian period, when the Jews had no king

(6.) The book itself distinctly tells us in chap. 4:3, and 5:18, that the events transpired after the captivity, as is rightly interpreted by the compilers of  the marginal references of the A.V. who, on this passage, refer to 2Ki 25:9-11, and Ezr 1:1-3.

b. The difficulty of taking the book to record either pre-exilian or post- exilian history made Luther view it as "a religious fiction or poem, written by a holy and ingenious man, who depicts therein the victory of the Jewish people over all their enemies, which God at all times most wonderfully vouchsafes.... Judith is the Jewish people, represented as a chaste and holy widow, which is always the character of God's people. Holofernes is the heathen, the godless or unchristian lord of all ages, while the city of Bethulia denotes a virgin'' indicating that the believing Jews of those days were the pure virgins" (Vorrede aufs Buch Judith). Some of, the names can scarcely have been chosen without regard to their derivation (e.g. Achior = Brother of Light; Bethulia = בתוליה, the virgin of Jehovah), and the historical difficulties of the person of Nebuchadnezzar disappear when he is regarded as the scriptural type of worldly power. Grotius, elaborating upon this idea, regards it as a parabolic description of Antiochus. Epiphanes' assault on Judaea — "Judith is the Jewish people (יהודית); Bethulia is the Temple (בית אליה); the sword which went out of it, the prayers of the saints; Nebuchadnezzar signifies the devil; Assyria is pride, the devil's kingdom; Holofernes is the devil's instrument; ( הלפר נחשlictor serpentis, minister diaboli); the widow is the helplessness of the Jewish people under the tyranny of Antiochus Epiphanes; Joachim or Eliakim signifies God will arise (אל יקוםיהוה קום) to defend Judaea and cut off the instrument of the devil who would have her corrupted." Many of the modern writers who regard it as containing pure fiction call it either drama (Buddeus), epopee (Artropaeus, Moreus, Von Niebuhr, etc.), apologue (Babor), didactic poem (Jahn), moral fiction (Bauer), or romance (Berthold). Among the Roman Catholics this notion of an allegory is favored by Jahn, who maintains that the difficulties are otherwise insuperable. De Wette, however, considers that the fact of Holofernes being a historical name (together with other reasons) militates against the notion of an, allegory, as maintained by Grotius. The name Holofernes is found in Appian (In Syriac. c. 47) and in Polybius (10:11). The latter, historian states that Holofernes, having conquered Cappadocia; lost it by endeavoring to change the customs of the country, and to introduce the drunken rites of Bacchus; and Casaubon (ad-Athen.) conjectures that this was the Holofernes of Judith. From its termination the name is supposed to  be of Persian extraction (compare Orophernes, Polybius, 33, 12); as Tisaphernes, Artaphernes, etc.

c. As the book itself, however, gives no intimation whatever that it is a fiction or an allegory, but, on the contrary, purports to be real history, as is evident from its minute geographical (1:7; 2:21.sq.; 3:9 sq.; 4:4, 6 sq.), historical (1:5 sq.), and chronological (1:13, 16; 8:4; 16:23) descriptions, Gutmann, Herzfeld, Keil, and others take it to contain a substance of truth embellished with fiction. This view is supported by the following facts:

1. Notwithstanding the arbitrary and uncritical manner in which the deutero-canonical historians dispose of their materials, they have always a certain amount of truth, around which they cluster the traditional embellishments.

2. A summary of the contents of Judith is given in the ancient Jewish prayers for the first and second Sabbaths of the Feast of Dedication — beginning with אודאִנפת בי ותשבand אין מושיע וגואל— among the events which occurred in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, and it cannot be supposed that the Jews would make it the basis of thanksgiving when the deliverance was never wrought, and the whole of it was nothing but a fiction.

3. There are ancient Midrashim which record the facts independently of the book of Judith. There is one, in particular, which gives a better recension of this book than either the Septuagint or the Vulgate, bears as much resemblance to the Septuagint and Vulgate as these two versions bear to each other, and removes many of the difficulties against its historical truthfulness, inasmuch as it begins with ch. 5:5, and thus shows that the Septuagint, from which the other versions were made, has put together two different records.

Those, however, who understand the book to be an allegorical representation of the Jewish people, widowed as to earthly resources, yet, by favor with God and man, prevailing over the powers of the world, do not thus relieve the fable from grave moral objections. An intelligent Jew, well read in the Hebrew Scriptures, could not have thought. of setting up Judith as a proper embodiment of female heroism and Virtue. Her plan of procedure is marred throughout by hypocrisy and deceit; she even prays to God that he would prosper her deceit (9:12), and praises the cruelty of Simeon in slaying the Shechemites, as if his deed bore on it the sanction of  heaven, though Jacob; the father of Simeon, had consigned it in the name of God to eternal reprobation. The spirit of vengeance, resolute in its aim, unscrupulous in the means taken to accomplish it, is the pervading animus of the story — a spirit certainly opposed to the general teaching of Old as well as New Testament Scripture, and incapable of being embodied in a heroic story except by one who had much more regard for the political than the moral and religious elements in Judaism.

V. Author and Date. — The difference of opinion upon this subject is as great as it is upon the character of the book. It is not named either by Philo or Josephus; nor have we any indication whatever by which to form a conjecture respecting its author. But it has been supposed by some that it. could not have been written by a contemporary, from the circumstance of the family of Achior being mentioned as still in existence, and of the festival of Judith being still celebrated. If this festival ever took place, it must have been of temporary duration, for, as Calmet observes, no record of it can be traced since the exile. Professor Alber, of Pesth, however, maintains that it is still recorded in the Jewish calendars. Jahn, after Grotius, refers the date of the book to the Maccabaean period, and derives an argument for its late composition from the fact of the feast of the New Moon being mentioned (8:6, comp. with Mar 15:42). De Wette (Einleitung) conceives that the whole composition bespeaks an author who was a native of Palestine, who could not have lived beyond the end of the 1st century of the Christian era (the date assigned to it by Eichhorn), inasmuch as it is then cited by Clement of Rome, but that the probability is that it was much earlier written. Movers, a Roman Catholic professor at Bonn, a man of great penetration in similar investigations respecting the canonical books of the Old Testament, endeavors to fix the date; of its composition in the year B.C. 104. "The author," he observes, "who has transferred the geographical relations of his own time to a former period [see, however, Foster, Geography of Arabia, 1844, 1, 185], makes the Jewish territory commence at Scythopolis (2:10), and makes Bethulia, against which Holofernes directed his attack, the first. Jewish city at the entrance into Judaea (4:7), reckoning the territory intervening between this and Samaria as tributary to the Jewish high priest. This state of affairs continued from the time of John Hyrcanus to Pompey's invasion of Judaea. Hyrcanus had seized upon Samaria, and wrested Scythopolis, with the surrounding territory, from Epicrates, the general of Ptolemy Lathurus (Josephus, Ant. 13, 10, 3), B.C. 110, according to Usher. But Samaria and  Scythopolis, with other acquisitions of the Maccabees, were lost forever to the Jewish nation when Pompey; B.C. 48, reduced Judaea to its ancient limits. The seacoast (3:1), independent of the Jews, continued, since the last years of the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, to be a Jewish possession; but Carmel, which (1:8) was inhabited by the Gentiles, was still independent in the beginning of his reign, and he first seized it after the war with Ptolemy Lathyrus (13:15, 4)." It is to this war that Movers considers the book of Judith to refer, and he supposes it to have been written after the unfortunate battle at Asochis, in Galilee (or, rather, Asophen on the Jordan) (Movers, Ueber die Ursprache der Deuteroksn. Bucher, in the Bonner Zeitschrift, 13, 36 sq.). De Wette conceives that this hypothesis is opposed by the following geographical combinations:

1. Galilee belonged to the Asmonaeans, the proof of which, indeed, is by no means certain, while the following indications thereof present themselves:

(a) Asochis seems to have belonged to Alexander Jannaeus, as it received Ptolemy Lathyrus (Josephus, Ant. 13, 12, 4, comp. with 15, 4).

(b) Hyrcanus had his son Alexander Jannaeus brought up in Galilee (13:12, 1).

(c) Antigonus returned from Galilee ( War, 1, 3, 3).

(d) Aristobulus seized upon Ituraea (Ant. 13, 11, 3), which presupposes the possession of Galilee.

(e) Even after the limits of Galilee were circumscribed by Pompey, it still belonged to the Jewish high priest (War, 1, 10 4).

2. Idumaea belonged to the Jewish state, but the sons of Esau came to Holofernes (7:8, 18).

3. If the author had the war with Ptolemy Lathyrus in view, the irruption of Holofernes would rather correspond with the movements of the Cyprian army, which proceeded from Asochis to Sepphoris, and thence to Asophen (Einleitung, § 307).

Wolff and others ascribe the authorship to Achior, B.C. 636-629; Huetius (in Proep. Evang. p. 217), Calmet (Dissert. Proelim. p. 142), etc., to Joshua, the son of Josedech, the companion of Zerubbabel, B.C. 536-515;  St. Jerome, etc., to Judith herself; Ewald, Vaihinger, etc., to the time of John Hyrcanus, B.C. 130-128; Volkmar, who takes it to be an allegorical description of the victory of the Parthians and Jews over Quietus, the delegate of Trajan, maintains (originally in the Theol. Jahrbuch. 1856, p. 362; and 1857, p. 448 sq.; afterwards in Handb. d. Einl. in d. Apokr. Tub. 1860) that it was written for the twelfth of Adar, A.D. 117-118, to commemorate this day (יוםטוריינוס). He makes Nebuchadnezzar stand for Trajan, Nineveh for Antioch, Assyria for Syria, Arphaxad for the Parthians, Ecbatana for Nisibis, Holofernes for Lucius Quietus, and Judith for Judaea. This explanation assumes the spuriousness of the reference in the First Epistle of Clement (§ 6), which is too early for the date assigned. It has been adopted by Baur, Hitzig (in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. 1860, p. 240 sq.), and Schenkel; but it is opposed by Hilgenfeld. (ibid. p. 270 sq.; 1861, p. 335 sq.), Lipsius (ibid. 1859, p. 39), and Ewald.

The fact, however, that, there are several records or recensions of the events contained in the book of Judith proceeding from different authors, and deviating materially from each other, precludes the possibility of ascertaining whose productions they are. All that can be said with certainty is that they all emanated from a Palestinian source. As the circumstances recorded are most plainly declared by the more trustworthy Hebrew copies, and in the Jewish prayers, to have occurred in the Maccabaean struggles for independence (circa B.C. 170-160), the first and shortest record of them which was used for liturgical purposes must be contemporary with the events themselves. The poetical genius of the nation, however, soon embellished the facts in various ways, and hence the different recensions. The Greek version contained in the Septuagint must have been made at a much later period, since the author of it was already ignorant of the time when these circumstances occurred, and, as we have seen, mixed up two totally different. records narrating events of different periods of the Jewish history.

VI. Canonicity of the Book. — Though the events recorded in Judith are incorporated in the hymnal service of the Jews called יוצרות, yet the book itself was, never in the Jewish canon. The distinction, however, which the Jewish synagogue kept up between treating the book with respect and putting it into the canon could not be preserved in the Christian Church. Hence Judith, which was at first quoted with approbation by Clemens Romanus (Ep. c. 55), was gradually cited on an equality with other  Scripture by Clemenis Alexandrinus (Strom. 4), Tertullian (De Monog. c. 17), Ambrose (De Offi. Minist. 3, 13), and Augustine (De Doctrinea Christianas, 2,8), and finally was canonized, in the councils of Carthage, by Innocent I of Rome, under Gelasius and of Trent. Some will have it that this book is quoted in the N.T. (comp. Jdt 8:4 sq., with 1Co 2:10 sq.; Jdt 9:12 with Act 4:24; Jdt 16:17 with Mat 12:42). Judith, with the other deutero-canonical books, has been at all times read in the Church, and lessons are taken from it in the Church of England in course.

VII. Literature. — The three Midrashim in Jellinek's Beth Ha-Midrash, vols. 1 and 2 (Leipzig, 1853), Montfaucon, La Verite de l'Histoire de Judith (Paris, 1690) Hartmann, Utrum Judditha contineat historiam (Regiom. 1671); De Bonacasa, Juditha ficta (Veron. 1614) Artopoeus Juditha Epopoea (Strasb; 1694); Capellius, Comment. et Notoe Crit. in V.T. p. 459; Arnald, The Apocrypha in Patrick, Lowth, and Whitby's: Comment.; Du Pin, History of the Canon (Lond. 1699), 1, 10 sq., 90 sq.; Eichhorn, Einleitung. in die Apokryphischen Schriften des Alten Testaments (Leipzig, 1795), p. 291 sq.; Prideaux, The. Old and New Testaments connected (ed. 1815), 1, 60 sq.; Whiston, Sacred History of the Old and New Testament, 1, 202; Reuss, in Ersch und Gruber's Encyklopadie, sec. 2, vol. 28, p. 98 sq.; Fritzsche, Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Test. (Lpzg. 1853), 2, 113 sq.; Journal of Sacred Literature, 1856, p. 342 sq.; 1861, p. 421 sq.; Vaihinger, in Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 7, 135 sq.; Keil, Einleitung in d. A.T. (ed. 1859), p. 698; Diestel in the Jahrb. f. d. Theol. 1862, p. 781 sq.; Lipsius, in Hilgenfeld's Zeitschr. 1867, p. 337 sq.

Express commentaries on this book alone have been written by Jos. Conzio, שַׁיר יְהוּדַית(Asti, 1628, 16mo); Jeh. Low ben-Seeb, מְגַלִּת יְהוּדַית(Vienna, 1799, 1819, 8vo); Frankel, יְהבּוּדַיה(Lpzg. 1830, 8vo); Is. Siebenberger, יְגַלִּת יְהוּדַית(Warsaw, 1840, 8vo); Volkmar, Das Busch Judith (Tubing. 1860, 8vo); Wolff, Das Buch Judith (Leipzig, 1861, 8vo). SEE APOCRYPHA.

## Judson, Adoniram[[@Headword:Judson, Adoniram]]

             the senior Baptist missionary to Burmah, was born in Maiden, Mass., Aug. 9, 1788. He was the eldest son of Adoniram and Abigail Judson. Before he was ten years of age he had acquired a reputation as a superior student and  in 1807 graduated with the highest honors from Providence College (now Brown University), being not yet twenty years old. For a short period subsequently he was unsettled in his religious belief, but aroused by the death of an old classmate under peculiar circumstances, he became an earnest inquirer after the truth, and, though not a Christian, was admitted as a "special student" in the divinity school of Andover, and while there was converted, and joined the Congregational Church. In 1809 he declined a tutorship in Brown University, and in February, 1810, formed the resolution of becoming a missionary to the heathen. Several young men joined the seminary at this time who had also been for some time impressed with the need of missions to unchristian peoples. Judson became intimately associated with them, and their zeal finally led them to press this object on the attention of the American churches, and, though not properly the cause, they were the occasion of the formation of the American Board of Commissioners for. Foreign Missions, who sent Mr. Judson to England to confer with the London Missionary Society as to the practicability of an affiliation between the societies and their joint operation in "foreign parts." Mr. Judson left America on this errand January 1, 1811, but on the way was captured by a privateering vessel, carried to France, and did not reach London till April 6, 1811. His mission failed in its primary object, but was of advantage to the cause of missions in America, for the American Board resolved to assume the responsibility of sending out its own missionaries. Mr. Judson, after marrying Ann Hasseltine; Feb. 5, 1812, embarked for India on the 19th of the same month, under the auspices of this new organization.

Changing his views of baptism on the voyage, almost immediately after his arrival he sought immersion at the hands of Dr. Carey, the Baptist missionary at Serampore. The Baptists in America were already possessed of considerable missionary zeal and intelligence and, on learning of Dr. Judson's change of view, were roused to intense earnestness, and in 1814 they organized a denominational missionary society, and took Dr. Judson under their patronage. The hostility of the East India Company towards missionaries was at that time so intense, that within ten days after Judson's arrival in India he was peremptorily ordered to leave the country, and, being forced to comply, he took passage in a vessel for the Isle of France, Nov. 30, 1812. He subsequently returned to Madras, but, finding the East India Company uncompromising in their opposition, he departed for Burma, and reached Rangoon July 13, 1813. Accepting Burmah as his mission field, Mr. Judson addressed himself to the task of acquiring the language of that country, and not only attained to  the greatest familiarity with it, but spoke and wrote it with "the elegance of a cultured scholar." At an early period in these pursuits he published some "Grammatical Notices" of the language, which in a few short pages (only twenty-six) furnish "a most complete grammar of this difficult tongue." In imitation of the Burmese rest houses attached to their pagodas for the accommodation of pilgrims and worshippers, Mr. Judson instituted a Zyat in the public street for the reception of and conversation with inquirers about Christianity. This was ever a notable feature of his ministry, as he spent whole days thus with the people. Meeting with some success among the people, he resolved to go to Ava, the capital, and "lay his missionary designs before the throne, and solicit toleration for the Christian religion." His efforts were ineffectual, and he returned to Rangoon, and made a short trip to Calcutta for the recovery of Mrs. Judson's health.

On July 20, 1822, Dr. Price, a newly arrived missionary physician, was summoned to attend on the king at Ava, and Mr. Judson was compelled to accompany him as interpreter. While at Ava Mr. Judson became known as the "Religion- propagating teacher," and, as his missionary prospects seemed favorable, though he went to Rangoon temporarily, he returned to Ava to prosecute his work. War breaking out between the British-India and the Burmese governments, all the foreigners at Ava came under suspicion as spies, and Mr. Judson, with others, was imprisoned. The horrible experiences of that incarceration cannot readily be described. On March 25, 1826, Mr. Judson himself wrote, "Through the kind interposition of our heavenly Father, our lives have been preserved in the most imminent danger from the hand of the executioner, and in repeated instances of most alarming illness during. my protracted imprisonment of one year and five months; nine months in three pairs of fetters, two months in five, six months in one, and two months a prisoner at large." After his release he rendered most important service to the British government in the formation of the treaty at Yandabo; and later in a commercial treaty. While absent with the government embassy as interpreter, his first wife, one of the noblest of women, died. Mr. Judson shortly after (1827) returned from Ava and settled at Amherst, but subsequently removed to Maulmain, as events had made it a much more important post. From this time to 1834 he was variously employed in his mission work at Maulmain, Rangoon, Prome, and other places, and became interested in the Karens. (q.v.), among, whom he made several missionary tours. In 1834 he married Mrs. Sarah Boardman, and completed his translation of the whole Bible into Burmese, in the revising. and perfecting of which, however, he spent sixteen years  more. This was the great work of his life and the best judges venture to hazard the opinion that three centuries hence Judson's Bible will be the Bible of the Christian Church of Burmah" (Calcutta Review, 14, 434). He also compiled a short Burmese and English dictionary. With a larger work of this kind he was occupied at the time of his death. In 1839-40 his health failed, and he was obliged to take several voyages for its recovery. In 1845, in consequence of the failing health of Mrs. Judson, he left for America. Mrs. Judson died at St. Helena, and Mr. Judson, continuing his voyage, reached Boston on. October 15. He was received, in America "with affectionate and enthusiastic veneration that knew no bounds. His eminent position as the founder and pioneer of the mission; his long and successful labors in the East; his romantic and eventful life, associated with all that is most beautiful and lofty in human nature; his worldwide fame, and his recent afflictions, encircled him in, the people's mind with the halo of an apostle." But Mr. Judson's heart was in Burmah. After marrying Miss Emily Chubbuck in June, 1846, he again set sail for India, and arrived at Rangoon on Nov. 30 of that year. His health, however, again declined, and he was obliged once more to resort to the sea for relief, but died on his way to the Isle of Bourbon, April 12, 1850, and was buried at sea. (J.T.G.)

## Judson, Ann Hasseltine[[@Headword:Judson, Ann Hasseltine]]

             was born at Bradford, Mass., Oct. 22, 1789. She was married to Adoniram Judson on Feb. 5, 1812, and was the first American woman to devote herself to foreign mission service. She became "intimately associated with her husband, in all his plans of benevolence, and bore an important part in their accomplishment" (Wayland's Judson, 1, 414), in 1824, in consequence of protracted ill health, leaving her husband in Burmah, she proceeded. alone to America, where she remained, adding, however, much to the interest and advancement of missions by the publication of a very interesting account of the history of the Burman Mission in a series of letters to Mr. Butterworth, a member of Parliament, whose hospitality she enjoyed while in England, till 1823, when she rejoined her husband at Rangoon, and proceeded with him to Ava. It was during, the trying scenes of the succeeding two years that her "devoted love, consummate tact, and heroic resolution were so manifest. Her whole time, with the exception of twenty days when she was confined by the birth of her child, was devoted to the alleviation of the sorrows of her husband and his fellow prisoners." She was perfectly familiar with the Burmese language, and possessed of a "presence which commanded respect even from savage barbarians, and  encircled her with a moral atmosphere in which she walked unharmed in the midst of a hostile city with no earthly protector" (Wayland, 1, 329). Her influence was acknowledged as contributing largely to the submission to the English terms of peace by the Burmese government. She died at Amherst on Oct. 24, 1826, during the absence of her husband, of disease which her sufferings and prostration at Ava had rendered her constitution incapable of resisting. "To great clearness of intellect, large powers of comprehension, and intuitive female sagacity, ripened by the constant necessity of independent action, she added that heroic disinterestedness which naturally loses all consciousness of self in the prosecution of a great object. These elements were, however, all held in reserve, and were hidden from public view by a veil of unusual feminine delicacy." (J.T.G.)

## Judson, Emily Chubbuck[[@Headword:Judson, Emily Chubbuck]]

             wife of Dr. Adoniram Judson, was born in Eaton, N.Y. Aug. 22, 1818. She contributed to the magazine literature of the country in early life under the assumed title of "Fanny Forester." She had contemplated becoming a missionary from early life, and marrying Dr. Judson June 2, 1846, she sailed with him from Boston for India, where she "employed all her strength in advancing the holy cause in which he was engaged." After his decease she was compelled, by reason of feeble health, to relinquish her mission work, and returned with her children to America. She rendered good service to Dr. Wayland in the preparation of his memoir of Dr. Judson. She died June 1, 1854. Her published works are, Alderbrook; a collection of Fanny Forester's Village Sketches and Poems" (Boston, 1846, 2 vols.); and the "Biographical Sketch of Mrs. Sarah B. Judson" quoted below. There are besides a goodly number of separate poems, of exquisite beauty of sentiment and of great pathos, of which we mention only My Bird and The two Mammas. See Wayland, Life and Labors of Adoniram Judson (Boston, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo); Calcutta Review, vol. 14; The Judson Offering, edited by J. Dowling D.D. (New York, 1848), Biographical Sketch of Sarah B. Judson, by Mrs. Emily C. Judson (New York, 1849); Knowles, Life of Mrs. Ann H. Judson; Kendrick, Life and Letters of Mrs. Emily C. Judson (1801); Stuart, Lives of Mrs. Ann H. Judson and. Sarah B. Judson, with a Biographical Sketch of Mrs. Emily C. Judson (1853). (J.T.G.)

## Judson, Sarah Boardman[[@Headword:Judson, Sarah Boardman]]

             was born in Alstead, N.H., Nov. 4, 1803. She was the daughter of Ralph and Abia Hull, and was married to the Rev; George. D. Boardman in 1825 with whom she proceeded to Tavoy, Burmah, and in his missionary work shared great dangers and sufferings. Her husband died in 1831. Two of her children had previously died, and with one child, a son, left to her, she continued to prosecute her missionary work. In 1834 she married Dr. Judson, and in 1845, in consequence of failing health, she left Burmah for America, accompanied by her husband. On their arrival at St. Helena Mrs. Judson died, Sept. 1, 1845. She translated the New Testament and Burmese tracts into Peguan, and Pilgrim's Progress into Burmese. Of her a writer in the Calcutta Review says (vol. 14), "Exquisite sensibility, a poet's soul and imagination, great natural abilities, thorough unselfishness, and a woman's depth of love and affection, all shrouded by the most unpretending meekness and devotion, were some of the elements which blended together to form a character of extreme beauty." Her poem commencing "We part on this green islet, love," etc., is enough to entitle her to high praise as a poet. (J.T.G.)

## Juel[[@Headword:Juel]]

             (Ι᾿ουήλ), a Graecized form (1Es 9:34-35) of two Heb. names:

a. in the former verse UEL (Ezr 10:34); b. in the latter JOEL (Ezr 10:43).

## Juel [[@Headword:Juel ]]

             was the most noted festival of the Scandinavian worship, which was celebrated in the longest night as a new year's celebration. Sacrifices and vows were made to the gods for fruitfulness for the coming year. In honor of the god Freir a huge boar was butchered, and the sacrifice, called the Jula-pig or Julablot, was made in the presence of the king. A golden boar was brought into the hall, all laid their hands on it and msde the most binding vows. Then four weeks of; eating, drinking, dancing, and playing followed. The name Yule for Christmas is thought to have thus originated.

## Juennin, Gaspard[[@Headword:Juennin, Gaspard]]

             a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Varembon (Bresse) in 1650, entered the Oratory in 1674, and taught literature, philosophy, and theology in several schools of the congregation of the Oratory. He died in 1713. He deserves special recognition as a theological writer. His principal works are,

(1) Commentarius Historicus et dogmaticus de Sacramentis (Lyons, 1696, 2 vols. fol.). This work contains, besides the commentary, three dissertations on censures, irregularities, and indulgences, and deserves special notice for the fact that it is the first work of modern theologians treating at length the subject of the sacraments: —

(2) Institutiones Theologicoe (Lyons, 1696, 4 vols. 12mo, and often), which was used for some time as a text book of theology in several Roman Catholic institutions; a revised edition, expunging some objectionable views, was prepared by Juennin in 1705, and the work continued in use. In 1708 he published an abridgment of it as a Compendium Theologioe (Paris, 1708, 12mo). He also published a separate treatise on the sacraments, Theorie et pratique des Sacraments (Paris, 1713, 3 vols. 12mo), which is valuable. See Hook, Eccles. Dict. 6,367.

## Jug[[@Headword:Jug]]

             SEE JOGA.

## Juggernaut[[@Headword:Juggernaut]]

             SEE JAGGERNAUT.

## Jugglers[[@Headword:Jugglers]]

             a word brought into English from the mediaeval Latin joculator (in Provencal joglar, joglador; in old French jonglere or jonglier), through the modern French jongleur, and originally used to designate the professional musicians who attended the Troubadors and Trouveres of Provence and the north of France, either singing their poems, or, if they sung them themselves, accompanying them with an instrument, which was reckoned beneath the dignity of the poet himself. This profession was in the Middle Ages (from the 11th to the 15th century) an honorable one, but it gradually died out, or at least lost its respectability, and jugglers became a term for rope dancers, and all that class of persons who sought to gratify the populace by sleight of hand or feats of agility, until in our own day, finally, it has come to be used as a synonym of conjurer, and is applied to persons who perform tricks of legerdemain (q.v.). SEE EXORCISM; SEE SORCERY.

## Jugulum[[@Headword:Jugulum]]

             SEE TRANSENNA.

## Juhles[[@Headword:Juhles]]

             a name given to aerial spirits or daemons among the Laplanders, from whom they receive a sort of adoration, though no statues or images of them exist. Their worship is conducted under particular trees. On Christmas-eve, and the day following, they celebrate the festival of the Juhles. On this occasion they rigidly abstain from animal food; and they carefully reserve some fragments of the food employed, which they suspend in a box behind the house, for the refreshment; of the spirits.

## Juice[[@Headword:Juice]]

             (עָסַיס, asis', as freshly trodden from grapes), new wine (as rendered Isa 49:26, etc.); hence fermented liquor of pomegranates (Son 8:2). SEE WINE.

## Juigne, Antoine Elonore Leon, Leclerc De[[@Headword:Juigne, Antoine Elonore Leon, Leclerc De]]

             a French prelate of high family, was born at Paris in 1728. He studied in his native city, became bishop of Chalons in 1764, and during the French revolution took refuge at Chambery, afterwards at Constance, and finally at Augsburg. In 1802 he returned to France, but. lived privately in Paris till his death, March 19, 1811. He left some ecclesiastical works, for which see Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Jukes, Charles[[@Headword:Jukes, Charles]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, native of England (1788), was converted in 1812, and joined the Church of St. Neots, Nottinghamshire, under the ministry of Rev. Thomas Morall. Filled with pious zeal, he began to preach as a layman, with great acceptance, among the destitute villages within twenty miles of his home; subsequently he entered the ministry, and came to this country in 1830. On his way to Canada, on the day boat to Albany, he preached, at the request of passengers, a sermon from the words "There is a God in heaven who revealeth secrets;" and, at the urgent request of a plain farmer, who was not a professing Christian, he turned aside to preach to two churches in Saratoga County, N.Y., to which he was at once called. He was settled successively in Presbyterian and Reformed churches at Edinburgh and Fish House, Amsterdam, Glen and Auriesville, Stone Arabia and Ephratah, and at Rotterdam, all in N.Y. He died at the latter place in 1862. At Glen about seventy persons united with the Church during the four years of his pastorate. His great characteristic was his untiring zeal and earnestness. He was a bold, catholic, evangelical preacher of righteousness, an excellent pastor, and a very exemplary and useful servant of the Lord. His temperament was peculiarly happy; his Christian experience large and varied; his death peaceful and triumphant. See Corning, Manual of the Ref. Ch.; Personal Recollections. (W.J.R.T.)

## Jul[[@Headword:Jul]]

             the name of Christmas among. the northern tribes of Europe. Originally it was the name of the old Scandinavian festival of winter solstice, but as the practices of that festival have in the main been incorporated in the Christmas feast, they term it Jul. SEE JULES.

## Jules[[@Headword:Jules]]

             are aerial spirits and daemons among the northern tribes, especially the Laplanders, to whom divine adoration is paid. They suppose them to dwell under particular trees, and proceed thither to offer up sacrifices once a year, at Christmas time, whence the name of the Christian festival corresponds to their Jul (q.v.). See Broughton, Biblioth. hist. Sacra, s.v.; Thorpe. Northern Mythol. 2, 49 sq.

## Julia[[@Headword:Julia]]

             (Ι᾿ουλία, fem. of Julius), a Christian woman of Rome, to whom Paul sent his salutations (Rom 16:15); she is named with Philologus, and is supposed to have been his wife or sister. A.D. 55. — Kitto. "Origen supposes that they were master and mistress of a Christian household which included, the other persons mentioned in the same verse. Some modern critics have conjectured that the name may be that of a man, Julias"

## Julian Calendar[[@Headword:Julian Calendar]]

             SEE CALENDAR, ROMAN.

## Julian Cross, Or Cross Of St. Julian[[@Headword:Julian Cross, Or Cross Of St. Julian]]

             is the name of a crosslet placed saltire ways. SEE CROSS.

## Julian Epoch; Julian Year[[@Headword:Julian Epoch; Julian Year]]

             SEE CHRONOLOGY, CHRISTIAN.

## Julian Of Eclanum[[@Headword:Julian Of Eclanum]]

             SEE PELAGIUS; SEE PELAGIANS.

## Julian Of Halicarnassus[[@Headword:Julian Of Halicarnassus]]

             the bishop celebrated as the leader of a faction of the Monophysites, who bear his name, flourished in the early part of the 6th century. When the  Monophysite bishops were deposed in 519 he was obliged to flee to Alexandria for safety. For further details, SEE MONOPHYSITES.

## Julian Of Toledo[[@Headword:Julian Of Toledo]]

             SEE TOLEDO, COUNCILS OF (14TH); SEE SPAIN.

## Julian The Apostate[[@Headword:Julian The Apostate]]

             emperor of Rome A.D. 361-363, is especially celebrated by his able and vigorous, but vain attempt to dethrone Christianity, and to restore the ancient Graeco-Roman paganism in the Roman Empire to its former power and glory. He was the nephew of Constantine the Great, the first Christian on the throne of the Caesars, and was educated under the restraining influence of the court Christianity of his cousin, the Arian emperor Constantius. The austere, monastic, intolerant, tyrannical, and hypocritical form of this belief repelled the independent youth, and made him a bitter enemy of Christianity, and an enthusiastic admirer of the heathen poets and philosophers, whose writings, in spite of the severe prohibition, he managed secretly to procure and to study, especially during his sojourn at the University of Athens. "The Arian pseudo-Christianity of Constantius produced the heathen anti-Christianity of Julian, and the latter was a well deserved punishment of the former." But he shrewdly concealed his real convictions. and hypocritically conformed to all the outward rites of Christianity till the death of the emperor. His heathenism was not a simple, spontaneous growth, but an artificial and morbid production. It was the heathenism of pantheistic eclecticism and Neo-Platonism, a strange, mixture of philosophy, poesy, and superstition, and, in Julian at least, in great part an imitation or caricature of Christianity.

With all his philosophical intelligence, he credited the most insipid legends of the gods, or gave them a deeper mystic meaning by the most arbitrary allegorical interpretation. He was in intimate personal intercourse with Jupiter, Minerva, Apollo, Hercules, who paid their nocturnal visits to his heated fancy, and assured him of their special favor and protection. His moral character corresponded to this pseudo-philosophy. He was full of affectation, vanity, sophistry, loquacity, and dissimulation, Everything he said, or wrote, or did was studied and calculated for effect. His apostasy from Christianity Julian dates from his twentieth year, A.D. 351. But while  Constantius lived he concealed his pagan sympathies with consummate hypocrisy for ten years, and outwardly conformed to all the rites of the Church. After December, 355, he suddenly surprised the world with brilliant military successes and executive powers as Caesar in Gaul, which was at that time threatened by barbarians, and won the enthusiastic love of his soldiers. Now he raised the standard of rebellion against his imperial cousin, and in 361 openly declared himself a friend of the gods. By the sudden death of Constantius in the same year he became sole emperor, and made his triumphal entry into Constantinople. He immediately set to work with the utmost zeal to reorganize all departments of the government on the former heathen basis. He displayed extraordinary talent, industry, and executive tact. The eighteen short months of his reign (Dec. 361-June 363) comprehend the plans of life long administration. He was the most gifted, the most learned and most active, and yet the least successful of Roman emperors. His reign was an utter failure, teaching the important lesson that it is useless to swim against the stream of history and to impede the Onward march of Christianity. He proved beyond the possibility of doubt, that paganism had outlived itself, and that Christianity was the only living religion which had truly conquered the world, and carried all the hopes of humanity. He died in the midst of his plans in a campaign against Persia, characteristically exclaiming (according to later tradition), "Galilaean, thou hast conquered!"

Julian did not resort to open violence in his attempt to destroy Christianity in the empire. He affected the policy of philosophical toleration. He did not wish to give the Christians an additional glory of martyrdom. He hoped to attain his end more surely in an indirect way. He endeavored to revive heathenism by his own personal zeal for the worship of the gods. But his, zeal found no echo, and only made him ridiculous in the eyes of the cultivated heathen themselves. When he endeavored to restore the oracle of Apollo near Antioch, and arranged for a magnificent display, only a solitary priest appeared in the temple and ominously offered — a goose. He also attempted to reform heathenism by incorporating with it the morals and benevolent institutions of Christianity. But this was like galvanizing a decaying corpse, or grafting fresh scions on a dead trunk. As to the negative part of his assault upon Christianity, Julian gave liberty to all the sects, in the hope that they might devour each other, but, instead of that, he only gave new vigor to the cause he hated. He forbade the Christians to  read the classical authors, and deprived them of the benefit of schools of their own, that they might either grow up in ignorance, or be forced get an education from heathen teachers. He assisted the Jews in rebuilding the Temple of Jerusalem in order to falsify the prophecy of Christ, but the attempt, three times repeated, signally failed, by an interposition of Providence approaching to the character of a miracle. (Respecting this question, see the judicious remarks in Lardner's Jewish and Heathen Testimonies, vol. 4.) Finally he wrote a book against Christianity, in which he united all the arguments of Porphyry, Celsus, Lucian, and other enemies before him, and infused into them his own bitter and sarcastic spirit. But this attack called forth able refutations from Gregory of Nazianzum, Cyril of Alexandria, and others, and contains a number of incidental admissions which confirm the truth of most of the leading facts of the Gospel history. Dr. Lardner (in his learned book on the Credibility of the Gospel History, in the London edition of his works by Kippis, 7, 638-639) thus sums up the involuntary testimony of this ablest and bitterest of all the heathen opponents of Christianity:

"Julian has borne a valuable testimony to the history and to the books of the New Testament. He allows that Jesus was born in the reign of Augustus, at thee time of the taxing made in Judaea by Cyrenius; that the Christian religion had its rise, and began to be propagated, in the times of the emperors Tiberius and Claudius. He bears witness to the genuineness and authenticity of the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and the Acts of the Apostles; and he so quotes them as to intimate that they were the only historical books received by Christians as of authority, and the only authentic memoirs of Jesus Christ and his apostles, and the doctrines preached by them. He allows their early date, and even argues for it. He also quotes, or plainly refers to, the Acts of the Apostles, to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans, the Corinthians, and the Galatians. He does not deny the miracles of Jesus Christ, but allows him to have 'healed the blind, and the lame, and daemoniacs;' and to have rebuked the winds, and walked upon the waves of the sea.' He endeavors, indeed, to diminish these works, but in vain. The consequence is undeniable such works are good proofs of a divine mission. He endeavors also to lessen the number of the early believers in Jesus, and yet he acknowledges that there were 'multitudes of such men in Greece and Italy' before St. John wrote  his Gospel. He likewise affects to diminish the quality of the early believers, and yet acknowledges that, besides men servants and maid servants,' Cornelius, a Roman centurion at Caesarea, and Sergius Paulus, proconsul of Cyprus, were converted to the faith of Jesus before the end of the reign of Claudius. And he often speaks with great indignation of Peter and Paul, those two great apostles of Jesus, and successful preachers of his Gospel; so that, upon the whole, he has undesignedly borne testimony to the truth of many things recorded in the books of the New Testament. He aimed to overthrow the Christian religion, but has confirmed it: his arguments against it are perfectly harmless, and insufficient to unsettle the weakest Christian. He justly excepts to some things introduced into the Christian profession by the hate professors of it, in his own time or sooner, but has not made one objection of moment against the Christian religion as contained in the genuine and authentic books of the New Testament."

Literature. — Juliani Imperatoris Opera quoe supersunt omnia (ed. by Petavius, Par. 1583, and more completely by E. Spanheim, Lips. 1696, 2 vols. fol.); Cyril of Alexandria Contra impium Jul. librix (which contains the chief argument of Julian against Christianity, with their refutation), in Cyril's Opera, ed. Aubert, tom. 6, and in Spanheim's edition of Julian's works. Also the relevant sections in the heathen historians Ammianus Marcellinus, Zosimus, and Eunapius, and in the Church histories of Socrates, Sozomenus, and Theodoret. Among modern writers on Julian we refer to Tillemont, Memoires, etc., 7, 322-420; Warburton, Julian (London, 1751); Neander, Julian and sein Zeitalter (Leipz. 1812; in an English dress, N.Y. 1850, l2mo); Joudot. Histoire de l'empereur Julien (1817, 2 vols.); Wiggers, Julian der Abtrunnige (Leipzig, 1837); Teuffel, De Juliano religionis Christiani contemptore (Tub. 1844); Fr. Strauss, Der Romantiker auf dem Thron der Coesaren, oder Julian der Abtrunnige (Manheim, 1847); Schaff; Ch. Hist. 2, 40 sq.

## Julian(Us) Cesarini, Cardinal[[@Headword:Julian(Us) Cesarini, Cardinal]]

             one of the most distinguished characters of the Church of Rome in the Middle Ages prominently connected with the efforts to heal the dissensions within the pale of the Romish Church of the 15th century, and the union of the Eastern and Western churches at the Council of Florence; was born at Rome in 1398, the descendant of a noble family noted in the annals of Italian history. He was educated at the University of Perugia, and early evinced the possession of great ability and uncommon talents. He particularly interested himself in the study of the Roman law, and soon acquired the reputation of being one of the foremost thinkers, and was honored with a professor's chair at Padua. He was not suffered, however, to continue long in the rostrum, for the Church of his day needed men of decision and energy to allay the strife which was raging fiercely, and threatening the destruction of the hierarchical edifice so lately dishonored in the occupation of the papal chair by licentious characters. sometimes familiarly termed the Babylonish captivity of the Church of Rome, the illustrious Colonna, better known as Martin V, was to obliterate, as well as to rebuild on a firm foundation both the moral and material influence of the papacy. For such a task his own talents, however great, were not sufficient, and the wise, far seeing pontiff was not slow to recognize the uncommon endowments of young Julian, who was accordingly appointed apostolic prothonotary, and, later, auditor of the Rota Romana. Cardinal Brunda in particular became interested in the rising Cesarinus; and when, in 1419, he was sent as papal legate to Bohemia to bring back the erring (?) sheep of the Slavonic fold, Julian was the legate's companion and mainstay. Though this mission failed to accomplish its objects, at the Diet of Brunn, Julian won golden opinions from the Romans, and in 1426 (May 22) was promoted to the cardinalate of Santo Angelo. When, in 1431, a diet was summoned at Nuremberg "to concert immediate and vigorous action for  crushing the hitherto successful rebellion," it was none other than cardinal Julian whom Martin V selected (after his death confirmed by Eugenius IV) to represent him in that ecclesiastical body, as well as in the general council which, in accordance with the celebrated decree "Frequens" of the Council of Constance, was soon to meet at Basle. It had been determined to extirpate the Hussites by all means. As kind words would not bring them back to the open arms of the Church the cardinal legate boldly exchanged the mitre for the helmet.

Quickly an army of Crusaders was gathered, and in himself blending together the characters of the priest and the soldier he sought to kindle in their hearts the fires of religious zeal and patriotic devotion. But neither the potency of a blessed banner and a consecrated sword nor the spectacle of an ecclesiastic urging on an army to a war of faith, had sufficiently impressed Rome's most faithful adherents to brave "The face of a religious influence like that of Hussitism, which was rooted in national sympathies, such as Rome could never awaken in the day of her greatest power," and ignominiously the papal legate again failed in his mission. Meanwhile, however, the Council of Basle had convened, opened in the absence of the legate by two of his deputies, and thither Julian directed his steps. He assumed its presidency Sept. 9, 1431, determined by peaceful measures to essay once more the accomplishment of a task which he had found it impossible to secure on the field of battle; and to his honor be it said that all the inducements which were now held out to the Hussites were the offerings of a sincere and pious soul, which desired above all things else the glory of God and the honor of his Church. "The sanguine and undaunted legate, who had been the first to reckon on the military campaign as the only remedy for the spreading disease; was now the first to fall back upon the council from which he had hitherto augured so little good. 'As I saw no other remedy left' (are his own words), I animated and encouraged all to remain steadfast in the faith, and to fear nothing, since on this very account I was going to the council where the whole Church would assemble'" (Jenkins). How much Julian did to obtain Eugenius' sanction to the continuation of the council which that pontiff was determined to abrogate, and how Julian, not withstanding the publication of a bull abrogating the council, and convoking it eighteen months later at Bologna continued the session, and with what liberality sagacity he counseled in the deliberations of this synod, and with what earnestness and zeal he defended the independence of the council and its superiority over the pontiff we have already mentioned in the article on SEE BASLE, COUNCIL OF (q.v.). Suffice it to say that, had the wise and all seeing  policy of the legate been allowed to be carried out in the name and with the full consent of the Roman pontiff, the Hussites would have been redeemed and the Church of Rome been spared the reductions which she suffered in the 16th century, and which even now threaten her very existence. SEE OLD CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Annoyed and distracted by the opposition of Eugenius, the president hardly knew how to dispose of the Bohemian question, and the Hussites, doubting the sincerity of the cardinal, received every advance with distrust, and misinterpreted every utterance of Julian; till it finally became evident to both parties that their mission was fruitless, and that it had only opened another and a still more intricate chapter in the history of this long and eventful controversy. SEE HUSSITES.

But if Julian had battled for reform within the Church, and had boldly argued in favor of the council's supremacy over the incumbent of the papal chair, he had yet faithfully adhered to the Roman pontificate; and when, as he believed, the fathers of the Church determined to deprive Eugenius of a portion of his support, he as earnestly defended the pontiffs cause, and suddenly the council found itself at variance with its able president, and the Church threatened with a greater schism than she had ever yet endured. It is true Julian had been one of the prime and most zealous leaders in abolishing the annates (q.v.), but he staunchly insisted with the same zeal for some compensation from other sources; and when he found the council indisposed to meet his views, he quickly changed front, and became one of Eugenius' most outspoken adherents. The breach had opened in February 1437; in September, the arrival of a papal bull ordering a synod at Ferrara to consider the question of uniting the Eastern and Western churches obliged Julian to resign the presidency, and on Jan. 9, 1438, he quitted Basle, and, after a short visit to Rome, hastened to Ferrara. SEE FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF; SEE FELIX V.

This sudden change of Julian from an opponent to an adherent of the Eugenian party has led historians to doubt the sincerity of the cardinal; but when we consider that Julian's great object was the union of the Eastern and Western churches, the healing of schisms within either, and a thorough reformation to suit the wants of the day, this action explains itself to us as really the natural development of those great principles of ecclesiastical policy upon which Julian had acted from the beginning; and "while the advocates of the pope were rejoicing over the immediate fruits of a successful duplicity, that vigorous and impulsive mind, which had guided the intellectual strength of Christendom in the freest and most enlightened council that had assembled since the apostolic age, was preparing itself for a future of more enduring  triumph. The long and dreary night of schisms and controversies seemed now far spent, and the day of strength and reunion was at hand. How sublime was the prospect now opening upon an earnest and sanguine mind. The restoration of the Church to its first beauty and integrity; its reformation by the recovery of its first estate, and of that spirit which made it one in Christ; the overthrow of the infidel and the enemy of the Church by a warfare of whose glories the earlier Crusades would become but a faint prophecy; the extension of the power of the papacy over all Christendom, and the restoration of the episcopacy to its pristine beauty under the one universal patriarch — these were the most prominent features of this vision of things to come. We cannot wonder that, with such a view before him the great reformer of the Church at Basle laid down the work of reformation to take up that of union; and while keeping still, as the rule of all his labors, the truth proclaimed at Constance, 'There can be no real union without reformation, nor true reformation without union,' he fell back upon the work of union when that of reformation became impossible. To one who regards his course from this point every stage of his transition from Basle to Florence will become clear and consistent. Everywhere we shall recognize a careful provision for the exigencies of the Church, formed from the matured experience of its past dangers, and a disinterested zeal which, in an age of selfish intrigue, was as naturally misrepresented as it was willfully misunderstood. The insinuation of Gibbon is at once confronted by the fact that if Julian had not sought the peace of the Church rather than his own aggrandizement, he might have grasped at this moment the papacy itself, and wrested from Eugenius that authority under which he was content to close a life of brilliant but ill requited service" (Jenkins, p. 266-268).

But if the conduct of Julian had hitherto been the outgrowth of a sincere heart, we can only look with suspicion upon his actions in the Council of Florence, removed thither from Ferrara. His name deserves to be treated with ignominy for the duplicity he manifested towards the leading prelates of the Eastern Church, and from this time dates the earliest "moral declension in the course of Julian, which was at once closed and expiated in the dark page of the Hungarian legation." SEE FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF; SEE PURGATORY; SEE FILIOQUE; SEE JOSEPH OF CONSTANTINOPLE.

For his valuable services to the papacy, Eugenius bestowed on him the bishopric of Frascati, and in 1443 further evinced his recognition of Julian's efforts by appointing him legate to Hungary, which  country, the very bulwark against further advances of the Turks, was at this time threatened by civil dissensions, and was fast developing many causes of as serious apprehensions to the court of Rome as Bohemia had done in the previous century. SEE SIGISMUND; SEE WLADISLAS.

Again Julian was obliged to lay aside his spiritual weapons, and to draw the temporal sword which he had once before wielded so unsuccessfully. But not only did he change the manner and weapons of warfare, but even the principles for which he fought; and hereafter Julian is marked by an unscrupulous pursuit of his object, and it becomes really difficult to detect, under the strange disguise which he henceforth assumes "the features of that enlightened mind which inspired the decrees and directed the correspondence of the Council of Basle." His task was to heal the dissensions of the Hungarian royalty, and to enlist that country, in union with all the rest of Christendom, to check the further advance, and, if possible, bring about the utter annihilation of the Turks; and when the sudden death of the queen regent Elizabeth (which is oftentimes said to have been caused by Julian Cesarinus) and the accession of Wladislas had secured to the Turks a peace of ten years, it was Julian who came forward to argue with the king on the fallacy of adhering to a compact with heretics, especially as the treaty had been made without the sanction of the holy see. The apostolic authority served to free Wladislas from his obligation, and the war with the Saracens began anew, in which both king and papal legate fell a prey to Mohammedan defenders at the battle of Varna (1440). According to some, Julian was murdered in his flight by a Wallachian who saw gold on his clothes; others say that the Hungarians killed him in punishment for his evil advice; while others, again, say that he died in 1446, in consequence of a wound received while leading on the Christians; and some Romish historians even claim that he suffered martyrdom in the camp of the Turks; but as none of the contemporary historians knew anything of the kind to have occurred, it seems useless to refute the statement. His speeches are contained in the Acts of Councils, and his two letters to Eugenius concerning the Council of Basle in the Fasciculus rerum expetend. (Col. 1535), p. 27 sq. See Jenkins Life and Times of Cardinal Julian (London, 1861, 8vo); Hefele, Quartalschrift, 1847, 2; Cave, Scriptores Ecclesiastes; Schröckh, Kirchengeschichte, 32, 11 sq.; Milman, Latin Christianity (see Index in vol. 8). (J.H.W.)

## Julian, St[[@Headword:Julian, St]]

             SEE POMERIUS.

## Juliana, St[[@Headword:Juliana, St]]

             SEE CORPUS CHRISTI.

## Julianists[[@Headword:Julianists]]

             SEE JULIAN OF HALICARNASSUS.

## Juliano[[@Headword:Juliano]]

             a Spanish Roman Catholic of the 17th century, who, while traveling in Germany, was converted to the Protestant faith. His zeal for the diffusion of the Word of God led him to undertake the dangerous enterprise of conveying into Spain a large quantity of Bibles concealed in casks, and packed up as Rhenish wine. A pretended Protestant betrayed him. He was seized by the Inquisition, and, together with eight hundred purchasers of his precious treasure, was condemned to the torture and to death. — Fox, Book of Martyrs, p. 136.

## Julias[[@Headword:Julias]]

             the name given by Philip the Tetrarch to Bethsaida in honor of Julia, the daughter of the emperor Augustus. SEE BETHSAIDA.

## Julien, Simon[[@Headword:Julien, Simon]]

             (called Julian of Paarma), an eminent French painter, was born at Toulon in 1736, studied under Bardou at Marseilles, and afterwards visited Paris, where he became a pupil of Carlo Vanloo, and gained the grand prize of the Royal Academy. He then visited Rome with the royal pension, and remained in that city ten years. On returning to Paris he soon gained a reputation, and was elected a ancademician. Among his best performances is an altar-piece for the chapel of the archbishop of Paris, at Conflans, representing St. Anthony in a Trance. He died at Paris, February 23, 1800. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Julitta Of Cappadocia[[@Headword:Julitta Of Cappadocia]]

             a female martyr of the 4th century, under Diocletian, was a Lycaonian of royal descent, and greatly celebrated for her Christian virtues. To avoid the bigoted rage of the pagan governor, she withdrew from Iconium, her native city, to Tarsus. But here, with her young son Cyricus, she was seized, and, confessing herself a Christian, was ordered to the rack. Her beautiful boy, for repeating his mother's words, "I am a Christian," was dashed in pieces on the pavement before her eyes, for which the dying mother gave thanks  to God. After patiently suffering various torments, she was beheaded, April 16, A.D. 305. — Fox, Book of Martyrs, p. 55.

## Julius[[@Headword:Julius]]

             (Ι᾿ούλιος, for the Latin Julius, the name of an honorable Roman family), the centurion of the imperial cohort who had the charge of conducting Paul as a prisoner to Rome, and who treated him with much consideration and kindness on the way (Act 27:1; Act 27:3; Act 27:43; comp. Act 27:11; Act 27:31). A.D. 55. — Kitto. "Augustus's band," to which Julius belonged, has been identified by some commentators with the Italian band (Act 10:1); by others, less probably, with the body of cavalry denominated Sebasteni by Josephus (Ant. 19, 9, 2, etc.). Conybeare and Howson (Life of St. Paul, ch. 21) adopt in the main Wieseler's opinion, that the Augustan cohort was a detachment of the Praetorian Guards attached to the person of the Roman governor at Caesarea; and that this Julius may be the same as Julius Priscus (Tacitus, Hist. 2, 92; 4, 11), sometime centurion, afterwards prefect of the Praetorians. SEE ITALIAN; SEE PAUL.

## Julius (2)[[@Headword:Julius (2)]]

             a Christian martyr, was a Roman senator in the 2d century. A convert to Christianity, he was ordered by the emperor to sacrifice to him as Hercules. This Julius absolutely refused to do, and he was imprisoned, and finally beaten to death with clubs. — Fox, Book of Martyrs. p. 22.

## Julius Africanus[[@Headword:Julius Africanus]]

             an ecclesiastical writer who flourished In the beginning of the 3d century, was, according to Suidas (s.v. Africanus), a native of Libya, but resided generally at Emmaus (afterwards Nicopolis), in Palestine. The same writer calls him also Sextus. Little is known of his personal history. Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 6, 31) relates that he undertook a journey to Alexandria to listen to Heraclas, the teacher of the catechumens in that city, as also that he was sent by the inhabitants of Emmaus to ask of the emperor Heliogabalus the restoration of their city, which was granted (see Jerome, De vir. illstr. c. 63). He was a friend of Origen; and as, in letters addressed to him when the latter was already some fifty years old, he styles him "son," it is to be supposed that he was much advanced in years in 238, while the expression "colleague" seems to imply that he was also a priest. He was, according to Jerome, in the full vigor of life during the reign of  Heliogabalus and Alexander Severus. We have no information concerning the precise date of his death; it occurred, in all probability, near the middle of the 3d century — some say about A.D. 232. He enjoyed great reputation for learning among the ancients. He is the author of the oldest Christian history of the world, the Chronographia, or De temporibus, which Eusebius considered very trustworthy: it extended from the creation to the third year of the reign of Heliogabalus (221). Unfortunately, the complete work is not in our possession; a portion, however, was preserved to us by copious extracts, which subsequent Church historians made from it, and these (fifty-six fragments) have been collected by Galland (Bibliotheca, vol. 2). Julius also wrote a letter to Origen concerning the authenticity of the history of Susannah and the Elders, and another to Aristides on the differences between the genealogies of Christ by Matthew and Luke. In this last letter, speaking against the opinion of a fraus pia having been perpetrated by the Church in order to prove the rights of Jesus as high priest and king, he says, "Far be it that such a thought should govern the Church of Christ as to invent a falsehood to glorify Christ." Eusebius, Photius, and Suidas ascribe to him also the authorship of another work in twenty-four books, a sort of compendium of information on medicine and natural philosophy. According to Suidas, it was a collection of empiric formulas for curing diseases by sorcery, etc. But, as this does not seem to agree with what we know of the general character of the man, Dupin thinks that there must be some mistake, and that there probably existed both a Julius Africanus and a Julius Sextus, who have been confounded one with the other. Finally, he has also been considered the author of several treatises — De trinitate, De circumcisione, De Attalo, De Pascha, De Sabbate — which are evidently not his, but belong to the Roman presbyter Novatian. See Möhler, Patrologie, 1, 577-580; Routh, Rel. Sacr. 2, 108 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 7, 155.

## Julius Caesar[[@Headword:Julius Caesar]]

             the first emperor of the Romans, deserves a place in our work on account of his connection with Jewish history. He was born at Rome, July 12, B.C. 100, and was educated in Greece, whither the Roman youths of his day were wont to resort for instruction. After having successively held the offices of tribune, quaestor, aedile, high priest, and praetor or governor of Spain, Caesar was one of the three parties who constituted the triumvirate  of Rome, B.C. 60. He now set out for (Gaul, ostensibly aiming at the subjugation of the Gauls, but actually to form and discipline an army that might enable him to force his coadjutors to leave to him alone the government of the Romans. The success with which his efforts, both as a soldier and a politician, were rewarded, are known to us from the history of the Gallic War that flowed from his own pen, as well as from other distinguished classic historians. When he went to Gaul he was to remain there five years, but the expiration of that time finding him involved in wars with the barbarians, five years more were added. Germany; Britain, and other countries also were invaded in turn; and when, at the death of Crassus, Caesar and Pompey alone were left to contend for supremacy, a quarrel naturally enough arose between the two rivals. Pompey was the favorite of the people, and therefore easily controlled the senate; if only once Caesar could be obliged to disband the army, as whose hero the victorious general of the Gallic wars was worshipped there could be no longer any need for contention, and Pompey alone would be intrusted with the responsibility of the Roman government. A decree was quickly passed by the Roman senate commanding Caesar to disband his forces; but Caesar not only refused to comply with the demand, but actually marched against Pompey, whom he soon drove from Rome, and in the Eternal City, B.C. 49, was made dictator. Of the pursuit of Pompey and the fate of the latter we need not speak here; but the noble conduct of the Roman general towards his fallen enemy and towards his assassins is so meritorious in its character, that it deserves at least, in passing, a Christian commendation.

When the news of the death of Pompey reached Rome, Caesar was again appointed dictator for one year and consul for five years, and was invested with tribunicial power for life. His adherence to the cause of Cleopatra led him to enter Egypt and to engage in the "Alexandrine war," which also he brought to a successful termination in March, B.C. 47. In September of this year he returned to Rome, and was once more appointed dictator. But with the death of Pompey his partisans had by no means vanished. It is true that they had quitted Rome, but in Africa they were still dutiful to the memory and principles of their late master. To Africa, therefore, Caesar directed his steps; the party of Pompey was quickly attacked and subdued. The feud of Metellus, of Scipio, of Cato, and Juba was sad indeed, but the display of noble and wise generosity which Caesar now displayed towards those arrayed in arms against him proves him "to have been possessed of a great, magnanimous nature. He was not a man that could stoop to the vulgar atrocities of Marius or Sulla, and so he majestically declared that  henceforth he had no enemies, and that hereafter he would make no difference between Pompeians and Caesareans." Returned to Rome, he celebrated his victories in Gaul, Egypt, Pontus, and Africa by four great triumphs, during which the whole Roman populace was feasted and feted by his magnificent liberality. But the display in which Caesar indulged soon led the Romans to fear that he aimed higher than the dictatorship — that absolute government was his object. Roman patriotism had not yet expired. Many there were in the Eternal City in whose veins flowed republican blood, and the man who dared to conspire to deprive them of the liberties they had so long enjoyed was doomed to fall at their hands. His death seemed the only surety of the continuation of their long enjoyed privileges of a free and untrammeled government. While Caesar was planning how soonest to wear the insignia of royalty, Brutus and other senators were sharpening their weapons to take his life. On the fifteenth of March, B.C. 44. after Caesar had taken his accustomed scat in the senate at the Capitol, a friend gave him a paper containing an account of the conspiracy against his life, but, while yet holding it in his hand, the conspirators themselves crowded around him, and at a given signal their daggers pierced his breast, and Rome was visited by the greatest disaster that could have befallen her at this time. To secular works belongs a reference to the writings of this remarkable character. For his reformation of the calendar, SEE CALENDAR, ROMAN.

By the ecclesiastical writer Caesar deserves notice for his kind enactments in behalf of the Jews, and generous treatment of them. From this people he had received valuable assistance during his campaign in Egypt, and Caesar always preserved a grateful recollection of Antipater and his brethren. In Egypt he confirmed all the privileges the Jews had previously enjoyed. In Judaea more favorable laws were enacted; Antipater was appointed lieutenant of the country, with the honored title of a Roman citizen; Hyrcanus was confirmed in the priesthood, and provision was made for the fortification of the Holy City and the repair of its walls. See Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, bk. 14, chap. 8, sq.; Strabo, Geography (Bohn's ed.), 3, 184. SEE CAESAR. (J.H.W.)

## Julius Echter[[@Headword:Julius Echter]]

             SEE MESPELBRUNN.

## Julius Henry[[@Headword:Julius Henry]]

             duke of Brunswick, deserves our notice on account of his identification with the Reform movement of the 16th century. He was born July 10, 1538, and was originally designed for the clerical office, but in 1568 he succeeded his father, and at once introduced the religion of the Reformers, for which he had early manifested a strong inclination. In 1576 he founded the University of Helmstedt. He died May 3, 1589.

## Julius I, Pope[[@Headword:Julius I, Pope]]

             a native of Rome, succeeded Marcus († Oct. 7, 336) on the 6th of Feb. 337, after the papal chair had been vacant for four months. We know hardly anything of him beyond the part he took in the Athanasian controversy. He sided with Athanasius, and convoked a synod to be held under his presidency; but the Eastern churches were not inclined to admit the right of arbitration and decision of the Roman bishop in such matters (see Epist. Synodalis Syn. Sardicensis ad Donatum, in Mansi, 3, 136), and declared to Julius that they did not admit his superiority to any other bishop, even though his was the largest city; yet they would continue in friendly relation with him if he would renounce the plan of subverting their decisions. Julius persisted in holding the synod despite the absence of the Eastern bishops, and Athanasius was declared the lawful bishop. He also took part, through his legates, in the Synod of Sardica. The Eastern bishops of this council, after their withdrawal to Philippopolis, excommunicated Julius. But this continued opposition did not prevent him from writing in 349, on the return of Athanasius to Alexandria, to the Church of that city an autograph letter of congratulation. This letter, and the one mentioned above, are all that we have from the pen of Julius (see Socrates, Hist. Eccl. 2, 23; Athanasius, Apol. 2, p. 770). He died April 12, 352, and is commemorated in the Roman Catholic Church on that day. The Eastern Church erroneously considers Julius as the author of one of its liturgies. See Socrates, lib. 2 and 3; Baronius, Ann. Ecclesiastes; Tillemont, Memoires; Sozomen, De Sect. art. 8; Dupin, Bibliotheque des Auteurs Ecclesiastes; Baillet, Vies des Saints, April 12; Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 27, 157.

## Julius II, Pope, Cardinal Della Rovere[[@Headword:Julius II, Pope, Cardinal Della Rovere]]

             nephew of pope Sixtus IV, took the papal chair after the one month's rule of Pius II, in 1503. He was born at Albezzola, near Savona, in 1441; became successively bishop of Carpentras, Albano, Ostia, Bologna, Avignon, and Mende and was finally made cardinal by his uncle, Sixtus IV. During the pontificate of Alexander VI, the most infamous and depraved of all the popes, Julian della Rovere already sought to prepare the way for his own succession in the pontificate; but the cardinal d'Amboise, archbishop of Rouen and minister of Louis XII, became his competitor, and the claims of the French prelate were sustained by an army marching against Rome. Outwitted in this attempt, Julian at once set out to procure his future success, and, persuading the Italian cardinals that their interest demanded the election of a native pope, secured the election of Piccolomini as pope Pius III. During the short reign of the latter Julian resumed his intrigues, and when Pius III died, twenty-six days after his election, Julian had so well succeeded in bribing the most influential cardinals by promises of power and temporal advantages that he received the position. After his exaltation to the papal throne, he set about to raise the papacy from the political degradation, to which it had sunk during the reign of his predecessors, generally termed "the night of the papacy." Determined to recover for the Church all that had belonged to the Roman see in the days of Innocent III, he began by driving Caesar Borgia out of his ill gotten possessions in the Romagna; but there he found another power, the Venetians, who, during the preceding troubles, had taken possession of Ravenna, Rimini, and other places. The Venetians offered to pay tribute to the see of Rome for those territories, but Julius refused, and demanded their absolute restitution to the Church. After fruitless negotiations, Julius, in 1508, made a league with Louis XII, the emperor Maximilian, and the duke of Ferrara, against Venice.

This was called the League of Cambray, and its object was the destruction of the republic of Venice and the partition of its territories. Venice, however, stood firm, although its armies were defeated and its territories were ravaged by both Germans and French. At last Julius himself, having recovered the town of Romagna, perceived the impolicy of uniting with ultramontane sovereigns against the oldest Italian state, and accordingly, in Feb. 1510, he made peace with Venice. Wishing to undo the mischief which he had done, and to drive the foreigners (whom he styled "barbarians") out of Italy; he first sought to arm the Germans against the French, whom he dreaded most; but, not  succeeding, he called to his aid the Swiss. He himself took the field, and attacked and took the town of La Mirandola, entering it by a breach, in January, 1511; later he met with reverses, and lost Bologna. But in the following October his legates succeeded in forming a league, which he called "holy," with Ferdinand of Spain, Henry of England, the Venetians, and the Swiss. The campaign subsequent, in 1512, effected the total expulsion of the French from Lombardy. But this was done by the Swiss, German, and Spanish troops, and Julius merely succeeded in driving one party, of foreigners out of Italy by means of other foreigners, who meantime subverted the republic of Florence, and gave it to the Medici. In the midst of these events, Julius died of an inflammatory disease, on the 21st of February, 1513. He was succeeded by Leo X. Louis XII had convoked a council in order to obtain the approval of the French clergy on his warfare against Rome. To retort this measure the fifth Lateran Council was convoked (brought to a close after the accession of Leo X), and thus the designs of the French king were completely frustrated. As an ecclesiastical ruler Julius has little to recommend him in the eyes of the Christian Church. As a political sovereign, he is described by Ranke as "a noble soul, full of lofty plans for the glory and weal of Italy;" and professor Leo considers him, with all his defects, as one of the noblest characters of that age in Italy. He was fond of the fine arts, patronized Bramante, Michael Angelo, and Raffaelle, and began the structure of St. Peter's Church. See English Cyclopaedia, s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 7, 157; Reichel, Roman See in the Middle Ages, p. 534 sq.; Baxmann, Politik d. Papste; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 7, 37 2 sq. (J.H.W.).

## Julius III, Pope[[@Headword:Julius III, Pope]]

             (Gian-Maria del Monte, CARDINAL GIOCCI), succeeded Paul III in 1550. He was born at Monte San Sovino, near Arezzo, Sept. 10, 1487. He first studied law, but, securing the protection of his uncle, cardinal Antonio del Monte, he entered the Church, and soon became archbishop, and was intrusted with the administration of different dioceses. Paul III made him cardinal of St. Vitale and bishop of St. Palestrina, and sent him as one of the four legates to open the Council of Trent (q.v.). After his elevation to the pontificate he reopened (1551) the sittings of the Council of Trent, suspended under his predecessor (1549). Closely allied to Charles V, he spent his reign in quarrelling with France, Venice, and also with Ferdinand, king of the Romans, and brother of Charles V. His name is linked with English history by his efforts to organize with Mary the reunion of England  with Rome. SEE POPE. Julius III died in March 1555, leaving behind him a very indifferent character, marked by incapacity and misconduct. While a cardinal he was remarkable for his firmness and activity, but after becoming pope he gave himself up to luxury and pleasure, and went so far in his disregard of all consistency as to give the cardinal's place left vacant by his election to one of his servants, whose only merit consisted in having taken care of his pet monkey. See Ciacconi, Vitoe Pontif.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 27, 165; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 7, 158; Ranke, Papacy, 1, 201 sq.; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 7, 458 sq.

## Julius Maternus[[@Headword:Julius Maternus]]

             SEE FIRMICUS.

## Juluka[[@Headword:Juluka]]

             in the mythology of the Caribbeans, is a mighty spirit, living on fish, doves, and other animals. He is of gigantic size, walks over land and sea, and his head projects far above the clouds. His forehead is decorated by a beautiful bandage, made of the feathers of the colibri, splendidly colored; this he  shows morning and evening. It is the rainbow. The remainder of the body remains hid in the clouds. If this spirit does not find enough to eat he causes sickness among the inhabitants. SEE JOULOUKA.

## Jumala[[@Headword:Jumala]]

             the supreme deity of the Laplanders. He was represented by a wooden idol in human form, seated on a sort of altar, with a crown on his head and a bowl in his lap, into which the devotees throw their voluntary offerings.

## Jumenta, Cattle[[@Headword:Jumenta, Cattle]]

             Heretics who denied the resurrection of the dead were accustomed to bestow opprobrious epithets on those who persisted in maintaining the truth of Scripture. Sometimes they called them carnei, animales, jumenta, carnal, sensual, cattle; also lutei, earthy, etc. — Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v.

## Jumnoutri[[@Headword:Jumnoutri]]

             a village on the banks of the river Jumna, which is considered by the Hindus as a spot of remarkable sanctity. Pilgrimage to this place from the low countries was thought to impart to the adventurer virtues almost equal to deification.

## Jumpers Or Barkers[[@Headword:Jumpers Or Barkers]]

             is a name for those persons who, as an inference from 2Sa 6:16, believe that religious worship must be accompanied by violent, agitations, convulsive leaping and dancing. This singular religious belief is said to have originated among the congregations of Mr. Whitefield, in the western part of Wales, about 1760, but it soon found friends among the Quakers, and later among the Irvingites. The Jumpers found special defenders in the Welsh poet William Williams (q.v.), Harris Rowland (q.v.), etc. They are sometimes called Barkers because frequently they do not confine their religious exuberances to jumping and dancing, but accompany them with violent groans and incoherent remarks, often degenerating into a sort of bellowing. Discountenanced in England, the Jumpers emigrated to the United States, and here they continue to flourish moderately. We believe they have some adherents in Pennsylvania and Ohio, and particularly in the extreme West. Evans, in his Sketch of the Denominations of the Christian World (Lond. 1811), relates his experience in a meeting of the Jumpers which he attended: "About the year 1785 I myself was very accidentally present at a meeting which terminated in jumping. It was held in the open air, on a Sunday evening, near Newport, in Monmouthshire. The preacher was one of lady Huntingdon's students, who concluded his sermon with the recommendation of jumping; and I must allow him the praise of consistency, for he got down from the chair on which he stood and jumped  along with his hearers. The arguments he adduced for this purpose were, that David danced before the ark, that the babe leaped in the womb of Elizabeth, and that the man whose lameness was removed leaped and praised God for the mercy which he had received! He expatiated on these topics with uncommon fervency, and then drew the inference that they ought to show similar expressions of joy for the blessings which Jesus Christ had put into their possession. He then gave an impassioned sketch of the sufferings of the Savior, and thereby roused the passions of a few around him into a state of violent agitation. About nine men and seven women for some little time rocked to and fro, groaned aloud, and then jumped with a kind of frantic fury. Some of the audience flew in all directions; others gazed on in silent amazement. They all gradually dispersed except the jumpers, who continued their exertions from eight in the evening till near eleven at night. I saw the conclusion of it; they at last kneeled down in a circle, holding each other by the hand, while one of them prayed with great fervor, and then, all rising up from off their knees, departed; but previous to their dispersion they wildly pointed up towards the sky, and are minded one another that they should soon meet there, and never again be separated."

## Jung[[@Headword:Jung]]

             SEE STILLING.

## Jung, Andreas[[@Headword:Jung, Andreas]]

             a Protestant professor of Strasburg, who was born in 1793, and died in 1863, is the author of, Geschichte des Reichstags zu Speyer in dem Jahre 1529 (Strasburg, 1830): — Geschichte der Reformation der Kirche in Strassburg (ibid. eod.): — Die offentlichen Bibliotheken Strassburg's (1836, 1844). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:634; Schmidt, Discours Academique Prononce a la Memoire de M.A. Jung (1864); Lichtenberger, Ecncyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Junge, Christian Gottfried[[@Headword:Junge, Christian Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Nuremberg, October 20, 1748. He studied at Altdorf, commenced his ministerial career in 1769, was in 1783 professor of theology at Jena, in 1793 pastor at his native city, and died March 27, 1814. He wrote, De Duratione Panarum Infernalium, etc. (Altdorf, 1783): — De Paenarum Divinarum vi Emendatrice (eod.). Besides a number of ascetical works and sermons, he also published the third edition of Doderlein's Summa Institutionis Theologi Christiani (1793). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 1:634; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:23, 298; 2:280. (B.P.)

## Junia, Or Rather Junias[[@Headword:Junia, Or Rather Junias]]

             (Ι᾿ουνίας, a deriv. of Junius, the name of a Roman family), a Christian at Rome, to whom Paul addressed a salutation in connection with Andronicus, as being his "kinsmen and fellow prisoners, who, are of note among the apostles," and were in Christ before himself (Rom 16:7); hence probably of Jewish extraction. A.D. 55. As the gender of the epithets applied is uncertain (συγγενεῖς καὶ συναιχμαλώτους), some (e.g. Origen, Chrysostom, and other fathers) have supposed a female (Ι᾿ουνίαν comes equally well from Ι᾿ουνία) to be meant (but see Michaelis, in Pott's Sylloge, 7, 128).

## Junilius Of Africa[[@Headword:Junilius Of Africa]]

             generally believed to have been bishop in the 6th century, is known by his work De partibus divine legis, dedicated to a certain bishop Primasius, probably the one of Hadrumetum who in 553 indorsed the Constitutum of  Vigilius. Junilius himself claimed no originality, but acknowledged his obligation to a certain Paulus of Persia, supposed to have been Paulus of Bassora, who afterwards became metropolitan of Nisibis (though he was not a Persian). The work is in the form of a dialogue between a master and his pupil, and is a sort of introduction to the sacred writings. The first book, on Scripture, is divided into two parts, on the outward expression and the inward meaning; the outward expression contains five particulars — the species of writing, its authority, its author, its style, and its order of place. The inward meaning has reference especially to three particulars, God, this world, and the next. The second book treats of this world, its creation, its government, the properties and accidents of nature, the nature of will, and the consequences and results of will. Junilius then speaks of types, of predictions before and under the law concerning Christ and the calling of the Gentiles, and of Reason in its agreement with the commands of Scripture. Special attention is due to the fact that Junilius does not count the Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Job, Judith, Esther, and the Maccabees among canonical books. The work has been published as Junilii de Partibus Divinoe Legis, libri 2 (Basil. 1545, 8vo; Francfort ad Oder, 1603, 8vo; and in Biblioth. Patri. 1). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 7, 174 sq.; Clark, Success. of Sac. Lit. 2, 323.

## Juniper[[@Headword:Juniper]]

             (דֹתֶם, ro'them, prob. so called from its use in binding; Sept. in 1Ki 19:4, ῾Ράθαμ v.r. ῾Ραθμέν; in 1Ki 19:5, φυτόν; in Job 30:4, ξύλον; in Psa 120:4, ἐρημικός; Vulg. juniperus. but in Psa 120:4, desolatorius), a shrub or tree mentioned as affording shade to Elijah in his flight to Horeb (1Ki 19:4-5), and as affording material for fuel, and also, in extreme cases, for human food (Psa 120:4; Job 30:4). The older translators seem to have been unacquainted with it, while the modern versions have generally followed the Vulgate in referring it to the juniper (see Stengel in the Biblioth. Brem. 7, fasc. 5; Hiller, Hierophyt. 1, 253; Sprengel, Gesch. d. Botan. 1, 25), which, however, seems to be indicated by a different Hebrew word. SEE HEATH.

The different species of juniper have by some botanists been ranked under Cedrus, the true species being distinguished by the title of Cedrus baccifera, and the pines by that of Cedrus conifera. Of Juniperus, the  ἄρκευθος of the Greeks and abhul of the Arabs, there are several species in Syria. Of these, J. communis, the common juniper, is a very widely diffused species, being found in Europe and Asia, in the plains of northern and in the mountains of southern latitudes, usually forming a low shrub, but in some situations being fifteen feet, and even thirty feet high, J. oxycedrus, the sharp or prickly, or brown berried juniper, closely allied to the common juniper, is an evergreen shrub, from ten to twelve, but sometimes even twenty feet high. It was found by M. Boyd on Mount Lebanon. J. drupacea, or large fruited juniper, is a species which was introduced into Europe from the East under the Arabic name habhel. This name, however, is applied rather to all the species than to any one in particular. It is a native of Mount Cassius, and is thought to be the same as the greater juniper found by Belon on Mount Taurus, which he describes as rising to the height of a cypress. J. Phoenicea, or Phoenician juniper, is the great juniper of Dioscorides, and is a native of the south of Europe, Russia, and Syria. It has imbricated leaves, bears some resemblance to the cypress, and attains a height of from twenty to thirty feet. J. Lycia, or Lycian juniper, is a dwarf species, and J. Sabina, or the common Savine, is usually a low spreading shrub, but sometimes rises to the height often or twelve feet. It is a native of the south of Europe and Syria. Of these species, J. oxycedrus and J. Phoenicea are the only species which could have been the berosh of Scripture. Some are of opinion that the wood of J. oxycedrus, rather than that of the so called cedar of Lebanon is the cedar wood so famed in ancient times for its durability, and which was therefore employed in making statues. It is to the wood of certain species of juniper that the name of cedar wood is now specially applied. SEE CEDAR.

The rothem, however, is no doubt the plant still called by the Arabs retem, and commonly known as Spanish broom. In Loudon's Encyclopoedia of Plants it is named Spartium monospermum, or white single-seeded broom, and is described as a very handsome shrub, remarkable for its numerous snow white flowers. Osbeck remarks that it grows like willow bushes along the shores of Spain, as far as the flying sands reach, where scarcely any other plant exists except the Ononis serpens, or creeping restharrow. The, use of this, shrub is very great in stopping the sand. The leaves and young branches furnish delicious food for goats. It converts the most, barren spot into a fine odoriferous garden by its flowers, which continue a long time. It seems to shelter hogs and goats against the scorching heat of the sun. The  twigs are used for tying bundles, and all kinds of herbs that are brought to market are fastened together with them. The Spaniards call it retama, from the Arabic name retem. It is now referred by all botanists to the genus Genista, and called G. monosperma. It is described by De Candolle as a branching and erect shrub, with slender, wand like, flexible branches; leaves comparatively few, linear, oblong, pressed to the branches, pubescent; inflorescence in few flowered lateral racemes; petals white, silky, nearly equal to one another; legumes oval, inflated, smooth, membranaceous, one to two seeded. It occurs on the sterile shores of Portugal, Spain, Barbary, and Egypt. It was found by Forskal at Suez, and named by him Genista Spartium? with roetoem as its Arabic name. Bove also found it at Suez, and again in different parts of Syria. Belon also mentions finding it in several places when traveling in the East. Burckhardt also frequently mentions the shrub rethem in the deserts to the south of Palestine, and he thought it to be the same plant as the Genista roetoem of Forskal. He states that whole plains are sometimes covered with this shrub, and that such places are favorite places of pasturage, as sheep are remarkably fond of the pods. Lord Lindsay again, while traveling in the middle of the valleys of Mount Sinai, says, "The rattam, a species of broom, bearing a white flower, delicately streaked with purple, afforded me frequent shelter from the sun while in advance of the caravan" (Letters, p. 183). Dr. Robinson, in his journey from Akabah to Jerusalem, says (Researches, 2, 124): "The shrubs which we had met with throughout the desert still continued. One of the principal of these is the retem, a species of the broom plant, the Genista roetoem of Forskal. This is the largest and most conspicuous shrub of these deserts, growing thickly in the water courses and valleys. Our Arabs always selected the place of encampment, if possible, in a spot where it grew, in order to be sheltered by it at night from the wind; and during the day, when they often went on in advance of the camels, we found them not unfrequently sitting or sleeping under a bush of retem to protect them from the sun. It was in this very desert, a day's journey from Beersheba, that the prophet Elijah lay down and slept beneath the same shrub" (1Ki 19:4-5, "under a juniper tree"). It affords shade and protection, both in heat and storm, to travelers (Virgil, Georg. 2, 434, 436), and Bonar describes it as particularly useful for shelter in the peninsula of Arabia Petraea (Sinai, p. 190).

In the other passages the meaning is not so clear, and therefore different interpretations have been given. Thus Job (Job 30:4) says of the half  famished people who despised him, "Who cut up mallows by the bushes, and rothem roots for their food." Though the broom root may perhaps be more suitable for diet than the juniper, yet they are both too bitter and medicinal to be considered or used as nutritious, and therefore some say that "when we read that rothem roots were their food, we are to suppose a great deal more than the words express, namely, that their hunger was so violent as not to refrain even from these roots," which were neither refreshing nor nourishing. Dr. Thomson's ingenious suggestion (Land and Book, 2, 438), that perhaps the mallows only were used for food, and the rothem roots as fuel to cook them with, seems hardly tenable from the phraseology. Ursinus supposes (Arboret. Bibl. c. 27) that instead of the roots of this broom we are to understand a plant which grows upon these roots, as well as upon some other plants, and which is well known by the English name of broom rape, the orobanche of botanists. These are sometimes eaten. Thus Dioscorides (2, 136) observes that the orobanche, which grows from the roots of broom, was sometimes eaten raw, or boiled like asparagus. Celsius again suggests an amendment in the sentence, and thinks that we should understand it to mean that the broom roots were required for fuel, and not for food, as the Hebrew words signifying fuel and food, though very similar to each other, are very different in their derivation (see Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 1317; on the contrary, Michaelis, Neue Orient. Bibl. 5, 4, 5), and this sense is confirmed by some of the Talmudical writers, as R. Levi ben-Gerson, in his, remarks on this passage, says. The broom is the only fuel procurable in many of these desert situations (see Thevenot, Trav. 1, 222). In Psa 120:4, David observes that the calumnies of his enemies were "like arrows of the mighty, with coals of rothem." The broom, being no doubt very commonly used as fuel in a country where it is abundant and other plants scarce, might readily suggest itself in a comparison; but it is also described as sparkling, burning, and crackling more vehemently than other wood, and the Arabs regard it as yielding the best charcoal. Thus the tree which afforded shade to Elijah may have furnished also the "coals" or ashes for baking the cake which satisfied his hunger (1Ki 19:6). See Celsius, Hierobot. 1, 246; Oedmann, Verm. Sammlungen, 2, 8; Forskal, Flora Aeg. et Arab. p. 56 and 214; Schultens, Comment. on Job, ad loc.; Robinson, Research. 1, 299; Burckhardt, Syria, p. 483; Pliny. H.N. 24, 9, 65; Balfour, Plants of the Bible, p. 50; Stanley, S. and P. p. 20, 79, 521.

## Junius, Francis[[@Headword:Junius, Francis]]

             son of the following, was born at Heidelberg, 1589. In early life he studied mathematics, but finally turned his attention to literature and theology. After finishing his studies he went to France to visit his parents. In 1620 he came over to England, and was received into the house of the earl of Arundel, where he lived as his librarian for thirty years. In 1650 he returned to the Continent, in order to pass some time in the bosom of his family. For two years he lived in Friesland, in a district where the ancient Saxon tongue was preserved, that he might study the language. In 1675 he returned to England, and in 1676 went to Oxford, whence he retired to Windsor, to his nephew saad Vossius; and died there Nov. 19 1677. He was a very learned philologian, as is evinced by his writings, — which are De pictura Veterum, libri 3 (Amsterdam, 1637, 4to): — Observationes in Willerami Paraphrasim Franicicam Cantici Canticorum (Amsterdam. 1655, 8vo): — Annotationes in harmoniam Latino-francicam quatuor Evangelistarum Latine a Tatian. confectam (Amsterd. 1655, 8vo): — Quatuor D.N.J.C. Evangeliorum Versiones perantiquoe duoe, Gothica scilicet et Anglo-saxonica, etc.; Accedit et glossarium Gothicum: cui proemittitur alphabetum Gothicum, Runicum, Anglo-saxonicum, etc. (Dordrechti, 1655, 4to): — Coedemonis Paraphrasis poetica Geneseos (Amsterdam, 1655, 4to). His Etymologicum Anglicanum was edited by Edward Lye, Oxford, 1743, folio. — Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. 1, 697.

## Junius, Franciscus[[@Headword:Junius, Franciscus]]

             (Françoise Du Jon), an eminent French Protestant theologian, was born at Bourges in 1545. He studied law at first, but embracing the principles of the Reformation, for which his father suffered persecution, he removed to Geneva in 1562, to study the dead languages and theology. In 1565 he took charge of a Walloon congregation at Antwerp: the party troubles of the time, however, obliged him to withdraw first to a church in Limburg, and finally to Germany. Frederick II welcomed him at Heidelberg, and he obtained a church in the Palatinate. During the war of 1568 he lived in the Low Countries, and was chaplain of the Prince of Orange. He afterwards again returned to his charge, and remained there until 1573, when he was called to Heidelberg by the elector, to take part with Tremellius in the translation of the Old Testament. After being also for a while professor of theology at Heidelberg, he returned to France in 1592 with the duke of Bouillon, and was employed by Henry IV on a mission to Germany. Later  he accepted a professorship at Leyden, where he remained until his death in 1602. His principal work was the Latin translation of the Old Testament, which he executed in conjunction with Tremellius. It appeared in five parts, the first containing the five books of Moses (Frankfort, 157b, folio); the second embracing the historical books, 1576; the third the poetical books; 1579; the fourth the prophets, 1579; and the fifth the apocryphal books, 1579. After the death of Tremellius the translation was revised by his colleague, and printed at London, 1584, 8vo. In the course of twenty years it passed through twenty editions, and was printed for the last time at Zurich, 1764, 8vo. Junius lived to superintend a third edition, 1596, folio; but the best edition probably is the seventh, published in 1624, folio, containing a good index by Paul Tossanus. "The index was published in volume by itself at Frankfort; 1687, folio, and repeatedly after. The translation cannot be called elegant; it is too literal, and is sometimes obscure on that account. It is also disfigured with useless glosses and rabbinical traditions" (Kitto). He wrote besides, Apocalypseos Analysis (1592): — Grammatica Linguoe Hebroeoe (3d edition, 1593): — Acta Apostolorum et epistoloe 2 S. Pauilli ad Corinth. ex Arabica translatione Latine reddita — Procataclema ad V.T. interpretationem: — proelectiones in 3 priora capita Geneseos: — Explicatio 4 priorum Psalmorum: — Psalmus 101, seu principis Christiani institutio: — Comment. in Ezechielem: Expositio Danielis: — Lectiones in Jonam: — Sacra parallela: — Notoe, in Epistolam S. Judoe. His Opera theologica were published at Geneva in 1613, in two vols. folio. and are partly exegetical, partly philological and polemic. His autobiography, which is published at the beginning of his works, was written in 1595, and is the source of his biographies published by Melch. Adam and in Bayle's Dictionary. See Haag. La France Protestante; Herzog, Real-Encykop. s.v.; Kitto, s.v. (J.H.W.)

## Junius, Robert[[@Headword:Junius, Robert]]

             a Dutch missionary, a native of Delft, who flourished in the 17th century, was sent by the Dutch government to the western part of the island of Formosa in 1634, and was eminently successful in his missionary labors. He is said to have baptized no less than six thousand persons. He also provided good educational advantages for the natives, and over six hundred young men crowded the schools he had founded. Of his personal history in other respects we are ignorant. His literary labors were confined to efforts in behalf of the people to whom he was sent. He composed some  prayers, and translated certain Psalms into the Formosan language. He returned to Holland in after days, but the date of his death is not known to us. See Mosheim, Ecclesiastes Hist. 3, bk. 4, cent. 17, sect. 1, note 24.

## Junkheim, Johann Zacharias Leonhard[[@Headword:Junkheim, Johann Zacharias Leonhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Anspach, September 8, 1729. He studied at Gottingen, was in 1754 vicar at his native place, and two years later pastor there. In 1757 he was rector of the gymnasium in Anspach, in 1764 court-preacher, and died August 17, 1790. He wrote, De Argumento pro Religione a Constantia Martyrum (Gottingen, 1751): — Progr. ad 1 Petr. 4:1, 2 (1762): — De Providentia Divina (eod.): — Decas Quaestionum Synodalium (1783-90). He also published Sermons. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:157; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:394, 444; 2:288. (B.P.)

## Junkin, David X., D.D[[@Headword:Junkin, David X., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Mercer, Pennsylvania, January 8, 1808. He graduated from Jefferson College in 1831, and studied two years at Princeton Theological Seminary. In 1835 he was ordained pastor at Greenwich, N.J.; in 1841 became professor of belles-lettres in Lafayette College; in 1848 pastor of the F Street Church, Washington, D.C.; in 1853 at Hollidaysburg, Pennsylvania; in 1860 chaplain at Annapolis, Maryland; in 1866 pastor of the North Church, Chicago, Illinois, and in the same year at Newcastle, Pennsylvania. He died at Martinsburg, West Virginia, April 22, 1880. Dr. Junkin was an eloquent and successful preacher, and a ready writer, being the author of several valuable books, among which was one entitled The Oath a Divine Ordinance, and an Element of the Social Constitution (N.Y. 1845, 12mo). See New York Observer, May 6, 1880; Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 83. (W.P.S.)

## Junkin, George, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Junkin, George, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister of note, was born in Kingston, Cumberland Comity, Pa., Nov. 1, 1790, entered Jefferson College in 1809, and graduated in 1813. While at college he was converted (1811), and upon the completion of his collegiate studies he entered at once on a theological course of study under Dr. John M. Mason in New York city, was ordained at Gettysburg, Pa. in 1818, and remained in the pastorate, though teaching and editing a paper a part of the time, till 1830. He was principal of Pennsylvania Manual Labor Academy at Germantown, Pa., from 1830 to 1832; president of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., from 1832 to 1841; president of Miami University from 1841 to 1844; Was then recalled to the presidency of Lafayette College; and was president of Washington College, Lexington, Va., from 1848 to 1861, when, on the secession of Virginia, he left the college, his home, and his property. Lafayette College thereafter honored him with an Emeritus professorship. He died May 20,1868. "Dr. Junkin for many years maintained a great influence in the Church courts, sustained by his thorough knowledge of every subject on which he attempted to speak, and the keen logic with which he exposed the fallacies in the arguments of his opponents. In 1844 he was moderator of the General Assembly. In 1833 he received the degree of D.D. from Jefferson College, and in 1856 that of LL.D. from Rutgers College. Dr. Junkin performed an amazing amount of work in his lifetime. His preaching record shows that he delivered a larger number of sermons than most pastors do, while his toils in building up and reviving colleges, in laborious agencies, in ecclesiastical labors in the Church courts, in the professor's chair, at the editor's desk, and through the press, in his numerous books, sermons, and essays, make us wonder how he could find the time and endure the labor of doing so much." He published The Educator, a periodical, in 1838; The Vindication, containing a history of the trial of the Rev. Albert Barnes by the Second Presbytery and by the Synod of Philadelphia, in 1836; A Treatise on Justifcation, in 1839; The Little Stone and the Great Image, or Lectures on the Prophecies, in 1844; The Great Apostasy, a sermon on Romanism, in 1853; Political Fallacies, in 1862; A Treatise on Sanctification, in 1864; and The Tabernacle, or the Gospel according to Moses. in 1865. See Index volume (No. 2) to Princeton Review, p. 226 sq.

## Juno[[@Headword:Juno]]

             the Roman name of the queen of heaven, essentially identical with the Grecian Hera. Juno was the daughter of Kronos (Saturn) and Rhea. She was the highest and most powerful divinity of the Greeks and Romans next to Jupiter (the Greek Ζεύς), of whom she was the sister and wife. Argos and Samos claimed the honor of her birth. According to Homer, she was educated by Oceanus and Thetis; according to others, by the Hours. Her marriage with Jupiter on the island of Crete was honored by the presence of all the gods. This marriage, according to Homer, was consummated without the knowledge of their parents. Others say that he subdued her by artifice on the island of Samos, and there married her. According to the Greek conception of her character, she was proud, ambitious, and jealous; and in the Homeric poems she is represented as an obstinate, quarrelsome shrew and her temper a source of continual discord between herself and her lord. She often spitefully favors persons who were the objects of his displeasure, and he, in return, treats her with all that severity which, in ancient times, the husband was accustomed to use towards the wife. He scolds and often beats her, and on one occasion, when she had driven Hercules, the favorite of her husband, to Cos by a storm, Jupiter was so angry that he bound her hands and feet, loaded her with two anvils; and suspended her from Olympus; and, to add to the inconveniences of her situation, none of the gods were permitted to help her. During the Trojan War she lulls Jupiter to sleep, in order to give the victory to the Greeks during his slumbers, and with difficulty escapes the blows which are aimed at her when he awakes.

No one of the goddesses dared contend with her. Diana once attempted it, but her cheeks exhibited the most woeful evidences of the strength of the mighty Juno. All, in fine, who assumed to themselves or attributed to others a superiority to her, experienced her vengeance. But she is, notwithstanding, a female of majestic beauty, the grandest of the Olympian goddesses, well calculated to inspire awe, although wanting the soft, insinuating, and heart touching beauty of Venus. As the only wedded goddess in the Greek mythology, she naturally presided over marriage and the birth of children. It is a significant feature of the Roman character that Juno, in addition to her other qualities, was the guardian of the national finances, watching over her people like a thrifty mother and housewife; and a temple, containing the mint, was erected to her on the Capitoline as Juno Moneta (the Money coiner). In the Roman conception she was also the goddess of chastity, and prostitutes  were forbidden to touch her altars. She was, in short, the protector of women. She not only presided over the fertility of marriage, but also over its inviolable sanctity, and unchastity and inordinate love of sexual pleasures were hated by the goddess. Women in childbed invoked Juno Lucina to help them, and after the delivery of the child a table was laid out for her in the house for a whole week, for newly born children were likewise under her protection. The month of June, which was originally called Junonius, was considered to be the most favorable period for marrying. As Juno has the same characteristics as her husband in so far as they refer to the female sex, she presides over all human affairs, which are based upon justice and faithfulness, but especially over domestic affairs, in which women are more particularly concerned. The companions of Juno were the Nymphs, Graces, and Hours. Isis was her particular servant. Among animals, the peacock, the goose, and the cuckoo were sacred to her. Her usual attribute is the royal diadem, formed like a long triangle. She is drawn in a carriage by two peacocks. She had several temples in Rome. The first day of every month, and the whole of June, were sacred to her. See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography, 2, 658.

## Jupiter[[@Headword:Jupiter]]

             (the Latin form of the Greek name Zeus, Ζεύς Genit. Διός), the principal deity of the Greek and Roman mythology, in which he is fabled to have been the son of Saturn and Ops. He is supposed to represent the fertilizing power of the heavens (see Creuzer, Symbolik, 2, 518, 522), and was worshipped under various epithets. See Walch, Dissert in Acta Apost. 3, 173; compare Horace, Odyssey, 1, 10, 5; Ovid, Fasti, 5, 495; Metamorph. 8, 626; Tzetz. in Lycophr. 481; "Hermes κήρυξΔιός," Apollod. Bibl. 3, 10, 2; Homer, Iliad. 2, 402; Virg. AEn. 3, 21; 9, 627; Xen. Cyrop. 8, 3, 31; Senec. Herc. Fur. 299. SEE MERCURY; SEE DIANA. (See Schmebel, De Jove πολιούχῳ ad Ac. Altdorf, 1740). This deity is alluded to in several passages of the Bible, and Josephus frequently refers to his worship. The following statements are chiefly from Kitto's Cyclopoedia, s.v.:

1. It is stated in 2Ma 6:1-2, that "the king sent an old man of Athens (Sept. Α᾿θηναῖον; Vulg. Antiochenum) (some say 'an old man, Atheneas,' but Grotius, following the Latin, suggests instead of Α᾿θηναῖον to read Α᾿ντιόχειον) to compel the Jews to depart from the laws of their fathers, and not to live after the laws of God; and to pollute also the Temple in  Jerusalem, and to call it the temple of Jupiter Olympius (Atob Διὸς Ο᾿λυμπίου), and that in Gerizim, of Jupiter the defender of strangers (Sept. Διὸς Ξενίου; Vulg. hospitalis), as they did desire that dwelt in the place." Olympius was a very common epithet of Zeus, and he is sometimes simply called Ο᾿λύμπιος (Homer, 2. 19, 108). Olympia, in Greece, was the seat of the temple and sacred grove of Zeus Olympius, and it was here that the famous statue of gold and ivory, the work of Phidias, was erected. Caligula attempted to have this statue removed to Rome, and it was only preserved in its place by the assurance that it would not bear removal (Josephus, Ant. 19, 1, 1). Antiochus Epiphanes, as related by Athenaeus, surpassed all other kings in his worship and veneration of the gods, so that it was impossible to count the number of the statues he erected. His especial favorite was Zeus. The Olympian Zeus was the national god of the Hellenic race (Thucydides, 3, 14), as well as the supreme ruler of the heathen world, and, as such, formed the true opposite to Jehovah, who had revealed himself as the God of Abraham. Antiochus commenced, in B.C. 174, the completion of the temple of Zeus Olympius at Athens (Polybius, Reliq. 26, 10; Livy, Hist. 41, 20), and associated the worship of Jupiter with that of Apollo at Daphne, erecting a statue to the former god resembling that of Phidias at Olympia (Amm. Marcell. 22, 13, 1). Games were celebrated at Daphne by Antiochus, of which there is a long account in Polybius (Reliq. 31, 3) and Atheneus (5, 5). Coins also were struck referring to the god and the games (Mionnet, 5, 215; Muller, Antiq. Antioch. p. 62-64). On the coins of Elis, the wreath of wild olive (κότινος) distinguishes Zeus Olympius from the Dodonaean Zeus, who has an oak wreath.

Antiochus, after compelling the Jews to call the Temple of Jerusalem the temple of Jupiter Olympius, built an idol altar upon the altar of God. Upon this altar swine were offered every day, and the broth of their flesh was sprinkled about the Temple (1Ma 1:46; 2Ma 6:5; Josephus, Ant. 12, 5, 4; 13, 8, 2; War, 1, 1, 2). The idol altar which was upon the altar of God (τὁν βωμὸν ὃς ην ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου) was considered by the Jews to be the "abomination of desolation" (βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως, 1Ma 1:54) foretold by Daniel (11:31; 12:11) and mentioned by our Lord (Mat 24:15). Many interpretations of the meaning of this prophecy have been given. SEE ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION.

The grove of Daphne was not far from Antioch ( Δάφνη ἡ πρὸς Α᾿ντιόχειαν, 2Ma 4:33; Josephus, War, 1, 12, 15), and at this city  Antiochus Epiphanes erected a temple for the worship of Jupiter Capitolinus. SEE DAPHNE. It is described by Livy as having its walls entirely adorned with gold (41, 20). To Jupiter Capitolinus the Jews, after the taking of Jerusalem, in whatever country they might be, were compelled by Vespasian to pay two drachmae, as they used to pay to the Temple at Jerusalem (Josephus, War, 7, 6, 6; Dion Cass. 66, 7). Hadrian, after the second revolt of the Jews, erected a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus in the place where the temple of God formerly stood (Dion Cass. 69, 12). There is, probably, reference made to Jupiter Capitolinus in Dan 11:38, alluding to Antiochus Epiphanes: "But in his estate shall he worship the god of forces" (fortresses,אֵֹלהֵי מָעֻזַּי, see Gesenius, Thesaur. s.v. מָעוֹז, p. 1011), for under this name Jupiter was worshipped by the victorious general on his return from a campaign, and it was in honor of Jupiter Capitolinus that he celebrated his triumph. Other conjectures have been made relative to this passage, but the opinion of Gesenius seems most probable. SEE MAUZZIM.

In the passage from 2 Macc. above quoted a temple was also ordered to be set up to Zeus Xenius on Mount Gerizim. Josephus gives a different account. He relates that the Samaritans, who, when it pleased them, denied that they were of the kindred of the Jews, wrote to Antiochus, the god (θεός on coins) Epiphanes, begging him to allow the temple on, Mount Gerizim, which had no name (ἀνώνυμον ἱερόν; comp. "Ye worship ye know not what," Joh 4:22), to be called the temple of Jupiter Hellenius (Ant. 12, 5, 5). This petition is said to have been granted. The epithet Ξένιος is given to Zeus as the supporter of hospitality and the friend of strangers (Plutarch, Amator. 20; Xenoph. Anab. 3 2, 4; Virgil, AEneid, 1, 735, etc.), and it is explained in 2 Macc. by the clause "as they did desire (Greek καθώς ἐτύγχανον, as they were; Vulg. prout erant hi, [as they were]) who dwelt in the place." Ewald supposes that Jupiter was so called on account of the hospitable disposition of the Samaritans (Geschichte, 4, 339, note), while Jahn suggests that it was because the Samaritans, in their letter to Antiochus Epiphanes, said that they were strangers in that country (Hebrew Commonwealth, 1, 319); Grotius says because the dwellers of the place were pilgrims from the regions of Mysia and Mesopotamia, specially referring to their idolatrous practices (2Ki 17:24 sq.).

2. The appearance of the gods upon earth was very commonly believed among the ancients. Accordingly we find that Jupiter and Mercury are said  to have wandered in Phrygia, and to have been entertained by Baucis and Philemon (Ovid, Met. 8, 611 sq.). Hence the people of Lycaonia, as recorded in Acts (Act 14:11), cried out, "The gods have come down to us in the likeness of men; and they called Barnabas Jupiter, and Paul Mercurius, because he was the chief speaker." Barnabas was probably identified with Jupiter not only because Jupiter and Mercury were companions (Ovid. Fast. 5, 495), but because his personal appearance was majestic (Chrysostom, Hom. 30; Alford, on Act 14:12; comp. 2Co 10:1; 2Co 10:10). Paul was identified with Mercury as the speaker, for this god was the god of eloquence (Horace, lib. 1, od. 10:5, etc.). The temple of Jupiter at Lystra appears to have been outside the gates (τοῦ Διὸς τοῦ ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως, Act 14:13), as was frequently the custom (Strabo, 14, 4; Herod. 1, 26), and the priest being summoned, oxen and garlands were brought, in order to do sacrifice with the people to Paul and Barnabas, who, filled with horror, restrained the people with great difficulty. It is well known that oxen were wont to be sacrificed to Jupiter (Homer, Il. 2, 402; Virgil, AEn. 3, 21; 9, 627; Xenoph. Cyrop. 7, 3, 11, etc.). According to the interpretation of others, however, the sacrifice was about to be offered before the doors of the house where the apostles were (ἐπὶ τοὺς πυλῶνας). Alford (Comment. ad loc.) denies that there is any ellipsis of τοῦ ναοῦ in the phrase ἱερεὺς τοῦ Διός his references, however, do not sustain his position; for Ζεὺς προπύλωνος would not necessarily be πρὸτῆς πόλεως, but merely the tulelary deity of a private mansion.

3. The word Εùδία (fair or fine weather) is derived from ευ and Δία. Jupiter, as lord of heaven, had power over all the changes of the weather. The Latins even used his name to signify the air — sub Dio (Horace, lib. 2, od. 3, 23), sub Jove frigido (Horace, lib. 1, od. 1, 25, etc. comp. "the image which fell down from Jupiter," A. Vers.; καὶ τοῦ διοπετοῦς, Act 19:35). The word εὐδία occurs in Mat 16:2, and in Sirach 3, 15. (For a full account of Jupiter and Zeus, see Smith's Dict. of Biography, s.v.; and for a list of the epithets applied to this god, see Rawlinson, Herod. vol. 1, Appendix, p. 680.)

## Jure Divino[[@Headword:Jure Divino]]

             an expression meaning "by divine right" used in connection with the question of the source of the ministerial authority. They who claim the "jus divinum" for that authority contend that the episcopal discipline and orders, having issued immediately from the authority of God, are the exclusive channel through which holy ordinances can be lawfully or efficaciously exercised. Others again (who consequently relinquish the jure-divino claim), while they maintain that the episcopal regimen is agreeable to the will of Christ and the practice of his apostles, do not find a warrant for holding the above exclusive views, nor for asserting the utter invalidity, while they still admit the irregularity of any other ministrations. In their opinion, the claims of a Christian ministry rest not on any unbroken succession, but on the basis of the divinely sanctioned institution of a Christian Church. The authority, therefore with which a Christian minister is invested they consider to be derived from Christ only by virtue of the sanction given by him to Christian communities; and they hold that it comes direct from the Church in whose name and behalf he acts as its representative, and just to that extent to which it has empowered and directed him to act. They consider that the system which makes the sacramental virtue of holy orders inherent indefeasibly in each individual minister detracts from the claims of the Church, makes the Church a sort of appendage to the priesthood, and, in fact, confounds the Church with the clergy, as if the spiritual community consisted only of its officers — Eden, Eccles. Dictionary, s.v. SEE SUCCESSION.

## Jurieu, Pierre[[@Headword:Jurieu, Pierre]]

             an eminent French Protestant theologian, was born at Mer, in the diocese of Blois, in 1637. He was the son of a Protestant minister, and nephew of the celebrated Rivet and Du Moulin. He possessed uncommon talents, and when barely nineteen received the master's degree, and after traveling in Holland and England, returned to his country to succeed his father in his pastoral office. His reputation for learning in 1674 obtained for him the situation of professor of theology and the Hebrew language in the Huguenot seminary at Sedan. When in 1681 the Protestants were deprived by Louis XIV of the permission, to give public instruction in that town, he retired to Rouen, and from thence went to Rotterdam, where he was appointed professor of theology. In that city the ardor of his zeal soon drew him into controversy with Bayle, Basnage, and Saurin, in the heat of  which he manifested the same rancor which unfortunately disgraces most of his polemical writings. He allowed himself likewise to fall into various errors by too much indulging a naturally lively imagination in the interpretation of prophecy. In his Commentary on the Apocalypse he even predicted the establishment of Protestantism in France during the year 1686. Those who differed from him in opinion, however high their character for learning and piety, he treated with a most unbecoming severity. Grotius and Hammond, perhaps the two greatest theologians of their age, because they differed from him on the subject of the Antichrist predicted in the book of Revelation, he styles "the disgrace of the Reformed Church, and even of Christianity." The same spirit is manifested in his well known controversy with the great Bossuet, whom he does not scruple to accuse of falsehood and dishonesty, though on the other hand; it must be allowed that the recriminations of this celebrated defender of the Church of Rome; if more politely expressed, are equally severe and destitute of truth; the great object of Bossuet being, it would appear, to charge his antagonist with holding the heretical opinions of the Socinians (Bossuet, Hist. des Vindications, 4, 64; 5, 236-238). With all these defects, Jurieu stands deservedly high as a controversialist. His learning was most profound; he is generally exact in the citation of his authorities, and he had a special talent in discovering the weak point in the cause of his antagonists. In respect of style and eloquence he is immeasurably behind Bossuet, but he is at least his equal in polemical talent, and by some is considered his superior in erudition. All of his writings are held in esteem by theologians of every shade as a storehouse of great research. Jurieu's private life was becoming that of a Christian minister; he was charitable to the poor almost beyond his means, and employed his influence abroad in alleviating the sufferings of his exiled brethren. He died Jan. 11, 1713. His principal works are, Histoire. du Calvinisme et du Papisme mise en parallele, etc. (Rotterdam, 1682, 2 vols. 12mo; 2d edit., ibid. 1683, 12mo): — Lettres Pastorales (Rotterdam, 1686-7, 3 vols. 12mo): — Le Vrai Systeme de l'Eglise (Dord. 1686, 8vo): L'Esprit de M. Arnauld (Deventer [Rotterdam], 1684, 2 vols. 12mo): — Prejuges legitimes contre le Papisme (Amst. 1685, 8vo): — Apologie pour l'Accomplissement des Propheties (1687, which has been translated into English, Lond. 1687, 2 parts, 8vo): — La Religion des Latitudinaires (Rotterd. 1696, 8vo); Histoire des Dogmes et des Cultes (Amst. 1704, 12mo; also translated into English, Lond. 1705, 2 vols.): — La politique du clerge de France (Amst.  1681, 12mo). — English Cyclop.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 7, 126; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 27, 267 sq.

## Jurisdiction[[@Headword:Jurisdiction]]

             is an ecclesiastical term denoting the power and authority vested in a bishop, by virtue of the apostolical commission, of governing and administering the laws of the Church within the bounds of his diocese. The same term is also used to express the bounds within which a bishop exercises his power, i.e. his diocese. To define this power of the ecclesiastic properly from that of civil jurisdiction has led to no little discussion. Of old the earl and bishop sat in the same court. Afterwards the bishop held his courts by himself, though temporal lords sat in synod with bishops — "the one to search the laws of the land, and the other the laws of God." The question of jurisdiction, after the period of the Conqueror, was often agitated between the pope and sovereigns. The things, the latter argued, and reasonably, that are Caesar's belong to Caesar, and it is treason to take them from him; the things that are God's belong to God, and it is impiety to take them from him. The Church is a free society, and should have perfect power of self government within its own domain, and a purely spiritual sentence should be beyond review by a civil court. SEE INVESTITURE; SEE KEYS, POWER OF.

## Jus Asyli[[@Headword:Jus Asyli]]

             the right of protection. From the 4th century, the privilege of asylum, or the right of protecting criminals, was possessed by Christian churches and altars. This privilege had belonged to sacred places among Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, and from them it may have been adopted by Christians. It seems to have been first introduced into the Christian Church in the time of Constantine; but the right was subsequently much circumscribed by various restrictions, as it was found to be a serious hindrance to the administration of justice. Since the 16th century the privilege has been almost entirely abolished. — Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v. SEE ASYLUM.

## Jus Devolutum[[@Headword:Jus Devolutum]]

             (devolved right). When, in the Established Church of Scotland, a patron does not present to a parish within six months after the commencement of the vacancy, the right of presentation falls to the presbytery, tanquam jure  devoluto. Still further to guard against abuse, it has been enacted (act 1719, c. 29) "that if patron shall present any person to a vacant church who shall not be qualified, by taking and subscribing the said oath in manner aforesaid, or shall present a person to any vacancy who is then or shall be pastor or minister of any other church or parish, or any person who shall not accept or declare his willingness to accept of the presentation and charge to which he is presented, within the said time, such presentation shall not be accounted any interruption of the course of time allowed to the patron for presenting; but the jus devolutum shall take place as if no such presentation had been offered, any law or custom to the contrary notwithstanding." — Eadie, Ecclesiastical Dictionary, s.v. SEE PATRONAGE.

## Jus Exuviarum[[@Headword:Jus Exuviarum]]

             SEE SPOLIATION.

## Jus Gislii Or Metatus[[@Headword:Jus Gislii Or Metatus]]

             SEE IMMUNITY.

## Jus primarum precum[[@Headword:Jus primarum precum]]

             SEE EXPECTANCY.

## Jus tus[[@Headword:Jus tus]]

             (Ι᾿οῦστος, for Lat, Justus, just; a frequent name among the Jews, equivalent to צִדַּיק, Josephus. Life, 9, 65, 76), the name or surname of several men. Schottgen (Hor. Hebr. in Act. Ap.) shows by quotations from Rabbinical writers that this name was not unusual among the Jews.

1. Another name for JOSEPH SEE JOSEPH (q.v.), surnamed BARSABAS, who was one of the two selected as candidates for the vacant apostolate of Judas (Act 1:23).

2. A proselyte at Corinth, in whose house, adjoining the synagogue, Paul preached to the Gentiles after leaving the synagogue (Act 18:7). A.D. 49.

3. Otherwise called JESUS, a Jewish Christian, named in connection with M ark by Paul as being his only fellow laborers at Rome when he wrote to the Colossians (Col 4:11). A.D. 57. Tradition (Acta Sanctorum, Jun. 4, 67) names him as the bishop of Eleutheropolis!

## Jushab-hesed[[@Headword:Jushab-hesed]]

             (Hebrew Yushab'-Che'sed, חֶסֶד יוּשִׁב, returner of kindness; Sept. Α᾿σοβαέσδ v.r. Α᾿σοβέθ; Vulg. Josabhesed), the last named of the sons of Pedaiah, of the royal line of Judah (1Ch 2:20; see Strong's Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 17, where it is shown that this is not a son of Zerubbabel, as appears in the text, which, immediately adds that these sons were in all five, either meaning merely those enumerated in the same verse, or requiring one of these [prob. the one in question, since it lacks the distinctive connecting particle ו, "and"] to be regarded as another name for the preceding, inasmuch as at least six sons would otherwise be enumerated. See 1Ch 2:19). B.C. cir. 536.

## Justel, Christopher[[@Headword:Justel, Christopher]]

             an eminent French Protestant canonist, was born at Paris in 1580. He became counsellor and secretary to the king of France, and died in 1649.  He is said to have been one of the most learned men of the Middle Ages, and, according to Haag, one of those whose writings throw great light on the obscure parts of the history of the early Church. His works have been published under the style of Bibliotheca juris canonici veteris, in duos tomos distributa, quorum unus canonum ecclesiasticorcum codices antiquos, tum Groeos, tum Latinos complectitur; alter vero insigniores juris canonici veteris collectores Groecos exhibet, ex antiquis codicibus MSS. Bibliothecoe Christophori Justelli. Opera et studio Gulielmi Voelli, theologi ac socii Sarbonici, et Henrici Justelli, Christophori F. (Paris, 1661, 2 vols. fol.). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 27, 287.

## Justel, Henry[[@Headword:Justel, Henry]]

             a French Protestant canonist, son of Christopher Justel (q.v.), was born at Paris in 1620. He succeeded his father as secretary and counsellor to king Henry IV. He appears to have foreseen the coming revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), and went to London in 1681. He was there appointed librarian of St. James, and retained that situation until his death Sept. 24, 1693. He had sent to the University of Oxford, by his friend Dr. Hickes, the original Greek MS. of the Canones Ecclesioe universalis, and received in return from that institution the degree of LL.D. in 1675. He was a friend of Locke and Leibnitz, and corresponded with most of the learned men of his day, by all of whom he was highly esteemed. His principal work is his edition of Christopher Justel's (see above) Bibliotheca juris canonici veteris. See Chauffepie, Nouv. Dict. Histor. et Crit.; Dupin, Bibliotheca des Auteurs Eccles. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 27, 289.

## Justi, Karl Wilhelm[[@Headword:Justi, Karl Wilhelm]]

             a German Protestant theologian, was born at Marburg, January 14,1767. He was educated at Jena, and became a private tutor at Metzlar, whence he removed to Marburg as a preacher in 1790. In 1793 he was chosen professor of philosophy in the university. In 1801 he was appointed archdeacon; soon after, superintendent and consistorialrath; in 1814 was made oberpfarrer, and in 1822 professor of theology. He died Aug. 7, 1846. Justi devoted himself to the study of O. and N.T. exegesis, after the method of Eichhorn and Herder. He was a man of erudition, taste, and liberality. The Prophets of the O.T. occupied his chief attention, and he published editions of several books of the O. Test. Scriptures. But he is especially noted for the three following works: Nationalgesange der  Hebriaer (1803-1818, 3 vols.): — an enlarged edition of Herder's Geist der Hebraischen Poesie (1829, 2 vols.): — Blumien althebraischer Dichtkunst (1809, 2 vols.): — Zionitische Harfenklange (1829). — Kitto, Cyclopoedia of Biblical Literature, 2, 699; Brockhaus, Conversations- Lex. 8, 566.

## Justi, Leonhard Johann Karl[[@Headword:Justi, Leonhard Johann Karl]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Miinchhausen, Hesse, December 5, 1753. He studied at Marburg and Gottingen, was in 1774 deacon at Marburg, and commenced his academical career in 1775. In 1779 he was professor, and succeeded his brother as first pastor of St. Elizabeth; He died May 12, 1800, leaving, Weissagungsgesang Mosis an die Israeliten, Deuteronomy 32 (Gottingen, 1774): — De Bileami Asina Loquente ad Numbers 22 (Marburg, eod.): — Ueber die den AEgyptern von den Israeliten bei ihrer Abreise abgeforderten Gerathe, Exodus 5, 11, 12 (1777): — Ueber den Genius des Sokrates (1779). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:157; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:23. (B.P.)

## Justice[[@Headword:Justice]]

             (צֶדֶק, righteousness, as an internal trait of character; מַשְׁפָּט, judgment, as a judicial act), as applied to men, is one of the four cardinal virtues. It consists, according to Cicero (De Finibus, lib. 5, cap. 23), in suo cuique tribuendo, in according to every one his right. By the Pythagoreans, and also by Plato, it was regarded as including all human virtue or duty. The word righteousness is used in our translation of the Scriptures in a like extensive signification. As opposed to equity justice (τὁ νομικόν) means doing merely what positive law requires, while equity (τὸ ἴσον) means doing what is, fair and right in the circumstances of every particular case. Justice is not founded in law, as Hobbes and others hold, but in our idea of what is right. Laws are just or unjust in so far as they do or do not conform to that idea. Justice may be distinguished as ethical, economical, and political. The first consists in doing justice between man and man as men; the second, in doing justice between the members of a family or household; and the third, in doing justice between the members of a community or commonwealth (More, Enchiridion Ethicum; Grove, Moral Philosophy). Dr. Watts gives the following rules respecting justice

"1. It is just that we honor, reverence, and respect those who are superiors in any kind (Eph 6:1; Eph 6:3; 1Pe 2:17; 1Ti 5:17).

2. That we show particular kindness to near relations (Pro 16:17).

3. That we love those who love us, and show gratitude to those who have done us good (Gal 4:15).

4. That we pay the full due to those whom we bargain or deal with (Romans 13; Deu 24:14).

5. That we help our fellow creatures in cases of great necessity (Exo 22:4).  6. Reparation to those whom we have willfully injured" (Watts, Sermons, serm. 24, 26, vol. 2). See Wollaston, Religion of Nature, p. 137, 141; Jay, Sermons, 2, 131.

## Justice Of God[[@Headword:Justice Of God]]

             is that perfection whereby he is infinitely righteous, both in himself and in all his proceedings. Mr. Ryland defines it thus: "The ardent inclination of his will to prescribe equal laws as the supreme governor; and to, dispense equal rewards and punishments as the supreme judge" (Rev 16:5; Psa 145:7; Psa 97:1-2). This attribute of the Supreme Being is the necessary result of the divine holiness, as exhibited in all his external relations to intelligent creatures. As holiness, in relation to God, is subjective, declaring his perfect purity justice is objective, exhibiting his opposition to sin as the transgression of his law. (These two aspects are exactly exhibited by the two Hebrew terms above.) Divine justice is distinguished as legislative, and rectoral or distributive. Legislative justice must approve and require that rational creatures conform their internal and external acts to the dictates of the moral law, which, either by the influence of the Holy Spirit on the conscience or by direct revelation, has been made known to all men. Rectoral or distributive justice is God's dealing with his accountable creatures according to the sanctions of his law, rewarding or punishing them according to their deserts (Psa 89:14). The latter is again distinguished into remunerative and punitive justice. Remunerative justice is a distribution of rewards, the rule of which is not the merit of the creature, but God's own gracious promise (Jam 1:12; 2Ti 4:8). Punitive or vindictive justice is the infliction of punishment for any sin committed by men (2Th 1:6). That God will not let sin go unpunished is evident:

1. From the word of God (Exo 34:6-7; Number 14:18; Neh 1:3);

2. From the nature of God Isa 1:13-14; Psalms 5, 5, 6; Heb 12:29);

3. From sin being punished in Christ, the surety of his people (1Pe 3:18);

4. From all the various natural evils which men bear in the present state.  The use we should make of this doctrine is this:

1. We should learn the dreadful nature of sin, and the inevitable ruin of impenitent sinners (Psa 9:17).

2. We should highly appreciate the Lord Jesus Christ, in whom justice is satisfied (1Pe 3:18).

3. We should imitate the justice of God by cherishing an ardent regard to the rights of God and to the rights of mankind.

4. We should abhor all sin, as it strikes directly at the justice of God.

5. We should derive comfort from the consideration that the judge of all the earth will do right as regards ourselves, the Church, and the world at large (Psa 97:1-2).

See Ryland, Contemp. 2, 439; Witsius, Economy, lib. 11, ch. 8, 11; Owen, On the Justice of God; Gill, Bode of Divinity, 1, 155, 8vo; Elisha Cole, On the Righteousness of God;

## Justice, Administration Of[[@Headword:Justice, Administration Of]]

             This seems to have been one of the first subjects which claimed the attention of the great lawgiver of the Hebrews. It appears from the advice of Jethro to Moses when "Israel was encamped at the Mount of God" (Exo 18:13-24). When Jethro had seen how constantly and laboriously Moses was occupied in "judging between one and another," he advised him to make some other provision in relation to the matter, and to restrict himself to the work which properly belonged to him, as the inspired teacher and leader of the people. This was accordingly done. A civil magistracy was created in a form adapted to the existing wants of the people, and by reference to the record we shall find how fully it covers every essential point in the case. The value of evidence in conducting trials; the principles upon which verdicts should be rendered, both in civil and criminal cases, together with the great institution of trial by jury, are all found in greater or less development in the statutes and ordinances given from God to the Hebrews.

Their courts of justice were of various grades, some known as high courts of appeal, and others so simple and multiplied as to carry the administration of justice to every man's door, and effectually to secure the parties against that ruinous evil, "the law's delay." "Judges and offices shalt  thou make in all thy gates," was the command; and to what minute subdivision this creation of tribunals was carried out, we see in the ordinance directing that there should be "rulers over thousands, rulers over hundreds, rulers over fifties, and rulers over tens, who should judge the people at all seasons."

The candidates for office were not to be selected from any one privileged class. They were taken" out of all the people." They were required to be well known for their intellectual and moral worth and their fitness for the station to which they were chosen. They were to be "able men, such as fear God; men of truth, hating covetousness;" "wise men, and understanding, and known among the tribes;" and these qualifications being not only all important, but all sufficient, none others were required.

With a judiciary constructed after this manner, justice could be administered promptly and freely; and, on the other hand, a remedy was provided against the evils of hasty decision, which could not fail in the end to discover and maintain the right of the case. And if "the best laws are those which are best administered," we shall find the ordinances given to the Hebrews for carrying the laws of the land into effect admirably adapted to their end, giving equal security to the poor and to the rich against violence and wrong. SEE JUDGE; SEE TRIAL. (E. de P.)

## Justicers, Itinerant[[@Headword:Justicers, Itinerant]]

             officers appointed by Richard I of England to watch over the interests of the Jews residents within the kingdom. They were instructed to protect the Hebrews against all oppression, to secure them in their interests and property, to decide all controversies between them and the Christians, to keep the seal of their corporation, and the keys of their public treasury.

## Justification[[@Headword:Justification]]

             (some form of the verbs צָדִקδικαιόω), a forensic term equivalent to acquittal, and opposed to condemnation; in an apologetic sense it is often synonymous with vindication or freeing from unjust imputation of blame.

I. Dogmatic Statement. — This term, in theological usage, is employed to designate the judicial act of God by which he pardons all the sins of the sinner who believes in Christ, receiving him into favor, and regarding him as relatively righteous, notwithstanding his past actual unrighteousness. Hence justification, and the remission or forgiveness of sin, relate to one and the same act of God, to one and the same privilege of his believing people (Act 13:38-39; Rom 4:5; Rom 4:8). So, also, "the justification of the ungodly," the "covering of sins," "not visiting for sin," "not remembering sin," and "imputing not inequity," mean to pardon sin and to treat with favor, and express substantially the same thing which is designated by "imputing or counting faith for righteousness." SEE PARDON.

Justification, then, is an act of God, not in or upon man, but for  him and in his favor; an act which, abstractly considered, respects man only as its object, and translates him into another relative state; while sanctification respects man as its subject, and is a consequent of this act of God, and inseparably connected with it. SEE REGENERATION.

The originating cause of justification is the free grace and spontaneous love of God towards fallen man (Rom 15:3; Rom 15:24; Tit 2:11; Tit 3:4-5). Our Lord Jesus Christ is the sole meritorious cause of our justification, inasmuch as it is the result of his atonement for us. The sacrificial death of Christ is an expedient of infinite wisdom, by which the full claims of the law may be admitted, and yet the penalty avoided, because a moral compensation or equivalent has been provided by the sufferings of him who died in the sinner's stead (Eph 1:7; Col 1:14; Rev 5:9). Thus, while it appears that our justification is, in its origin, an act of the highest grace, it is also, in its mode, an act most perfectly consistent with God's essential righteousness, and demonstrative of his inviolable justice. It proceeds not on the principle of abolishing the law or its penalty, for that would have implied that the law was unduly rigorous either in its precepts or in its sanctions. SEE ATONEMENT.

Faith is the instrumental cause of justification, present faith in him who is able to save, faith actually existing and exercised. SEE FAITH. The atonement of Jesus is not accepted for us, to our individual justification, until we individually believe, nor after we cease to live by faith in him. SEE IMPUTATION.

The immediate results of justification are the restoration of amity and intercourse between the pardoned sinner and the pardoning God (Rom 5:1; Jam 2:23); the adoption of the persons justified into the family of God, and their consequent right to eternal life (Rom 8:17); and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit (Act 2:38; Gal 3:14; Gal 4:6), producing tranquillity of conscience (Rom 8:15-16), power over sin (Rom 8:1) and a joyous hope of heaven (Rom 15:13; Gal 5:3). SEE SPIRIT, FRUITS OF.

We must not forget that the justification of a sinner does not in the least degree alter or diminish the evil nature and desert of sin. Though by an act of divine clemency the penalty is remitted, and the obligation to suffer that penalty is dissolved, still it is naturally due, though graciously remitted. Hence appear the propriety and duty of continuing to confess and lament  even pardoned sin with a lowly and contrite heart (Eze 16:62). SEE PENITENCE.

II. History of the Doctrine. —

1. The early Church Fathers and the Latin Church. — Ecclesiastical science, from the beginning of its development, occupied itself with a discussion on the relation of faith to knowledge; but even those who attributed the greatest importance to the latter recognized faith as the foundation. A merely logical division into subjective and objective faiths and an intimation of a distinction between a historic and a rational faith (in Clemens Alexandrinus, Stromata. 2, 454; Augustine, De Trinitate, 13, 2), were of little consequence. Two conceptions became prevailing: Faith as a general religious conviction, particularly as confidence in God, and the acceptance of the entire doctrine of the Church, fides catholica. The formula that faith alone without the works justifies is found in the full Pauline sense in Clemens Romanus (1 ad Corinthios. c. 32) and is sometimes used by Augustine polemically in order to defend the freedom of grace and the priority of faith. More generally it is used as an argument against the necessity of the Jewish law (Irenaeus, 4:25 Tertullian, adv. Marcell. 5, 3). The oecumenical synods were instrumental in gradually giving to the conception of fides catholica the new sense that salvation could be found only by adherence to ecclesiastical orthodoxy. But as a mere acceptance was possible without a really, Christian sentiment, and as the Pauline doctrine was misused by heretics in an antinomian sense, it was demanded that faith, be proved by works. Church discipline developed this idea with regard to the sins of the faithful, so as to demand a satisfaction through penances and good works (Augustine, Serm. 151, 12). It became, therefore, the doctrine of the Church that such faith alone works salvation as shows itself in acts of charity, while to merely external works faith or charity is opposed as something accessory. Pelagius assumed only a relative distinction between naturally good works and the good works that proceed from faith; in opposition to which Augustine insisted that the difference is absolute, and that without faith no good works at all are possible. As salvation was thought to be conditioned by works also, it was, even when it was represented as being merely an act of God, identified with sanctification. The importance attributed to abstention created gradually a distinction between commands and advices, and the belief that through the fulfilment of the latter a virtue greater than required would  arise (Hermas, Pastor Simil. 3, 5, 3; Origen, In Epistolam, ad Romans 3; Ambrose, De Viduis, 4, 508).

2. The Greek Church. — Little discussion and little controversy has occurred on this doctrine in the Greek Church. Faith and works together are regarded as the conditions of salvation. The words of James are referred to first, yet faith is declared to be the stock from which the good works come as the fruits. The description of faith proceeds from the definition in the Epistle to the Hebrews to the acceptance of the entire ecclesiastical tradition. Man is said to participate in the merit of the Mediator not only through faith, but also through good works. Among the latter are comprised the fulfilment of the commandments of God and of the Church, and, in particular, prayers, fastings, pilgrimages, and monastic life. They are considered useful and necessary not only as a means of promoting sanctification, but also as penances and satisfaction.

3. Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church during the Middle Ages. — The Scholastics regarded faith as an acceptance of the supersensual as far as it belongs to religion, differing both from intuition and from knowledge; and although essentially of a theoretic character, yet conditioned by the consent of the will; which, however, in the description of faith, is reduced to a minimum. Originally only God is an object of faith, but mediately also the holy Scriptures; as a summary of the Biblical doctrines, the Apostles Creed, and, as its explication, the entire doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. As an accurate knowledge of the doctrines of the Church cannot be expected from every one, the subjective distinction was made between fides implicita and explicita; the former sufficient for the people, yet with the demand of a developed belief in some chief articles. There was, however, a difference of opinion on what these articles were, and even Thomas Aquinas wavered in his views. Faith may, even upon earth, partly become a science, and appears in this respect only as the popular form of religion. It is a condition of salvation, but becomes a virtue only when love, as animating principle [forma], pervades it [fides formata]; with a mere faith [informis] one may be damned. The fides formata includes the necessity of the good works for salvation, but they must be founded in pious sentiment. All other works not proceeding from faith, are dead though not entirely useless. The necessity of good works is fully carried out only by the inculcation of penance as satisfactiones, but with constant reference to a union of the soul with Christ, and the moral effect of the good works. Justification, according to Thomas Aquinas, is a movement  from the state of injustice into the state of justice, in which the remission of sins is the main point, though it is conditioned by an infusion of grace which actually justifies men. As an act of God which establishes in man a new state [habitus], it is accomplished in a moment. Among the people the Pelagian views prevailed, that man, by merely outward works, had to gain his salvation, and the Church became, especially through the traffic in indulgences, a prey to the immoral and insipid worship of ceremonies. In opposition to this corruption, many of the pious Mystics pointed to the Pauline doctrine of faith.

4. Doctrine of the Reformers of the 16th Century and the old Protestant Dogmatics. — The Reformation of the 16th century renewed the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith alone, emphasizing in the sense of Augustine, the entire helplessness of man, and made it the fundamental doctrine of the Reformed Church. This faith is represented as not merely an acceptance of historic facts, but is distinguished as fides specialis from the general religious conviction, arising amidst the terrors of conscience, and consisting in an entire despair of one's own merit and a confident surrender to the mercy of God in the atoning death of Christ. Worked by God, it does not work as virtue or merit, but merely through the apprehension of the merit of Christ. Its necessity lies in the impossibility of becoming reconciled with God through one's own power. Hence this reconciliation is impossible through good works, which are not necessary for salvation, though God rewards them, according to his promise, upon earth and in heaven; but, as a necessary consequence, the really good works will flow forth from faith freely and copiously. The opinion of Amsdorf, that good works are an obstacle to salvation, was regarded as an unfortunate expression, which may be taken in a true sense, though it is false if understood in a general sense. As man is unable to satisfy the law supererogatory works and a satisfaction through one's own works are impossible. Justification through love is impossible, because man cannot love God truly amidst the terrors of conscience. Hence justification is a divine judicial act, which, through the apprehension of the justice of Christ, apprehended in faith, accepts the sinner as just, though he is not just. This strict distinction between justification and sanctification was maintained on the one hand against Scholasticism, which, through its Pelagian tendencies, seemed to offend against the honor of Christ, and to be unable to satisfy conscience, and on the other hand against Osiander, who regarded justification as being completed only in sanctification. The works even of  the regenerated, according to the natural side, were regarded by the Reformers as sins. The Reformed theology in general agreed with the doctrine of justification as stated above, yet did not make it to the same extent the fundamental doctrine of the whole theology. According to Calvin, justification and sanctification took place at the same time. The dogmatic writers of the Lutheran Church distinguished in faith knowledge, assent, and, confidence, assigning the former two to the intellect, the latter to the will. From the fides generalis they distinguished the justifying faith (specialis seu salvifica), and rejected the division into fides informis et formata. As a distinguishing mark, they demanded from a true faith that it be efficient in charity. For works they took the Decalogue as a rule; a certain necessity of works was strictly limited. But, however firmly they clung in general to the conception of justification as something merely external (actus forensis) and foreign (imputatio justitiae Christi), some dogmatic writers held that justification had really changed something in man, and indeed presupposed it as changed. Hollaz pronounced this doctrine openly and incautiously, while Quenstedt designated these preceding acts as merely preparatory to conversion.

5. Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church since the Reformation. — The Council of Trent, in order to make a compromise with the Pauline formula, recognized faith as the beginning and the foundation of justification, but the full sense which Protestantism found in it was rejected. This faith is the general belief in divine revelation, though in transition to a special faith, yet a mere knowledge which still gives room to mortal sins. Justification is remission of sins and sanctification, through an infusion of the divine grace, in as far as the merit of Christ is not merely imputed, but communicated. It is given through grace, but as a permanent state it grows through the merit of good works according to the commandments of God and the Church, through which works the justified, always aided by the grace of God in Christ, have to render satisfaction for the temporal punishment of their sins and to deserve salvation. Not all the works done before justification are sins, and to the justified the fulfilment of the commandments of God is quite possible, although even the saints still commit small, venial sins. A further development of this doctrine is found in the writings of Bellarmine. He admits faith only as fides generalis, as a matter of the intellect, yet as a consent, not a knowledge. Though only the first among many preparations for justification a certain merit is ascribed to faith. The Council of Trent had rejected the imputation of the merits of Christ only as the exclusive  ground of justification; Bellarmine rejected it altogether. He explicitly proclaimed the necessity of good works for salvation, though only a relative salvation. "The opera supererogationis, which were not mentioned at Trent, though they remained unchanged in tradition and practice, are further developed by Bellarmine. According to him, they go beyond nature, are not destined for all, and not commanded under penalties.

6. Modern Protestantism. — Socinus denied any foreign imputation, also that of the merit of Christ. When supranaturalism in general declined, the points of difference from the Roman Catholic Church were frequently lost sight of Kant found in the doctrine of justification the relation of the always unsatisfactory reality of our moral development to the future perfection recognized in the intuition of God. De Wette declared it to be the highest moral confidence which is founded on the communion with Christ, and turns from an unhappy past to a better future. Modern mystics have often found fault with the Protestant doctrine as being too outward, and approached the doctrine of the Roman Church. The Hegelian School taught that justification is the reception of the subject into the spirit, i.e. the knowledge of the subject of his unity with the absolute spirit or, according to Strauss, with the concrete idea of mankind. According to Schleiermacher, it is the reception into the communion of life with both the archetypal and historical Christ, and the appropriation of his perfection. Justification and sanctification are to him only different sides of the carrying out of the same divine decree. Many of the recent dogmatic writers of Germany have again proclaimed this doctrine to be the essential principle of Protestantism, some (Dorner, Das Princip unserer Kirche, Kiel, 1841) taking justification in the sense of a new personality founded in Christ, others (Hundeshagen, Der deutsche Protestantismus. Frankft. 1847) in the sense that God, surveying the whole future development of the principle which communion with Christ establishes in the believer, views him as righteous. One of the last dogmatic manuals of the Reformed Church (Schweizer, 2, 523 sq.) distinguishes conversion and sanctification as the beginning and progress of a life of salvation, and assigns justification to the former. See Hase, Evangelische Dogmatik (Leipzic, 1850) p. 310 sq.; C.F. Baur, Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte (Stuttgart, 1847); Hahn, Das Bekenntniss der evangelischen Kirchengeschichte in seinem Verhaltniss zu dem der Romischen und Griechischen.

III. Literature. — See, for Roman Cath. views, Möhler, Symbolism, ch. 3; Willett, Syn. Pap. 8, 67 sq.; Cramp, Text-book of Popery, ch. 5; Bossuet,  Works, vol. 1 and 2 Stud. und Krit. 1867. vol. 2; D'Aubigne, Hist. Reformation, vol. 2; Forbes, Considerations, 1, 1; Nicene Creed; 1, 173; Hughes, Works, 1, 410. For Protestant views, see Buchanan, Justification (Edinb. 1867, 8vo; reviewed at length in Lond. Review, Oct. 1867, p. 179); Brit. and For. Evang. Rev. Oct. 1867, art. 6; Wesley, Works, 5, 255; 6, 106; Calvin, Instit. vol. 2; Cunningham, Reformers, p. 402; Planck, Hist. Prot. Theol. (see Index); Knapp, Theology (see Index); Wardlaw, System. Theology, 2, 67.8 sq.; Graves, Works, vol. 4; Monsell, 4, 232, 240; Waterland, Works, vol. 6; T. Goodwin, Works (see Index); Wilson, Apostol. Fathers (see Index); Martensen, Dogmatics, p. 390 sq.; Pye Smith, Introd. to Theol. (see Index); Burnet, On the 39 Articles (see Index); Carmich, Theol. of the Scriptures, vol. 2; Neander, Prot. and Cath. p. 131-146; Ch. Dog. 2, 66 sq.; Planting and Train. of Christian Church, vol. 2; Riggenbach, in the Stud. und Krit. 1863, 4:691; 1867, 1, 405, 2, 294; 1868, 2, 201; North Brit. Review, June, 1867; p. 191 sq.; Dr. Schaff, Protestantism, p. 54-57; Good Words, Jan. 1866 Heppe, Dogmatics, p. 392; Biblioth.-Sacra, 1863, p. 615; Bibl. Repos. 11, 448 Christ. Review, Oct. 1846; Jahrb. deutsch. Theol. 7, 516; Ware, Works, 3, 381; Journal of Sac. Lit. 21; 1869, 3, 545; Christian Monthly, 1845, Jan. p. 102; Feb., p. 231; New Englander (see Index); Hauck, Theolog. Jahresber. Jan. 1869, 59; 1867, p. 543; Bull. Theologique. 1, 25, 41; Brit. and For. Evang. Rev. July, 1868, p. 537; Brit. and For. Rev. Oct. 1868. p. 683, 692; Amer. Presbyt. Review, Jan. 1867. p. 69. 202; Evang. Quart. Rev. Oct. 1869, p. 48; British Quart. Rev. Jan. 1871, p. 144; Church Rev. Oct. 1870, p. 444, 462; Zeitschr. wissensch. Theol. 1871, 4.

## Justin[[@Headword:Justin]]

             surnamed the Philosopher, or, more generally, the Martyr, of whom Eusebius (Hist. Ecclesiastes 1, 4, c. 11) says that he overshadowed all the great men who illuminated the 2d century by the splendor of his name, was born towards the close of the apostolic age, that is, the beginning of the 2d century. He was the son of a wealthy Greek, Priscius, who had, in all probability, come to reside at Flavia Neapolis (erected on the site of the ancient Sichem), in Samaria, with the Roman colony sent by Vespasian to the city that bore his name. But little is known of his personal history. From one of his works, the Dialogues with Tryphon (c. 2 sq.), we learn that he traveled much in his youth, and studied ardently the various systems of philosophy prevalent in his day, searching after some knowledge which should satisfy the cravings of his soul. The myths and absurd worship of  the heathen had failed to satisfy the youthful soul longing to know God and the relations of God to man, and in turn Stoic and Peripatetic, Pythagorean and Platonist, were examined to set his mind at rest upon the vital question. By the Stoic he was told that, in philosophical speculation, the subject which he seemed to consider the most important was only of subordinate rank. A Peripatetic, at the end of a few days, informed him that the most important thing for him to attend to was to afford the philosophic instructor security for his tuition. By the Pythagorean he was rejected, outright, because he confessed himself ignorant of music, astronomys and geometry, which that school considered a necessary introduction to the study of philosophy, and so he turned in despair to the Platonists, at this time in high repute in the place in which Justin resided. At last he seemed to have gained the haven of peace; the Platonic doctrine of ideas could not fail to inspire young Justin with the hope that he "should soon have the intuition of God," for is not this the aim of Platonic philosophy? "Under the influence of this notion," he relates himself, "it occurred to me that I would withdraw to some solitary place, far from the turmoil of the world, and there, in perfect self collection, give myself to my own contemplations.

I chose a spot by the seaside." Whether Justin still resided at this time at Flavia Neapolis — and in that case the quiet resort must have been the shores of the Dead Sea, perhaps the valley of the Jordan, north of this sea (Otto), or on some unfrequented spot of Lake Genesareth or whether, as seems more probable, he then resided at Ephesus, is a matter of dispute. In favor of Ephesus are Schröckh, Tillemont, Hilgenfeld, Dorner, etc. But, be the name of the place Flavia Neapolis or Ephesus, it was in his resort by the shore of the resounding sea attracted to it, no doubt, chiefly by the grandeur of the object he was seeking to solve, and the loveliness of the spot that we find him one day, while wrapped up in thought, pacing up and down by the side of the sea, which moaned in melancholy unison with his reflections, accosted by a man of venerable aspect, sage and grave, and soon the two are engaged in earnest converse on the subject ever uppermost in young Justin's mind. Somewhat enamored of the Platonic philosophy, he argues in its favor with the appositely present senior, and contends that at some future day it will conduct him into that nearer acquaintance with God, or, in the Platonists' term, afford him the "vision of divinity." But the meek old man, who is a Christian, contends that the goal which he is seeking to gain cannot be reached by any philosophical school or by unaided mind even of the highest order; the fallacy of Plato is proved in some two or three points of doctrine belonging to that system, and  finally the doubting and indocile disciple is visited with the curt and not gentle apostrophe, You are a mere dealer in words, but no lover of action and truth; your aim is not to be a practicer of good, but a clever disputant, a cunning sophist." Once more the inquiring youth is baffled in his attempt to lay hold of the truth; he is again convinced that even from the foremost of heathen philosophers he cannot obtain the pearl for which he is seeking so earnestly. But with this intelligence there comes also the direction, "Search the Scriptures;" study the Hebrew prophets; men who, guided by the Spirit of God, saw and revealed the truth, and even foretold events future to their day; read the last and heroic words of the disciples of him who came to raise a fallen world, and to restore it to eternal and imperishable felicity. "Pray," ended the venerable Christian, "that the gates of light may be opened to thee, for none can perceive and comprehend these things except God and his Christ grant them understanding." Justin was impressed; he had often heard the Platonists calumniate the Christians, but he had always discredited the statements. He had frequently observed the tranquillity and fortitude with which these followers of Jesus encountered death and all other evils which appear terrible to man, and he could never condemn as profligates those who could so patiently endure.

He had long believed them innocent of the crimes imputed to these consistent martyrs. He was now, prepared to think that they held the truth. He reflected on the words of the venerable stranger, and was convinced that they inculcated the "only safe and useful philosophy." From this time (the exact date is doubtful; the Bollandists place it in A.D. 119; it is generally believed, with Cave, Tillemont, Ceillier, and others, that it occurred in A.D. 133) his personal history becomes obscure, as he has but little to relate of himself hereafter, and as from other sources we cannot gather much on which we can depend. Certain it is that he at once enlisted in active service in behalf of the new cause. Retaining the garb of a philosopher, he ardently devoted himself, as is evinced by his works, to the propagation of Christianity by writing and otherwise. Tillemont argues, from the language of Justin (Apolog. Prima, c. 61, 605), that he was a priest, but this inference is not borne out by the passage, and, though approved by Maran, is rejected by Otto, Neander, and Semisch. That he visited many places in order to diffuse the knowledge of the Christian religion is probable (comp. Cohortat. ad Groec. c. 13, 34), and he appears to have made the profession of a philosopher subservient to this purpose (Dialog. cum Tryph. init.; Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 4, 11; Photius, Bibl. cod. 125). According to what is commonly deemed the ancient record of his  martyrdom (though Papebroche regards this as narrating the death of another Justin), he visited Rome twice. On his second visit he was apprehended, and brought before the tribunal of Rusticus, who held the office of praefectus urbi; and as he refused to offer sacrifice to the gods, he was sentenced to be scourged and beheaded, which sentence appears to have been immediately carried into effect. Several other persons suffered with him.

Papebroche rejects this account of his martyrdom, and thinks his execution was secret, so that the date and manner of it were never known. The Greek Menoea (s. d. 1 Junii) state that he drank hemlock. His death is generally considered to have taken place in the persecution under the emperor Marcus Antoninus; and the Chronicon Paschale (1, 258, ed. Paris; 207, ed. Venice;: 482, ed. Bonn), which is followed by Tillemont, Baronius, Pagi, Otto, and other moderns, places it in the consulship of Orphitus and Pudens, A.D. 165; Dupin, Semisch, and Schaff place it in A.D. 166; Fleury in A.D. 167; and Tillemont and Maran in A.D. 168. Papebroche (Acta Sanctorum, April 2, 107), assigning the Apologia Secunda of Justin to the year 171, contends that he must have lived to or beyond that time. Dodwell, on the contrary, following the erroneous statement of Eusebius in his Chronicon, places his death in the reign of Antoninus Pius; and Epiphanius, according to the present reading of the passage (adv. Hoeres. 46, 1), which is most likely corrupt, places it in the reign of the emperor Hadrian or Adrian, a manifest error, as the Apologia Prima is addressed to Antonisus Pius, the successor of Hadrian, and the Secunda probably to Marcus Aurelius and L. Verus, who succeeded Antoninus. The death of Justin has been very commonly ascribed (compare Tatian, Contra Groecos c. 19; Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 4, 1, and Chron. Paschale) to the machinations of the Cynic philosopher Crescens. The enmity of Crescens and Justin's apprehension of injury from him, are mentioned by Justin himself (Apolog. Secunda, c. 3). He has been canonized by the Eastern and Western churches; the Greeks celebrate his memory on the 1st of June, the Latins, on the 13th of April. At Rome, the Church of St. Lorenzo without the walls is believed to be the resting place of his remains; but the Church of the Jesuits at Eysstadt, in Germany claims to possess his body: there is, however, no reason to believe that either claim is well founded. The more common epithet added to the name of Justin by the ancients is that of "the philosopher" (Epiphanius, 1.c.; Eusebius, Chronicon, lib. 2; Jerome, De Viribus Illustr. c. 23; Chronicon Paschale. l.c.; George Sylicellus, p. 350, 351, ed. Paris; p. 279, ed. Venice; Glijcas, Annal. pars 3, p. 241, ed. Paris; p. 186, ed. Venice; p. 449, ed.  Bonn); that of "the martyr," now in general use, is employed by Tertullian (Adv. Valent. c. 5), who calls him "philosophus et martyr;" by Photius (Biblioth. cod. 48, 125, 232), and by Joannes Damascenus (Sacra Parall. 2, 754, ed. Lequien), who, like Tertullian, conjoins the two epithets.

Works. — It remains for us to consider the writings of Justin Martyr, which, although not very voluminous, so far as they are known to be or to have been extant, are among the most important that have come down to us from the 2d century, not so much because they are apologetic as because they are the earliest Christian apologies extant. In their classification we follow closely, with Smith (Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. s.v.), one of the latest editors of the works of Justin Martyr, J.F.C. Otto, who makes four distinct classes.

(1.) Undisputed Works. —

1. Α᾿πολογία πρώτη ὑπέρ Χριστιανῶν πρὸς Α᾿ντωνῖνον τὸν Εὐσεβῆ, Apologia prima pro Christianis ad Antoninum Pium, mentioned in the only two known MSS. of the Apologies, and in the older editions of Justin, e.g. that of Stephens (Paris, 1551, fol.) and that of Sylburg (Heidelberg, 1593, folio), as his second Apology, is one of the most interesting remains of Christian antiquity. It is addressed to the emperor Antoninus Pius, and to his adopted sons "Verissimus the Philosopher," afterwards the emperor M. Aurelius, and "Lucius the Philosopher" (we follow the common reading, not that of Eusebius), afterwards the emperor Verus, colleague of M. Aurelius. From the circumstance that Verissimus is not styled Caesar, which dignity he acquired in the course of A.D. 139, it is inferred by many critics, including Pagi, Neander, Otto, Semisch, and others, that the Apology as written previously, and probably early in that year. Eusebius places it in the fourth year of Antoninus, or the first year of the 230th Olympiad, A.D. 141, which is rather too late. Others contend for a still later date Justin himself, in the course of the work (c. 46), states that Christ was born a hundred and fifty years before he wrote, but he must be understood as speaking in round numbers. However, Tillemont, Grabe, Fleury, Ceillier, Maran, and others, fix the date of the work in A.D. 150. "Its contents," says bishop Kaye, "may be reduced to the following heads:

[1] Appeals to the justice of the ruling powers, and expostulations with them on the unfairness of the proceedings against the Christians, who were condemned without any previous investigation into their lives or opinions merely because they were Christians, and were denied the liberty allowed  to all the other subjects of the Roman empire, of worshipping the God whom they themselves preferred.

[2] Refutations of the charges of atheism, immorality, and disaffection towards the emperor, which were brought against the Christians these charges Justin refuted by appealing to the purity of the Gospel precepts, and to the amelioration produced in the conduct of those who embraced Christianity; and by stating that the kingdom to which Christians looked forward was not of this world, but a heavenly kingdom.

[3] Direct arguments in proof of the truth of Christianity, drawn from miracles and prophecy. With respect to the former, Justin principally occupies himself in refuting the objection that the miracles of Christ were performed by magical arts. With respect to the latter, he states in forcible terms the general nature of the argument from prophecy, and shows the accomplishment of many particular prophecies in the person of Jesus, inferring, from their accomplishment, the reasonableness of entertaining a firm persuasion that the prophecies yet unfulfilled that, for instance, respecting Christ's second advent — will in due time be accomplished.

[4] Justin does not confine himself to defending Christianity bus occasionally becomes the assailant, and exposes with success the absurdities of the Gentile polytheism and idolatry. In further confirmation of the innocuous, or, rather, beneficial character of Christianity, Justin concludes the treatise with a description of the mode in which proselytes were admitted into the Church, of its other rites and customs, and of the habits and manner of life of the primitive Christians." To this Apology, the larger one of the two, are generally appended three documents: (1) Α᾿δριανοῦ ὑπὲρ Χριστιανῶν ἐπιστολή, Adriani pro Christianis Epistola, or Exemplum Epistoloe Imperatoris Adriani ad Minucium: Fundanum Proconsulum Asioe. This Greek version of the emperor's letter was made and is given by Eusebius (Hist. Ecc 4:8). Justin had subjoined to his work the Latin original (Eusebius, Hist. Ecc 4:8), which probably is still preserved by Rutinus in his version of Eusebius, for which, in the work of Justin, the version of Eusebius was afterwards substituted. (2) Α᾿ντωνίνου ἐπιστολὴ πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν τῆς Α᾿σίαςt A;iac, Antonini Epistola ad Commune Asioe. It is hardly likely that this document was inserted in its place by Justin himself; it has probably been added since his times and its genuineness is subject to considerable doubt. It is given, but with great variation, by Eusebius. (Hist., Eccles. 4, 13), and was written,  according to the ext of the letter itself, as it appears in Eusebius, not by Antonius, but by his successor, M. Aurelius. (3) Μάρκου βασιλέως ἐπιστολὴ προς τὴνσύγκλητον, έν ῃ μαρτυρεῖ Χριστιανοὺς αἰτίους γεγενῆσθαι τῆς νίκης αὐτῶν Marci Imperatoris Epistola ad Senatum qua testatur Christianos victorioe causam fuisse. This letter, the spuriousness of which is generally admitted (though it is said by Tertullian, Apologetics, cap. 5, that a letter of the same tenor was written by the emperor), relates to the famous miracle of the so called thundering legion (q.v.).

2. Α᾿πολογίαδευτέρα ὑπὲρ τῶν Χριστιανῶν πρὸς τὴν ᾿Ρωμαίων σύγκλητον, Apologia Secunda pro Christianis ad Senatum Romanum. This second and shorter plea for the Christians was addressed probably to the emperors M. Aurelius and Lucius Verus, or, rather, to Aurelius alone, as Verus was engaged in the East in the Parthian war. (See below.) Neander adopts the opinion formerly maintained by Valesius, that this Apology (placed in the older editions before the longer one just described) was addressed to Antoninus Pius; but Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 4, 17,18) and Photius (Bibl. cod. 125) among the ancients, and Dupin, Pagi, Tillemont, Grabe, Ruinart, Ceillier, Maran, Mosheim, Semisch, and Otto among the modems, maintain the opposite side. Otto thinks it was written about A.D. 164; others place it somewhat later. Scaliger (Animadv. in Chron. Euseb. p. 219) and Papebroche (Acta Sanctorum, Aprilis 2, 106) consider that this second Apology of Justin is simply an introduction or preface to the first, and that the Apology presented to Aurelius and Verus has been lost, but their opinion has been refuted by several writers, especially by Otto. Granted, then that this Apology was presented to M. Aurelius, we find it "occasioned by the punishment inflicted on three persons at Rome, whom Urbicus, the prefect of the city, had put to death merely because they were Christians. After exposing the injustice of this proceeding, Justin replies to two objections which the enemies of the Gospel were accustomed to urge. The first was, Why, if the Christians were certain of being received into heaven, they did not destroy themselves, and save the Roman governors the trouble of putting them to death? Justin's answer is, that, if they were so to act, they would contravene the designs of God by diminishing the number of believers, preventing the diffusion of true religion, and, as far as depended upon them, extinguishing the human race.

The second objection was, 'Why, if they were regarded by God with an eye of favor, he suffered them to be exposed to injury and oppression?' Justin replies that the  persecutions with which they then were, and with which many virtuous men among the heathens had before been visited, originated in the malignant artifices of demons the offspring of the apostate angels, who were permitted to exercise their power until the designs of the Almighty were finally accomplished. Another objection, of a different kind, appears to have been urged against the Christians that, in exhorting men to live virtuously, they insisted, not upon the beauty of virtue, but upon the eternal rewards and punishments which await the virtuous and wicked. Justin replies that these are topics on which every believer in the existence of God must insist, since in that belief is involved the further belief that he will reward the good and punish the bad. With respect to direct arguments to prove the divine origin of Christianity, that which Justin principally urges is drawn from the fact that no man ever consented to die in attestation of the truth of any philosophical tenets; whereas men, even from the lowest ranks of life, braved danger and death in the cause of the Gospel. Towards the conclusion of the tract, Justin states that he was himself induced to embrace Christianity by observing, the courage and constancy with which its professors encountered all the terrors of persecution." Two Fragmenta, given by Grabe in his Spicileg. saecul. 2, 173, are supposed by him to belong to the second Apology, in the present copies of which they are not found; but the correctness of this supposition is very doubtful.

3. Πρὸς Τρυφῶνα Ι᾿ουδαῖον δίάλογος, Cum Tryphone Judoeo Dialogus. This dialogue, in which Justin defends Christianity against the objections of Trypho, professes to be the record of an actual discussion, held, according to Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 4, 18), at Ephesus Trypho describes himself as a Jew; "flying from the war now raging, probably occasioned by the revolt under Barchochebas, in the reign of Hadrian A.D. 132-134. But, though the discussion probably took place at the time, it was not committed to writing, at least not finished, till some years after, as Justin makes a reference to his first Apology, which is assigned, as we have seen, to A.D. 138 or 139, It has been conjectured that Trypho is the Rabbi Tarphon of the Talmudists, teacher or colleague of the celebrated Rabbi Akiba, but he does not appear as a rabbi in the dialogue. The dialogue is perhaps founded upon the conversation of Justin with Trypho rather than an accurate record of it. After an introduction, in which Justin gives an account of the manner of his conversion to Christianity, and earnestly exhorts Trypho to follow his example, Trypho replies to the exhortation by saying that Justin would have acted more wisely in adhering to any one of  the philosophical sects to which he had formerly been attached than in leaving God, and placing all his reliance upon a man. In the former case, if he lived virtuously, he might hope to obtain salvation; in the latter he could have no hope. His only safe course, therefore, was to be circumcised, and comply with the other requisitions of the Mosaic law. Justin answers that the Christians had not deserted God, though they no longer observed the ceremonial law. They worshipped the God who brought the forefathers of the Jews out of the land of Egypt, and gave the law, but who had plainly declared by the prophets that he would give a new law — a law appointing a new mode of purification from sin, by the baptism of repentance and of the knowledge of God — and requiring a spiritual, not a carnal circumcision. The ceremonial law was, in truth, given to the Jews on account of the hardness of their heart, as a mark of God's displeasure at their apostasy, when they made the golden calf in Horeb.

All its ordinances, its sacrifices, its Sabbath, the prohibition of certain kinds of food, were designed to counteract the inveterate tendency of the Jews to fall into idolatry. If, says Justin, we contend that the ceremonial law is of universal and perpetual obligation, we run the hazard of charging God with inconsistency, as if he had appointed different modes of justification at different times; since they who lived before Abraham were not circumcised, and they who lived before Moses neither observed the Sabbath nor offered sacrifices, although God bore testimony to them that they were righteous. Having, as he thinks, satisfactorily proved that the ceremonial law is no longer binding, Justin replies to an argument used by Trypho, that the prophecy of Dan 7:9 taught the Jews to expect that the Messiah would be great and glorious; whereas the Messiah of the Christians was unhonored and inglorious, and fell under the extreme curse of the law, for he was crucified. Justin's answer is, that the Scriptures of the Old Testament speak of two advents of the Messiah, one in humiliation and the other in glory; though the Jews, blinded by their prejudices, looked only to those passages which foretold the latter. He then proceeds to quote passages of the Old Testament in which, the Messiah is called God, and Lord of Hosts. In this part of the dialogue Justin extracts from the Old Testament several texts in which he finds allusions to the Gospel history. Thus the paschal lamb was a type of Christ's crucifixion; the offering of fine flour for those who were cleansed from the leprosy was a type of the bread in the Eucharist; the twelve bells attached to the robe of the high priest, of the twelve apostles.

Justin next undertakes to prove that the various prophecies respecting the Messiah were fulfilled in Jesus; but, having  quoted Isaiah 7 to prove that the Messiah was to be born of a virgin, he first runs into a digression caused by an inquiry from Trypho, whether Jews who led holy lives, like Job, Enoch, and Noah, but observed the Mosaic law, could be saved; and afterwards into a second digression, occasioned by a remark of Trypho's that the Christian doctrine respecting the pre existence and divinity of Christ, and his subsequent assumption of humanity, was monstrous and absurd. Combating these points, Trypho next inquires" of Justin whether he really believes that Jerusalem would be rebuilt, and all the Gentiles, as well as the Jews and proselytes, collected there under the government of the Messiah; or whether he merely professed such a belief in order to conciliate the Jews. Justin, in answer, admits that the belief was not universal among the orthodox Christians, but that he himself maintained that the dead would rise again in the body, and live for a thousand years in Jerusalem, which would be rebuilt, and beautified and enlarged. He appeals in support of his opinion to Isaiah, and to the Apocalypse, which he ascribes to John, one of Christ's apostles. Justin then concludes the interview by debating the conversion of the Gentiles. He contends that the Christians are the true people of God, inasmuch as they fulfill the spiritual meaning of the law, and do not merely conform, like the Jews, to the letter. They have the true circumcision of the heart; they are the true race of priests dedicated to God, and typified by Jesus, the high priest in the prophecy of Zechariah; they offer the true spiritual sacrifices which are pleasing to God, agreeably to the prophecy of Malachi; they are the seed promised to Abraham, because they are actuated by the same principle of faith which actuated Abraham; they are, in a word; the true Israel. The dialogue with Trypho appears to be mutilated, but to what extent is a matter of dispute. "Two fragments are assigned to it by Grabe (Spicilegium, saec. 2, 175), but it is doubtful with what correctness. "It is to be observed," says Smith (Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography), "that, although Otto ranks the Dialogus cum Tryphone among the undisputed works of Justin, its genuineness has been repeatedly attacked. The first assault was by C.G. Koch, of Apenrade, in the duchy of Sleswick (Justini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone... νοθεύσεως... convictus), but this attack was regarded as of little moment. That of Wetstein (Proleg. in. Nov. Test. 1, 66), founded on the difference of the citations from the text of the Sept. and their agreement with that of the Hexaplar edition of Origen, and perhaps of the version of Symmachus, which are both later than the time of Justin, was more serious, and has called forth elaborate replies from Krom (Diatribe de Authentia Dialog.  Justini Martyr. cum Tryph.; etc., 1778, 8vo), Eichhorn (Einleitung in das A.T.), and Kredner (Beiträge zur Einleitung, etc.). The attack was renewed at a later period by Lange, but with little result. An account of the controversy is given by Semisch (book 2, sect. 1, ch. 2), who contends earnestly for the genuineness of the work. It may be observed that the genuineness even of the two Apologies was attacked by the learned but eccentric Hardouin."

(2.) Disputed or Doubtful Works.-

4. Λὸγος πρὸς ῾῏Ελληνας, Oratio ad Groecos. "If this is indeed a work of Justin, which we think very doubtful, it is probably that described by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 4, 18) as treating περὶ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων φύσεως (compare Photius, Bibl. cod. 125), and by Jerome (De Vir. Illustr. c. 23) as being "de Daemonum nature;" for it is a severe attack on the flagitious immoralities ascribed by the heathens to their deities, and committed by themselves in their religions festivals. Its identity, however, with the work respecting daemons is doubted by many critics. Cave supposes it to be a portion of the work next mentioned. Its genuineness has been on various grounds disputed by Oudin, Semler, Semisch, and others, and is doubted by Grabe, Dupin, and Neander. The grounds of objection are well stated by Semisch (book 2, sect. 2, c. 1) but the genuineness of the piece is asserted by Tillemont, Ceillier, Cave, Maran, De Wette, Baumgarten-Crusius, and others, and by Otto, who has argued the question, we think with very doubtful success. If the work be that described by Eusebius, it must be mutilated, for the dissertation on the nature of the daemons or heathen deities is said by Eusebius to have been only a part of the work, but it now constitutes the whole.

5. Λᾠγος Παραινετικὸς πρὸς ῾῏Ελληνας, Cohortatio ad Groecos. This is, perhaps, another of the works mentioned by Eusebius, Jerome, and Photius (1. c.), namely, the one said by them to have been entitled by the author" ῎Ελεγχος, Confutatio, or perhaps Τοῦ Πλατῶνος ἔλεγχος, Platonis Confutatio (Photius, Bibl. cod. 232), though the title has been dropped, Others are disposed to identify the work last described with the Confutatio. The genuineness of the extant work has been disputed, chiefly on the ground of internal evidence, by Oudin and by some German scholars (Semler, Arendt, and Herbig); and is spoken of with doubt by Neander; but it has generally been received as genuine, and is defended by Maran,  Semisch (book 2, sect. 1, c. 3), and Otto. It is a much longer piece than the Oratio ad Groecos.

6. Πεπὶ μοναρχίας, De Monarchia. The title is thus given in the MSS. and by Maran. A treatise under nearly the same title, περὶ θεοῦ μοναρχίας, De Monarchia Dei, is mentioned by Eusebius, Jerome, and Photius (l.c.). The word Θεοῦ is contained in the title of the older editions of the extant treatise, which is an argument for Monotheism, supported by numerous quotations from the Greek poets and philosophers. As, according to Eusebius, Justin had used citations from the sacred writings which are not found in the extant work, it is probable that, if this be the genuine work, it has come down to us mutilated. Petavius and Tillemont in a former age, and Herbig and Semisch in the present day, doubt or deny the genuineness of this treatises and their arguments are not without considerable force but the great majority of critics admit the treatise to be Justin's, though some of them, as Cave, Dupin, and Ceillier, contend that it is mutilated. Maran, understanding the passage sin Eusebius differently from others, vindicates not only the genuineness, but the integrity of the work. Some of the passages quoted from the ancient poets are not found in any, other writing, and are on that account suspected to be spurious additions of a later hand."

7. Ε᾿πιστολὴ πρὸς Διόγνητον., Epistola ad Diognetum. This valuable relic, of antiquity, which describes the life and worship of the early Christians, is by some eminent critics, as Labbe, Cave, Fabricitus, Ceillier, Baumgarten-Crusius; and others, ascribed to Justin by others, as Tillemont, Le Nourry, Oudin, Neander, and Semisch, it is ascribed to some other, but unknown writer, who is supposed to have lived earlier than Justin. Grabe, Dupin, Maran, and Otto, are in doubt as to the author ship. Both Otto and Semisch give a lengthened statement of the arguments on the question those of Semisch, derived chiefly from a comparison of the style and thoughts of the author with those of Justin in his undisputed works, clearly point to some other person as its author." Comp. especially Pressense, Early Years of Christianity, 2, (Martyrs and Apologists), p. 591, footnote (N.Y. 1871, 12mo). (The fragment of Justin on the Resurrection is noticed under lost works.)

(3.) Spurious Works.-

8. Α᾿νατροπὴ δογμάτων τινῶν Α᾿ριστοτελικῶν, Quorundam Aristotelis Dogmatum Confutatio. "Possibly this is the work described by Photius  (Bibl. cod. 125) as written against the first and second books of the Physics of Aristotle. Its spuriousness is generally admitted; scarcely any critics except Cave, and perhaps Grabe, contend that it belongs to Justin; but its date is very doubtful, and its real authorship unknown.

9. ῎Εκθεσις τῆς ὀρθῆς σμολογίας, Expositio rectoe Confessionis. Possibly this is the work cited as Justin's by Leontius of Byzantium, in the 6th century; but it was little known in Western Europe till the time of the Reformation when it was received by some of the reformers, as Calvin, as a genuine work of Justin, and by others, as Melancthon and the Magdeburg centuriators placed among the works of doubtful genuineness. But it is now generally allowed that the precision of its orthodoxy, and the use of various terms not in use in Justin's time, make it evident that it was written at any rate after the commencement of the Arian controversy, and probably after the Nestorian, or even the Eutychian controversy. Grabe, Ceillier, and some others ascribe it to Justinus Siculus.

10. Α᾿ποκρίσεις πρὸς τοὺς ὀρθοδόξους περὶ τινῶν ἀναγκαίων ζητημάτων, Responsiones ad Orthodoxos de quibusdam Necessariis Quoestionibus. This is confessedly spurious.

11. Ε᾿ρωτήσεις Χριστιανικαὶ πρὸς τοὺς ῾῏Ελληνας, Quoestiones Christianoe ad Groecos, and Ε᾿ρωτήσεις ῾Ελληνικαὶ πρὸς τοὺς Χριστιανούς, Quoestiones Groecoe ad Christianos. Kestner alone of modern writers contends for the genuineness of these pieces. It is thought by some that either these answers, etc., or those to the Orthodox just mentioned, are, the Αποριῶν κατὰ τῆς εὐσεβέιας κεφαλαιώδεις ἐπιλύσεις, Brief Resolutions of Doubts unfavorable to Piety, mentioned by Photius (Bibl. cod. 125).

12. Epistola ad Zenams et Serenum, commencing; Ι᾿ουστῖνος Ζηνᾶ'/ καὶ Σερήνῳ τοῖς ἀδελφῖς χαίρειν, Justinus Zenee et. Serenofratribus salutem. This piece is by the learned (except Grabe, Cave, and a few others) rejected from the works of Justin Martyr, Halloix, Tillemont, and Ceillier ascribe it to a Justin, abbot of a monastery near Jerusalem, in the reign of the emperor Heraclius, of whom mention is made in the life of St. Anastasius the Persian; but Maran considers that as doubtful."

(4.) Lost Works. —

13. Σύνταγμα κατὰ πασῶν τῶνγεγενημένων, Liber contra omnes Hoereses, mentioned by Justin himself in his Apologia Prima (c. 26, p. 70, ed. Maran: 1, 194, ed. Otto), and therefore antecedent in the time of its composition to that work.

14. Λόγοοι, Εύγγραμμα κατὰ Μαρκίωνος, Πρὸς Μαρκίωνα, Contra Marcionem (Irenaeus, Adv. Hoeres. 4, 6, conf. 5, 26; Jerome, De Vir. Illustribus, c. 23; Eusebius. Hist. Ecclesiastes 4, 11; Photius, Bibl. cod. 125). "Baumgarten Crusius and Otto conjecture that this work against Marcion was a part of the larger work, Contra omnes Hoereses, just mentioned; but Jerome and Photius clearly distinguish them." The fragment De Resurrectione Carnis, preserved by Joannes Damascenus (Sacra Parall. Opera, 2, 756, etc., ed. Lequien), and usually printed with the works of Justin, is thought by Otto to be from the Liber contra omnes Hoereses, or from that against Marcion (supposing them to be distinct works), for no separate treatise of Justin on the Resurrection appears to have been known to Eusebius, or Jerome or Photius but such a work is cited, by Procopius of Gaza, In Octateuch. ad Genes. 3, 21. Semisch, however (book 2, sect. 1, c. 4) who, with Grabe and Otto, contends for the genuineness of the fragment, which he vindicates against the objections of Tillemont, Le Nourry, Maran, Neander, and others, thinks it was an independent work."

15. ψάλτης,Psaltes, a work the nature of which is not known; and,

16. Περὶ ψυχῆς, De Anima — both mentioned by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 4, 18) and Jerome (l.c.), Besides these works Justin wrote several others, of which not even the names have come down to us (Eusebius, 4, 18), but the following are ascribed to him on insufficient grounds.

17. Υπομνήματα εἰς Ε᾿ξαήμερον., Commentarius in Hexaemeron, a work of which a fragment, cited from Anastasius Sinaita (In Hexaem. lib. 7), is given by Grabe (Spicil. SS. Patr. vol. s. saec. 2, p. 195) and Maran (Opp. Justin.). Maran, however, doubts it is Justin's, and observes that the words of Anastasius do not imply that Justin wrote a separate work on the subject.

18. Πρὸς Εὐφράσιον σοφιστὴν περὶ προνοίας καὶ πίστεως, Adversus Euphrasium Sophistam, de Providentia et Fide, of which a citation is preserved by Maximus (Opus. Polemica, 2, 154, ed. Combefis). This treatise is probably the work of a later Justin.

19. A Commentary on the Apocalypse. The supposition that Justin wrote such a work is probably founded on a misunderstanding of a passage in Jerome (De Viris Illustr. c 9), who says that "Justin Martyr interpreted the Apocalypse," but without saying that it was in a separate work. The authorship of the work Περὶ τοῦ παντός, De Universo, mentioned by Photius (Bibl. cod. 48), was, as he tells us, disputed, some ascribing it to Justin, but apparently with little reason. It is now assigned to Hippolytus (q.v.).

Nearly all the works of Justin, genuine and spurious (viz. all enumerated above in the first three divisions, except the Oratio ad Groecos and the Epistola ad Diognetum), were published by Robert Stephens, Paris, 1551, fol. This is the editio princeps of the collected works but the Cohortatio ad Groecos had been previously published, with a Latin version, Paris, 1539, 4to. There is no discrimination or attempt at discrimination in this edition of Stephens between the genuine and spurious Works. The Oratio ad Groecos, and the Epistola ad Diognetum, with a Latin version and notes, were published by Henry Stephens, Paris, 1592, 4to, and again in 1595. All these works, real or supposed, of Justin were published, with the Latin version of Langus, and notes by Fred. Sylburgius, Heidelberg, 1593, fol.; and this edition was reprinted, Paris, 1615 and 1636, fol., with the addition of some remains of other early fathers; and Cologne, (or rather Wittenberg), 1686, fol., with some further additions. A far superior edition, with the remains of Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, and Hermias the Philosopher, with a learned preface and notes, was published, opera et studio unius ex Monachis congreg. S. Mauri," i.e. by Prudentius Maranus, or Marani (Paris, 1742, fol.). In this the genuine pieces, according to the judgment of the editor (Nos. 1-6 in our enumeration), are given in the body of the work, together with the Epistola ad Diognetum, of the authorship of which Maran was in doubt. The two Apologies were placed in their right order for the first time in this edition. The remaining works, together with fragments which had been collected by Grabe (who had first published in his Spicilegium SS. Patrum the fragment on the Resurrection from Joannes Damascenus) and others, and the Martyrum S. Justini, of which the Greek text was first published in the Acta Sanctorum, Aprilis, vol. 2, were given in the Appendix. From the time of Maran, no complete edition of Justin. was published until that of Otto (Jena, 1842-44, 2 vols. 8vo; new edition, 1847-50, 3 vols. 8vo). The first volume contains the Oratio et Cohortatio ad Groecos, and the Apologia Prima and  Apologia Secunda. The second contains the Dialogus cum Tryphone, the Epistola ad Diognetum, the fragments, and the Acta Martyrii Justini et Sociorum. Numerous valuable editions of the several pieces appeared, chiefly in England. The Apologia Prima was edited by Grabe (Oxford, 1700, 8vo); the Apologia Secunda, Oratio ad Groecos, Cohortatio ad Groecos, and De Monarchia, by Hutchin (Oxford, 1703, 8vo); and the Dialogus cum Tryphone, by Jebb. (Lond. 1 719, 8vo). These three editions had the Latin version of Langus, and variorum notes. The Apologia Prima, Apologia Secunda, and Dialogus cum Tryphone, from the text of Robert Stephens, with some corrections, with the version of Langus, and notes, were edited by Thirlby and published, Lond. 1722, folio. It has been conjectured that this valuable edition, though published under the name of Thirlby, was really by Markland. The Apologia Prima, Apologia Secunda Dialogus cum Tryphone, and the fragments, are given in the first volume of the Bibliotheca Patrum of Galland. We do not profess to have enumerated all the editions of the Greek text, and we have not noticed the Latin versions. Full information will be found in the prefaces of Maran and Otto. There are English translations of the Apologies by Reeves, of the Dialogue with Trypho by Brown, and of the Exhortation to the Gentiles by Moses."

Theological Views. — Of the more striking peculiarities of Justin's theological system, we present the reader a short but faithful summary from the pen of the late professor C. E. Stowe: "There is in every man a germ of the divine reason, a seed of the Logos, whereby man is related to God, and becomes capable of forming an idea of God. By this spark of the divine intelligence the better men among the pagan philosophers were illuminated; but more especially, and far beyond these, the prophets and inspired men of the Old Testament. Still this revelation was only fragmentary and partial. Only in Christ was the Logos, the diving reason, perfectly revealed. The Logos, the Word, is himself God, yet from God; the Word the First-begotten, the Power, the primitive Revelation of God. He is the only-begotten of God, yet without any dividing or pouring forth of the divine substance, but begotten solely by the will of the Father. The Son was with God before the creation; the Word of the Father, and begotten when God by him in the beginning created and ordered all things. As to his personal subsistence, he is distinct from God, but numerically only, not essentially; and subordinate to the Father, but only insomuch as he has his origin and being from the counsel of the paternal will. As he is the first revelation of the Father, so he is the medium of all the subsequent  revelations of the divine light and life. He is the Creator and Governor of the world, the universal reason. He dwells in every reasonable being, in different measure, according to the susceptibility of each individual; and he was the leader and bearer of the Old Testament theocracy.

He is the God who appeared to Moses and to the patriarchs. He it is who said, I am the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob; and he was with such heathen as Socrates, though not with those who were ungodly. When the fullness of time had come, this Word, through the, Virgin, became flesh, according to the will of the Father, that he might participate in and bear our infirmities, and take away from us the curse of the law. In him were united and made objective the human reason and the divine intelligence; he was in the flesh both man and God incarnate, and thus the Savior of fallen men. This is the true and the only safe and saving philosophy; in comparison with this, all other philosophy has only a subordinate value; this alone works salvation, and here only can we recognize the divine, and attain to God. He who is filled with the spirit of Christ derives not his knowledge from the erring, and imperfect, and fragmentary reason, but from the fullness and perfection of reason, which is Christ himself" (Bibliotheca Sacra, 1852, p. 829 sq.). As a whole, the works of Justin Martyr everywhere attest," says Dr. Schaff (Ch. Hist. 2, 484), his honesty and earnestness, his enthusiastic love for Christianity, and his fearlessness in its defense against all assaults from without and perversions from within. Justin was a man of very extensive reading, enormous memory, inquiring spirit, and many profound ideas, but wanting in critical discernment. His mode of reasoning is often ingenious and convincing, but sometimes loose and rambling, fanciful and puerile. His style is easy and vivacious, but diffuse and careless.

He is the first of the Church fathers to bring classical scholarship and Platonic philosophy in contact with the Christian theology. He found in Platonism many responses to the Gospel, which he attributed in part to the fragmentary, germ like revelation of the Logos before the incarnation, and in part to an acquaintance with the Mosaic Scriptures. With him Christ was the absolute reason, and Christianity the only true philosophy. His sources of theological knowledge are partly the living Church tradition, partly the Holy Scriptures, from which he cites most frequently, and generally from memory, the Old Testament prophets (in the Sept.), and the Memorials of the Apostles, as he calls the canonical gospels. He expressly mentions the revelation of John. But, like the Pastor Hermae, he nowhere notices Paul, though several allusions to passages of his epistles can hardly be mistaken, and Justin's position towards  heathenism was anything but the Ebionistic, and was far more akin to that of Paul. Any dogmatical inference from this silence is the less admissible, since in the genuine writings of this father not one of the apostles or evangelists is expressly named, but reference is always made directly to Christ. Justin's exegesis of the Old Testament is typological and Messianic throughout, finding references everywhere to Christ." See Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. 4, 8-13, 16-18; Jerome, De Vir. Illust. c. 23; Phot. Bibl. cod. 48, 125, 232, 234; Martyrium s. Acta Martyrii Justinii, apud Acta Sanctorum, April. vol. 2; and apud Opera Justini, edit. Maran and Otto; Halloix, Illustrium Eccl. Orient. Scriptorum "Vitoe, saecl. 2, p. 151, etc.; reprinted, with a Comment. Proevius and Notoe by Papebroche, in the Acta Sanctorum, April. vol. 2; Grabe, Spicilegium SS. Patrum, 2, 133; Baronius, Annales, ad annos 130, 142, 143, 150, 164, 165; Pagi, Critioe in. Baronium; Cave, History of Literature, 1. 60, ed. Oxf. 1740-43; the ecclesiastical histories of Tillemont, 2, 344, etc.; Fleury, 1, 413, etc., 476, etc.; Dupin, Nouvelle Bibliotheque, etc.; Ceillier, Des Auteurs Sacres, 2, etc.; Lardner, Credibility, etc.; Otto, De Justini Martyris Scriptis; Fabricius, Biblioth. Groec. 7, 52, etc.; Semisch, Justin der Martyrer (Breslau, 1840-2; translated by Ryland in the Biblical Cabinet); Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. and Mythology, 2, 682 sq.; Bp. Kaye, Writings and Opinions of Justin Martyr (2d ed., revised, Lond. 1836, 8vo); Kitto, Journal Sacred Lit. 5, 253 sq.; Roberts and Donaldson, Ante- Nicene Christian Lib. (Edinb. 1867, T. and T. Clark), vol. 2; Neander, Church History, 1, 661 sq.

## Justin I[[@Headword:Justin I]]

             or the Elder, Roman emperor of the East, born A.D. 450, was originally a swineherd. The soldiers of the Praetorian band forced him to accept the imperial dignity on the death of Anastasius in 518. He is noted in ecclesiastical history for his interference in behalf of the orthodox bishops who had been banished by the Arians, but whom he recalled, and for several edicts which he published against the Arians. Hearing of the destruction of Antioch by an earthquake, he laid aside the imperial robe, clothed himself in sackcloth, and passed several days in fasting and prayer to avoid divine judgment. He rebuilt that city and other places which were destroyed by the same calamity. He died in 527. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Biog. 2, 677 sq.

## Justin Of Sicily[[@Headword:Justin Of Sicily]]

             SEE JUSTINUS.

## Justin The Gnostic[[@Headword:Justin The Gnostic]]

             who flourished towards the close of the second century, has only recently become known to us through the Philosophoumena of Hippolytus (5, 22; 10, 15), and of his personal history and origin very little information has come down to us. His system has a Judaizing cast, and is mostly based upon a mystical interpretation of Genesis. He propagated his doctrines secretly, binding his disciples to silence by solemn oaths. In his gnosis Justin made use of Greek mythology, especially the tradition of the twelve conflicts of Hercules. He assumes three original principles, two male and one female. The last he identifies with Eden, which marries Elohim, and becomes thus the mother of the angels of the spirit world. The tree of life in Paradise represents the good, the tree of knowledge the evil angels. The four rivers are symbols of the four divisions of angels. The Naas, or the serpent spirit, he made, unlike the Ophites, the bearer of the evil principle;  he committed adultery with Eve, and a worse crime with Adam; he adulterated the laws of Moses and the oracles of the prophets; he nailed Jesus to the cross. But by this crucifixion Jesus was emancipated from his material body, rose to the good God to whom he committed his spirit in death, and thus became the deliverer. Schaff, Church History, 1, 242, 243. SEE GNOSTICISM.

## Justina Of Padua, St[[@Headword:Justina Of Padua, St]]

             patroness of Padua, and, together with St. Mark, of Venice also. According to the hagiographers she was a native of the former city, and suffered martyrdom there in 304, under Diocletian, and according to others under Nero. We have no details on the event, however. Her relics, which were lost, were recovered (?) in 1177, and are preserved in a church of Padua which bears her name. In 1417 a convent of Benedictines in the neighborhood reformed their rules, taking the name of Congregation of St. Justina of Padua. This reform was followed by another in 1498, under the care of Luigi Barbo, a Venetian senator, whom pope Alexander VI created first abbot of the order. The congregation spread, and the monastery of Mount Cassin, having joined it in 1504, was made its headquarters by Julius II. Moreri considers the legend of this saint's miracles as fabulous, yet the Roman Church commemorates her on the 7th of October. See Tillemont, Hist. de la Persecution de Diocletian, art. 55; Baillet, Vies des Saints, Oct. 7th. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gener. 27, 310.

## Justina, St[[@Headword:Justina, St]]

             is said to have been born at Antioch, of Christian parents, and to have suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia in 304. St. Cyprian, surnamed the Magician, is charged with the attempt of her seduction by magic, and that her conduct led him to embrace the Christian faith. During the persecution ordered by Diocletian and Maximian they were arrested together, and, after suffering torture with great firmness, were sent to Diocletian at Nicomedia. The latter caused them at once to be beheaded. The Greek Church commemorates them on the 2d of October and the Roman Church on the 26th of September. The empress Eudocia, wife of Theodosius the Younger, wrote a poem in three cantos in honor of St. Justina and St. Cyprian. See Photius, Bibliotheca, cap. 184; Tillemont, Memoires,. vol. 5; Dupin, Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles. au troisieme siecle; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, 27,309.

## Justinian I, The Great [[@Headword:Justinian I, The Great ]]

             (SEE FLAVIUS ANICIUS JUSTINIANUS),

## Justinian emperor of the East[[@Headword:Justinian emperor of the East]]

             was born in 483 of an obscure family. He shared the fortunes of his uncle Justin, who, from a common Thracian peasant, was raised to the imperial throne, and, after the death of his uncle, Aug. 1, 527, was himself proclaimed emperor. He obtained great military successes over the Persians. through his celebrated general Belisarius, destroyed the empire of the Vandals in Africa, and put an end to the dominion of the Ostrogoths in Italy, which successes restored to the Roman empire a part of its vast possessions. But Justinian was by no means satisfied with the renown of a conqueror. Learned, unweariedly active, and ecclesiastically devout, he aspired to the united renown of a lawgivers theologian, and champion of the genuine Christian orthodoxy as well; and his, in some respects, brilliant reign of nearly thirty years is marked by earnest though unsuccessful efforts to establish the "true faith" for all time to come. Indeed, he regarded it as his especial mission to compel a general uniformity of Christian belief and practice, but by his persistency only increased the divisions in church, and state, as he was greatly misguided by his famous wife, who, though animated by great zeal for the Church, was  blindly devoted to the Monophysites. Yet, however unfortunate the efforts of Justinian in behalf of Christian orthodoxy resulted, so much is certain, that his aim was noble and lofty, and that he was actuated by the holiest of purposes. It is said of him that he spent whole nights in prayer and fasting, and in theological studies and discussions, and that he placed his throne under the especial protection of the Virgin Mary and the archangel Michael, He adorned the capital and the provinces with costly temples and institutions of charity. Among the churches which he rebuilt was that of St. Sophia at Constantinople, which had been burned in one of the civil commotions. This church is esteemed a masterpiece of architecture. The altar was entirely of gold and silver, and adorned with a vast number and variety of precious stones. It was by this emperor that the fifth (Ecumenical Council was convened at Constantinople (A.D. 553) to secure the end for which Justinian was personally laboring — the union of the Church and the extirpation of heresies. His fame, however, rests chiefly on his great ability as legislator. Determined to collect all previous legislative Roman enactments, he entrusted to a number of the ablest lawyers of Rome, under the direction of the renowned Tribonianus, the task of a complete revision and digested collection of the Roman law from the time of Hadrian to his own reign; and thus arose, after the short lapse of seven years, the celebrated Codex Justinianeus, "which thenceforth became the universal law of the Roman empire, the sole text book in the academies at Rome, Constantinople, and Berytus, and the basis of the legal relations of the greater part of Christian Europe to this day." This body of Roman law, which is "an important source of our knowledge of the Christian life in its relations to the state and its influence upon it," opens with the imperial creed on the Trinity (for which, see Schaff, Church History, 3, 769) and the imperial anathema against the prominent Christian heretics. The whole collections of Justinian are now known under the style of Corpus Juris Civilis. The editions with Gothofredus' notes are much esteemed. The four books of Justinian's Institutions were translated into English, with notes, by George Harris, LL.D. (Lond. 2d ed. 1761, 4to, Lat. and Engl.). Justinian also wrote a libellus confessionis fidei, and a hymn:( ὁμογενης υἱος και λογος του θεου, etc.). (J.H.W.)

## Justiniani, Agostino[[@Headword:Justiniani, Agostino]]

             a Dominican and bishop of Nebbio, in the isle of Corsica, was born at Genoa in 1470, and died in 1536, on the way from Genoa to Corsica. He edited, Philonis Judaei Quaestiones et Responsiones super Genesin: — R. Mosis AEgyptii Ductor Dubitantium: — Porcheti de Sylvaticis Victoria contra Impios Hebraeos: — Liber Jobi Veritati Hebraicae Restitutus, and published Psalterium Hebr., Graec., Arab. et Chald. cuss Tribus Lat. Interpretationibus et Glossis (Genoa, 1516). See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:36; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Justiniani, Benedetto[[@Headword:Justiniani, Benedetto]]

             a Jesuit papal preacher at Rome, who died December 19, 1622, at Toulouse, professor of theology, wrote Explanationes in Omnes Epistolas Pauli (Lyons, 1612, 2 vols.): — Explanationes in Omnes Epistolas Catholicas (ibid. 1621): — Apologia pro Libertate Ecclesiastica ad Gallo- Francos. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:253, 268. (B.P.)

## Justinus Of Sicily[[@Headword:Justinus Of Sicily]]

             bishop of one of the sees in that island in the latter part of the fifth century, was present at a council held at Rome A.D. 483 or 484, under pope Felix III, in which Petrus Fullo (Γναφεύς); or Peter the Fuller, was condemned  as a heretic for having added to the "trisagion" the heretical words "who suffered for us." Several bishops, among whom was Justin, desirous of recalling Peter from his errors, addressed letters to him. Justin's letter to Peter, in the original Greek, with a Latin version, Epistola Justini Episcopi in Sicilia, ad Petrum Fullonem S. Gnapheum, is given in the Concilia (vol. 4, col. 1103, etc., edit. Labbe; vol. 2, col. 839, edit. Hardouin; vol. 7, col. 1115, edit. Mansi). The genuineness of this letter, and of six others of similar character from various Eastern or Western bishops, which are also given in the Concilia, is disputed by Valesius (Observat. Eccles. ad Evagrium Libri dus, Lib. I De Petro Antiochen. Episcop. c. 4), but defended by Cave (Hist. Litt. 1, 458), who, however, contends that the Greek text is not the original, but a version from the Latin. Pagi (Critici in Baronii Annales, ad ann. 485, c. 15) proposes to correct the reading of the title of Justin's letter from "Episcopi in Sicilia" to "Episcopi in Cilicia;" others; would read the name "Justinianus," but on what authority we do not know. Dodwell and others ascribe to this Justin the Responsiones ad Orthodoxos, and the Expositio Rectoe Confessionis, reputed to be by Justin Martyr, and printed with his works. See Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. 7, 53; 11, 661; 12, 655. — Smith, Dict. Greek and Roman Biog. s.v.

## Justus[[@Headword:Justus]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, accompanied Laurentius and Mellitus when they departed from Rome, in 601, to join the mission at Canterbury. He was a Roman by birth; was also first bishop of the see of Rochester. He was translated to Canterbury in 624. The great event of his short occupancy of the latter see was the extension of the Kentish mission to Northumbria. This was effected by the marriage of Edwin, the king of Northumbria, with Ethelburga, the sister of Eadbald, king of Kent. Justus consecrated Paulinus, July 21, 625, to be archbishop of York. He died November 10, 627. See Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 1:100 sq.

## Justus Of Tiberias[[@Headword:Justus Of Tiberias]]

             (in Galilee), son of Pistus, one of the most noteworthy Jewish historians, flourished in the beginning of the Christian era. He was in the employ of king Agrippa as private secretary when the revolution in Galilee broke out, and though the city of Tiberias had been especially favored by the king, the Tiberian Jews soon followed in the course of their neighbors, and many, gathered, under Pistus and his son Justus, who, besides the advantage of a Greek education, was a great natural orator, and easily swayed the masses. As we have shown in our articles on Josephus and John of Gischala, Josephus desired ever the leadership, be it among his own nation or among the Romans, and Justus having made early advances in favor of the revolution, and quickly gained the confidence of the people, Josephus feared and hated him, and, as soon as the war terminated, took special pains to convince the Romans that Justus was the greater rebel of the two.  The conduct of Josephus towards Justus became still more unjustly severe after the latter had ventured to write a history of the war, now unhappily lost, in which the treacherous action of Josephus was laid bare. Indeed, Josephus himself makes the only avowed object of the publication of his "life" his vindication from the calumnies of Justus, who is accused of having falsified the history of the war with Rome (comp. Josephus, De vita sua, § 37, 65, 74), as well as of having delayed the editing of the book until the decease of Agrippa and the other great men of the time, because his accounts were false and he feared the consequences of his unjustness: an untruthfulness. Justus, according to Photius (Bibl. cod. 33), also wrote a history of the Jews from the times of Moses down to the death of Herod, in the third year of the reign of Trajan, but this work also is unfortunately lost. Some writers (Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesiastes 3, 9; Stephanus Byzant. s.v. Τιβερίας) speak of a special work of his on the Jewish War, but this may refer only to the last portion of his chronicle which Diogenes Laertius (2, 41) calls a Στίμμα. Suidas (s.v. Ιοῦστος) mentions some other works of Justus, of which, however, nothing is extant. See Grätz, Gesch. der Juden, 3, 397 sq.; Stud. und Krit. 1853, p. 56 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Justus, St.[[@Headword:Justus, St.]]

             is the name of a Christian martyr who, with his brother Pastor (aged respectively twelve and nine years), when the persecution of Diocletian against the Christians began, in the face of certain martyrdom boldly avowed himself a Christian. For this alone they were cruelly flogged; and Dacian, at that time the governor of Spain, enraged at their courageous resignation, finally caused them to be beheaded.

Another St. Justus, celebrated in history, was bishop of Lyons, in France. His life gives us an insight into the customs of the 4th century. The monks, both in the East and the West, sought at that time to prevent as far as possible capital punishment, and often represented those who had undergone it in punishment of their crimes as martyrs. A man who, in an excess of rage had killed several persons in the streets of Lyons, fled to the bishop's church for protection. Justus, in order to shield him, delivered him into the hands of the authorities on the condition that he should be but lightly punished but the mob took him out of the hands of the officers and killed him. Justus, considering himself responsible for the death of this man, and henceforth unworthy of his office, fled to Egypt, where he remained unknown in a convent, and there died about 390.

Another St. Justus, a native of Rome, followed St. Augustine in his mission to England, and became, in 624, archbishop of Canterbury. He died Nov. 10, 627. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Jutland[[@Headword:Jutland]]

             a province of Denmark, contains, since the Peace of Vienna of Oct. 30, 1864, which regulated the frontier between Denmark and Germany, 9738 square miles; and in 1880 had 788,119 inhabitants. It constitutes the northern part of the Cimbrian peninsula, and is bounded on the north by the Skagerrack, on the east by the Kattegat, on the south by Schleswig, and on the west by the German Sea. Originally the Cimbri are said to have lived there; subsequently the country was occupied by the Juts, a Saxon tribe. At the beginning of the 10th century it was conquered by the Danish king Gorm, and since then it has been a part of the kingdom of Denmark. Christianity was introduced into Jutland by Ansgar (q.v.), and the Christianization of the country was completed within a comparatively short period. The first church was erected at Ribe. The Reformation was first carried through in the city of Viborg by the efforts of Hans Yansen a young peasant from the island of Fuhnen. Jutland has now four Lutheran dioceses Aalborg, Viborg, Aarhuus, and Ribe. SEE DENMARK. (A.J.S.)

## Juttah[[@Headword:Juttah]]

             (Hebrew Yutah', יוּטָה, Jos 15:55,Vulg. Jota; or Yuttah', יֻטָּה, perhaps inclined, otherwise i.q. Jotbah, Jos 21:16, Vulg. Jeta; Sept. Ι᾿εττά v.r. Ι᾿τάν and Τανύ), a Levitical city in the mountains of Judah, named in connection with Ziph, Jezreel, etc., in the neighborhood of Maon and Carmel (Jos 15:55). It was allotted to the priests (21:16), but in the catalogue of 1Ch 6:57-59, the name has escaped. Eusebius (Onomast. s.v.) calls it a large village by the name of Jettan (Ι᾿εττάν), and places it eighteen miles south of Eleutheropolis, in the district of Daromas (the south). It is doubtless the village discovered by Dr. Robinson (Researches, 2, 628), four miles south of Hebron, and still called Yutta, having the appearance of a large Mohammedan town, on a low eminence, with trees around and where the guides spoke of the existence of old foundations and former walls. Schwarz calls it Zata in his Palest. p. 106, and Seetzen Jitta on his map.

"The selection of Juttah as a city of the priests suggests the idea of its having already been a place of importance, which is seemingly confirmed by early and numerous allusions to it in the inscriptions on the Egyptian monuments. There it appears to be described under the names Tah, Tahn, and Tahn-nu, as a fortress of the Anakim near Arba or Hebron; and it is not a little remarkable that another Egyptian document, the Septuagint, expresses the word in almost the selfsame manner, Ι᾿τάν and Τανύ, (Jour. Sac. Lit. April and July, 1852, p. 73, 316, 317)" (Fairbairn, s.v.).

The "city of Juda" (Luk 1:39), whither Mary went to visit Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist (εἰς πόλιν Ι᾿ούδα), and where Zecharias therefore appears to have resided, has usually been supposed to mean Hebron; but, if the reading be correct, the proper rendering would be "to the city Judah," i.e. its capital, or Jerusalem (see Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. 12), notwithstanding the absence of the article (Winer's Grammat. V.T. p. 136). But, as this was not intended (see Rob. Valesius, Epist. ad Casaubon. 1613, p. 669), Reland (Palest. p. 870) has suggested a conjectural reading of "Juttah" for "Judah" (Ι᾿ουτά for Ιούδα) in the above passage of Luke, which has met with favor among critics (see Harenberg, in the Nov. Miscell. Lips. 4, 595; Paulus, Kuinol, ad loc.), although no various reading exists to justify it.

## Juttah (2)[[@Headword:Juttah (2)]]

             Its modern representative Yutta is thus described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (3:310);

"A large village standing on a ridge. It is built of stone, but some of the inhabitants live in tents. The water supply is from cisterns. On the south there are rock-cut tombs, and rock wine-presses are found all around the village. The neighborhood is extremely stony. South of the village are scattered olives, which are conspicuous objects; on the west, a little lower, under a cliff, is a small olive- yard: to the south-west a few figs. The inhabitants are very rich in flocks; the village owns, it is said, 17,000 sheep, besides goats, cows, camels, horses, and donkeys. The sheik alone has 250 sheep."

## Juvencus, Caius Vettius Aquilinus[[@Headword:Juvencus, Caius Vettius Aquilinus]]

             one of the earliest Church historians and Christian poets, a native of Spain, was a contemporary of Constantine, and a presbyter of the Church. Living at the time when Christianity ascended the throne of the Caesars, he attempted to clothe the recital of Biblical events in the classic and elegant style of the best profane writers. About 330 he composed his Historia evangelica, a work in four books, dedicated to Constantine. It is the reproduction of the Gospels in Latin hexameters, following the text closely, especially St. Matthew's, and in the style imitating Lucretius, Ovid, and especially Virgil, thus making a sort of epic poem, after the model of the AEneid. "The liberal praises bestowed upon Juvencus by divines and scholars, from St. Jerome down to Petrarch, must be understood to belong rather to the substance of the piece than to the form in which the materials are presented. We may honor the pious motive which prompted the undertaking, and we may bestow the same commendation upon the laborious ingenuity with which every particular recorded by the sacred historians, and frequently their very words, are forced into numbers, but the very plan of the composition excludes all play of fancy and all poetical freedom of expression, while the versification, although fluent and generally harmonious, too often bids defiance to the laws of prosody; and the language, although evidently in many places copied from the purest models, betrays here and there evident indications of corruption and decay. The idea that this production might be employed with advantage in the interpretation of the Scriptures, inasmuch as it may be supposed to exhibit faithfully the meaning attached to various obscure passages in the early age to which it belongs, will not, upon examination, be found to merit much attention" (Professor Ramsay, in Smith, ut infra). He also wrote parts of the Old Testament in the same manner, but of these we know only his Liber in Genesin (according to Jerome, De script. ill. 84, he wrote "nonnulla codem metro ad sacramentorum ordinem pertinentia"). The Historia evangelica was first printed by Deventer, s. 1. (probably 1490); then often reprinted, as in the Collectio vet. Poet. eccl. of Fabricius (Basil. 1564); the Bibl. M. Lugd. 4, 55 sq.; by E. Reusch (Francfort and Lpz. 1710); and later from a manuscript in the collection of the Vatican by F. Arevale (Rome, 1792, 4to), and in the first book of Gebser. Extracts of the Genesis were given in Martene's Nov. Collect. tom. 9; and lately J.B. Pitra, in his Spicilegium Solesmense (Paris, Didot, 1852; comp. Proleg. 42 sq.), published both these verses from the Genesis, and other fragments from  the Old Testament, forming 6000 verses, and gained great credit by his efforts to prove their authenticity as works of Juvencus. See Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 5, 277; Fabricius, Bibl. med. et inf. Lat. 4, 212; Gebser, De Juvenci vita et scriptis adj. lib. i. hist. evang. (Jena, 1827); Bahr, Rom. Lit. Gesch. (Suppl. 1); Smith, Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog. 2, s.v.

## Juxon, William[[@Headword:Juxon, William]]

             a celebrated English prelate, distinguished for his faithfulness to the unfortunate king Charles, was born at Chichester in 1582, and was educated at St. John's College, Oxford, where he obtained a fellowship in 1598. He first studied law, but afterwards altered his mind, took orders, and was presented in 1609 to the vicarage of St. Giles, Oxford, together with which, after 1614, he held the rectory of Somerton. In 1621 he was chosen president of his college, after which he rose rapidly, through the interest of archbishop Laud, being successively appointed dean of Worcester, clerk of the closet, bishop of Hereford, dean of the Chapel Royal, and, in 1633, bishop of London. The sweetness of his temper, the kindness and courtesy of his manners, and his uniform benevolence, made bishop Juxon a general favorite, and archbishop Laud fixed upon him as a fit person to hold a secular office under government. This was one of Laud's fatal errors. He did not perceive and make allowance for the change of public opinion. Bishops had, before the Reformation, become great men by holding secular appointments, and the archbishop thought to restore the order to its ancient importance in men's eyes by reverting to the exploded system. He forgot that bishops held secular offices formerly from the necessity of the case, and because there were not a sufficient number of the laity qualified, and that the fact itself, though necessary, was still an evil, since it interfered with their higher and spiritual duties. In Laud's own time the laity were better qualified than the clergy for office, and the appointment of the clergy was justly offensive, both as an insult to the laity, and as leading the people to suppose that the bishops had nothing to do in their dioceses. Under this false policy, in 1625 Juxon was appointed to the post of lord high treasurer, the highest office at that time in the kingdom, and next in precedence to that of the archbishop and to the great seal, which had not been held by a clergyman since the reign of Henry VII.

In 1641 he resigned this office, which, it was admitted by all parties, he had held without reproach. The general harmlessness of his character enabled him to remain for the most part undisturbed at Fulham. Nevertheless, he remained firm to his principles, and steady in his loyalty to the king, by  whom he was frequently consulted. He was in attendance upon the king at the treaty in the Isle of Wight, in 1648, and during the king's trial acted as his spiritual adviser. Bishop Juxon was also in attendance upon the king in his last hours upon the scaffold. Juxon continued in his position until the abolition of kingly government, by the House of Lords, and the establishment of a Commonwealth. He then retired to his own estate, the manor of Little Compton, in Gloucestershire, where he passed his days in a private and devout condition. At the Restoration, aged as he was, he was appointed, we might almost say by acclamation, archbishop of Canterbury in 1660. He was not able to exert himself much in his spiritual office, but he was a benefactor to the see, for during the short time he held the archbishopric he expended on the property fifteen thousand pounds; he moreover augmented the vicarages, the great tithes of which were appropriated to the see. He died June 4, 1663. By his last will, archbishop Juxon bequeathed £7000 to his alma mater. He left also £100 to the parish of St. Giles, of which he had been vicar; the same sum to four other parishes in Oxford, and sums for the repair of St. Paul's and Canterbury Cathedrals, and other charitable uses, in all to the amount of £5000. Wood tells us that he was a man of primitive sanctity, wisdom, piety, learning, patience, charity, and all apostolical virtues. Whitelock says of him that he was a comely person, of an active and lively disposition, of great parts and temper, full of ingenuity and meekness, not apt to give offense to any, and willing to do good to all; of great moderation, sincerity, and integrity, insomuch that he was the delight of his time. He wrote a Sermon on Luk 18:31 : — a treatise, entitled Χάρις καὶ Εἰρήνη, or Some Considerations upon the Act of Uniformity (London, 1662, 4to). In this work he shows himself to be no friend to the scheme of a comprehension. A catalogue of books in England, alphabetically digested (Lond. 1658), bears his name. See Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v. (J.H.W.)