THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY REFERENCE

CYCLOPEDIA of BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL and ECCLESIASTICAL LITERATURE

Jehoash- Johlsohn, J. Joseph by James Strong & John McClintock

To the Students of the Words, Works and Ways of God:

Welcome to the AGES Digital Library. We trust your experience with this and other volumes in the Library fulfills our motto and vision which is our commitment to you:

MAKING THE WORDS OF THE WISE AVAILABLE TO ALL — INEXPENSIVELY.

AGES Software Rio, WI USA Version 1.0 © 2000

Jeho'ash

(Heb. Yehoish', vayby] Jehovah-given; in most of the passages in 2 Kings 'only; more usually in the contracted form Yoash', va/y, "Joash," Sept. Ἰωάς, Josephus Ἰώασος), 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 (1201) 2 Chronicles 21:4, 17; 22:1, 8, 9, 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 Jehojada, 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; 12; 2 Chronicles 24). He is one of the three kings (Ahaziah, Jehoash, Amaziah) omittted by Matthew in the genealogy of Christ (**Matthew 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 (Lings 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 (Kings 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 42012 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 (Kings 14:1-17). SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

Jeho'hanan

(Heb. *Yehochanan*', nj /j p]*Jehovah-granted*, q.d. θεοδῶρος), the name of several men. *SEE JOHANAN*; *SEE JOHN*, etc.

- **1.** (Sept. Ἰωνάν) A Korhite and head of the sixth division of Levitical Temple porters (Δασω) 1 Chronicles 26:3). B.C. 1014.
- 2. (Sept. Ἰωανάν) Jehoshaphat's second "captain," in command of 280,000 (?) men (Δ4775-2 Chronicles 17:15); probably the same whose son Ishmael supported Jehoiada in his restoration of prince Jehoash (Δ4775-2 Chronicles 23:1). B.C. cir. 910.
- 3. (Sept. Ἰωανάν, 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 (ΔRRD-2 Chronicles 28:12). B.C. ante 738.
- **4.** (Sept. Ἰωανάν, 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 (ΔΙΟΙΕΣΙΣΙΑ 10:6); doubtless the same elsewhere

- called JOHANAN in the original (***Nehemiah 12:22, 23) and perhaps identical with No. 7 below.
- **5.** (Sept. Ἰωανάν) One of the "sons" of Bebai, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Babylonian exile (ΔSUB) Ezra 10:28). B.C. 459.
- **6.** (Sept. Ἰωνάθαν v.r. Ἰωνάν, Auth. Vers. "Johanan.") Son of Tobiah, the Samaritan enemy of the Jews; and son-in-law of Meshullam (***Nehemiah 6:18). B.C. 446.
- 7. (Sept. Ἰωνάν) One of the priests who celebrated with music the reparation of the walls of Jerusalem (Nehemiah 12:42). B.C. 446. He was perhaps the same with No. 4 or No. 8.
- 8. (Sept. Ἰωανάν) A leading priest, the "son" of Amariah and contemporary with Joiakim (Nehemiah 12:13). B.C. cir. 406. He may have been identical with the preceding.

Jehoi'achin

(Heb. Yehoyakin', ^yk\pehy] Jehovah appointed; Sept. Ἰεχονίαςin in ¹²⁴⁶2 Kings 24:6, 8, 12, 15; 25:27; Ἰεχονίας in Chronicles 36:8, 9; Ἰωακείμ in ΔΕΣΕ Jeremiah 52:31; Josephus Ιωάχιμος Ant. 10, 6, 3; 7, 1; N. Test. Teχονίας, "Jechonias," «ΜΕΜαtthew 1:11, 12; contracted once γκαν, Yoyakin', ²⁰⁰⁰Ezekiel 1:2, Sept. Ἰωακείμ, Auth. Vers. "Jehoiachin"), also in the contracted forms JECONIAH (hynky] Yekonyah', Sept. Ἰεχονίας in Jeremiah 27:20; 28:4; 29:2; (Chronicles 3:16, 17; but omits in Esther 2:6; likewise paragogic Whynky] Yekonya'hu, ^{ann} Jeremiah 24:1; Sept. Ἰεχονίας) and CONIAH (Konyah', only paragogic Whynk; Konya'hu, Jeremiah 22:24, 28; 37:1, Sept. Ἰεχονίας), 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 4238 Kings 24:8, but only eight according to 4439 Chronicles 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 Chronicles 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 1 Esd. 1:43. Among recent commentators, Keil, Thenius, and Hitzig favor the reading eighteen, while Bertheau prefers eight. The language in Jeremiah 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 Ezekiel 19:5-9. The decided reprobation, however, in ¹²⁰⁰2 Kings 24:9, and in ¹²⁰⁰2 Chronicles 36:9, would hardly be used of a mere child. The mention of his mother in 424122 Kings 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 Matthew 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 [42362 Kings 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 Kings 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 (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 (2240) Kings 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 Jeremiah 29:2; Ezekiel 17:12; 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 Kings 24:14, is probably a round number, made up of the 7000 soldiers of verse 16 and the 3023 nobles of Jeremiah 52:28, exclusive of the 1000 artificers mentioned in 42462 Kings 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 (Zedekiah (Kings 24:11-16; 2 Chronicles 36:9, 10; SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR.

Jehoiachin remained a captive at Babylon — actually in prison (al K, tyB) and wearing prison garments (2523 Jeremiah 52:31, 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 (2527 Kings 25:27-30; 2523 Jeremiah 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 2001 Jeremiah 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 (2022), 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" (**Ezekiel 1:2; 8:1; 24:1, etc.); the latest date being "the twenty-seventh year" (Ezekiel 29:17; 40:1). We also learn from Esther 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 (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 1 Esd. 5:5, but the text seems to be corrupt. That Zedekiah, who in ⁴³⁸⁶1 Chronicles 3:16 is called "his son," is the same as Zedekiah his uncle (called "his brother" in 48602 Chronicles 36:10), who was his successor on the throne, seems certain. But it is probable that "Assir" (rSai= captive), who is reckoned amongst the family of Jeconiah in Chronicles 3:17, may really have been only an appellative of Jeconiah himself (see Bertheau on Chronicles 3:16). SEE ASSIR. In the genealogy of Christ (**Matthew 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 (²⁰²⁰Jeremiah 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 (1 Esd. 1:34, ¹²²⁰2 Kings 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*.

Jehoi'ada

(Hebrew *Yehôyada*', [dy/hy]*Jehovah known*; Sept. Ἰωιαδά, Ἰωιαδέ, Ἰωδαέ), the name of two or more priests.

- 1. The father of Benaiah, which latter was one of David's chief warriors (**1008**2 Samuel 8:18; 20:23; 23:20, 22; **1008*1 Kings 1:8, 26, 32, 36, 38, 44; 2:25. 29, 34, 35, 16; 4:4; **312**1 Chronicles 11:22, 24; 18:17; 27:5). B.C. ante 1046. He is probably the same mentioned as assisting David at Hebron as leader (clygrae) of 3700 armed Aaronites (**312**1 Chronicles 12:27); Josephus, who calls him $16080\mu o \zeta$, says 4700 Levites (*Ant.* 7, 2, 3). In **515*1 Chronicles 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 (ADDIE) Chronicles 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. 4380)-1 Chronicles 18:7-11; 26:20-28; Kings 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 Deuteronomy 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 Kings 12 and 400 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 (Chronicles 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, \dot{l} ωδαος), follows the Bible account; but in his list of the high priests (Ant. 10, 8, 6), the corresponding name seems to be Axioramus (Αξεώραμος, 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 ⁴²⁰⁶Jeremiah 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 Matthew 23:25. SEE ZEDEKIAH.

3. (**Nehemiah 3:6). *SEE JOIADA*.

Jehoi'akim

(Heb. Yehôyakinm', μyqychy] Jehovah established; Sept. Ἰωαλόμ, oftener Ἰωακείμ, Josephus Ἰωάκιμος; compare Joiakim, Jokim), the second son of Josiah by Zebudah, daughter of Pedaiah of Rumah (probably the Dumah of Joshua 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 Signature 2 Kings 23:34, 35, 36; 24:1, 5, 6, 19; Signature 2 Chronicles 36:4, 5, 8; Signature 36:1, 5, 6, 19; Signature 37:1, 26:1, 21, 22, 23; 27:1, 20; 28:4; 35:1; 36:1, 9, 28, 29, 30, 32; 37:1; 45:1; 46:2; 52:2; Signature 37:1, 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 (Signature 2):34:34. 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 (**Genesis 41:45; **Ezra 5:14; **Daniel 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 (***OTD**2 Samuel 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 (****Deremiah 22:19). (**SEE ECKHIRD**, *Vom Esels-Begräbniss**, Lpz. 1716.) **SEE NAME**.

Jehoiakim's younger brother Jehoahaz, or Shallum, as he is called Jeremiah 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 (**DIS**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 (Kings 23:33, 34; Jeremiah 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 (Kings 23:34; Deremiah 22:10-12; Ezekiel 19:4). Pharaohnecho 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 (Kings 24:7; Heremiah 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 (Chronicles 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 (Daniel 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 Jeremiah 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 (2500) Jeremiah 31:1; 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 (Kings 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 (Jeremiah 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 (Kings 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 Jeremiah 15:4 with ¹²⁴¹² 2 Kings 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 Jeremiah 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" (*** Jeremiah 22:18, 19; 36:30; see *** Chronicles 3:15; (23) 2 Kings 23:34-37; 24:1-7; (480) 2 Chronicles 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 ²⁶⁶⁰Jeremiah 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 ¹²²³⁴2 Kings 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 Matthew 1:11, in the received text, the name of Jehoiakim (Ἰωακείμ, "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 ¹²³⁵⁻² Kings 23:37 tells us that "he did that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah," a statement which is repeated in ¹²⁴⁰⁻² Kings 24:9, and ¹⁴⁴⁰⁵⁻² Chronicles 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 ¹⁴⁶⁰⁻¹ 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 (Jeremiah 26:20-24). The curious notice of him in 1 Esd. 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 (Jeremiah 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 (Jeremiah 22:14, 15). SEE IMAGERY, CHAMBERS OF.

Jehoi'arib

(Hebrew Yehôyarib', byr βέης] whose cause Jehovah defends; Sept. Ἰωαρείβ or Ἰαρείβ v.r. Ἰωαρίμ; το Chronicles 9:10; 24:7 only; elsewhere, both in Heb. and A.V., the name is abbreviated to JOIARIB), a distinguished priest at Jerusalem (του Chronicles 9:10), head of the first of the twenty-four sacerdotal "courses" (του Chronicles 24:7). B.C. 1014. Of these courses, only four are mentioned as having returned from Babylon—those of Jedaiah, Immer, Pashur, and Harim (του Ezra 2:36-39; του Nehemiah 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, col. 1 in ed. Bomberg). This might account for our finding, at a later period, Mattathias described as of the course of Joarib (1 Macc. 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 (του 1

Chronicles 9:10; **GIIO*Nehemiah 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 (**OIID*Nehemiah 10:2-8; 12:1-7), and mention is made of Mattenai as chief of the house of Joiarib in the days of Jeshua (**OID*Nehemiah 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 **OID*Ezra 2:36-39, and **OID*Nehemiah 7:39-42. To the course of Joiarib Josephus tells us he belonged (**Ant. 11, 6, 1; **Life*, §* 1). **SEE PRIEST*.

Jehon'adab

(Heb. Yehonadab', bd/hy] to whom Jehovah is liberal, ^{ΔΩΠ5}2 Samuel 13:5; ^{ΔΩΠ5}2 Kings 10:15, 23; ^{ΔΩΠ5}Jeremiah 35:8, 14, 16, 18; Sept. Ἰωναδάβ, Auth. Version "Jonadab," except in ^{ΔΩΠ5}2 Kings 10:15, 23), also in the contracted form Jonadab (bd/y, Yonadab', ^{ΔΩΠ5}2 Samuel 13:3, 32, 35; ^{ΔΩΠ5}Jeremiah 35:6, 10, 19; Sept. Ἰωναδάβ), the name of two men.

- 1. A son of Shimeah and nephew of David, a very crafty person (dam) µkj; the word is that usually translated "wise," as in the case of Solomon, 2 Samuel 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 (2008) 2 Samuel 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 (ver. 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 (2008) 2 Samuel 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 (*** Jeremiah 35:6-19). *SEE RECHAB*. It appears from ** 1 Chronicles 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 (Judges 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 (Judges 1:16; Numbers 24:21). Another had returned to the frontier of their native wilderness on the south of Judah (Judges 1:16). A third was established, under a fourfold division, at or near the town of Jabez, in Judah (Thronicles 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 Judges 1:16; 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" (Jeremiah 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 (Jeremiah 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 Amos 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 (Nings 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 (Nings 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 (**2028*) Kings 10:23). SEE JEHU.

Jehon'athan

(Heb. Yehonathan', ^tn/hy] Jehovah given; Sept. Ἰωνάθαν), the full form of the name of four men.

- **1.** The oldest son of king Saul (**OHB**1 Samuel 14:6, 8, 21; 18:1, 3, 4; 19:2, 4, 6, 7; 20 throughout and all later passages except **ONATHAN SEE JONATHAN [q.v.], as the Hebrew likewise elsewhere has).
- 2. Son of Uzziah and superintendent of certain of king David's storehouses (t/rxapthe word rendered "treasures" earlier in the verse and in 27, 28 "cellars") (1275) Chronicles 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 (*477.8*2 Chronicles 17:8). B.C. 910.
- **4.** A priest (***Nehemiah 12:18), and the representative of the family of Shemaiah (verse 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.

Jeho'ram

(Heb. *Yehoram*', μr/hy] *Jehovah exalted*, ΔΣΣΟ1 Kings 22:50; ΔΣΙΟ2 Kings 1:17; 3:1, 6; 8:16, 25, 29; 9:15, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24; 12:18; ΔΣΙΟ2 Chronicles 17:8; 21:1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 16; 22:1, 5, 6, 7, 11; Septuag. Τωράμ, Α.V. "Joram" in ΔΣΙΟΣ Kings 9:15, 17, 21, 22, 23), also in the contracted form JORAM (μr/y, *Yoram*', ΔΣΙΟΣ Samuel 8:10; ΔΣΙΟΣ Kings 8:16, 21, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29; 9:14, 16, 29; 11:2; ΔΣΙΟΣ Chronicles 3:11; 26:25; ΔΣΙΟΣ Chronicles 22:5, 7; Sept. Τωράμ,, but Τεδδουράμ in ΔΣΙΟΣ Samuel 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 (*** Samuel 8:10; Heb. and A.V. "Joram"); elsewhere called HADORAM (*** Chronicles 18:10).
- **2.** A Levite of the family of Gershom, employed with his relatives in special sacred services connected with the Temple treasury (Chronicles 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 (Chronicles 17:8). B.C. 910.
- **4.** (Josephus Ἰώραμος, 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 (ΔΙΙΙΤ΄ 2 Kings 1:17; 3:1). The date of his accession, in the second year of the reign of Jehoram of Judah (ΔΙΙΙΤ΄ 2 Kings 1:17), must be computed from a viceroyship of the latter during his father Jehoshaphat's war at Ramothgilead (ΔΙΙΙΤ΄ 1 Kings 22:2 sq.). The reckoning in ΔΙΙΙΤ΄ 2 Kings 9:29 is according to Jehoram's actual reign; that in ΔΙΙΙΤ΄ 2 Kings 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 (Kings 3:11; Kings 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 (**TRID**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 (Kings 3:2); for in 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 (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 (Kings 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 (Kings 3:2, 3) with the fact of the prevalence of Baal worship at the end of his reign (Kings 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 (*1216) 2 Kings 6:30, 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 (*1284). 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 Ramothgilead, 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 (Kings 8:29; 9:14, 15), leaving his army in the charge of Jehu, one of his ablest and most active generals, to hold Ramothgilead 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 (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 (<1272-1) B.C. 883. SEE JEHU.

5. (Josephus Ἰώραμος, 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 (Chronicles 21:5, 20; Kings 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 (Kings 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 Kings 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 (Chronicles 20); and must be distinguished from a still earlier copartnership (Kings 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 (***Genesis**) 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 (Joshua 21:13), one of the strongest fortified cities in Judah (Kings 19:8), and perhaps one of those "fenced cities" (4008) Chronicles 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 (Kings 8:16-24; Chronicles 21). His name appears, however, in the royal genealogy of our Saviour (Ἰωράμ, "Joram," Matthew 1:8). SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

Jehoshab'eäth

(Chronicles 22:11). SEE JEHOSHEBA.

Jehosh'aphat

(Heb. Yehoshaphat', fpy/hyælehovah judged, i.e. vindicated; Sept. Ἰωσαφάτ); sometimes in the contracted form Joshaphat (fpy/y, Yoshaphat', ΔΙΙΙΑ΄) Chronicles 11:43; 15:24; Ἰωσαφάτ, A. Vers. in the latter passage "Jehoshaphat;" N.T. Ἰωσαφάτ, "Josaphat," ΔΙΙΙΑ΄ Ματικάν 1:8; Josephus Ἰωσάφατος), the name of six men.

- **1.** A Mithnite, one of David's famous bodyguard (Chronicles 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 (** 15:24; Heb. "Josaphat"). B.C. cir. 1043.

- **3.** Son of Ahilud, and royal chronicler (q.v.) under David and Solomon (***2 Samuel 8:16; 20:24; ***1008*1 Kings 4:3; ***385*1 Chronicles 18:15). B.C. 1014.
- **4.** Son of Paruah and Solomon's purveyor (q.v.) in Issachar (4007)1 Kings 4:17). B.C. circ. 995. *SEE SOLOMON*.
- 5. The fourth separate king of Judah ("Israel" in 4202 Chronicles 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 (Kings 22:41, 42: Chronicles 20:31). He commenced his reign by fortifying his kingdom against Israel (Chronicles 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 (1228-1 Kings 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 (4476) Chronicles 17:6), although not altogether (Chronicles 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 (Chronicles 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 (4470)2 Chronicles 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 (Kings 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 (4900) Chronicles 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 (Chronicles 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 (4005) Chronicles 20:55-37; 1 Kings 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 (Kings 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 ioin 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 (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 (Chronicles 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 (Ιωσαφάτ, "Josaphat") occurs in the list of our Savior's ancestors (****Matthew 1:8). SEE JUDAH. KINGDOM OF.

6. The son of Nimshi and father of king Jehu of Israel (Kings 9:2, 14). B.C. ante 883.

Jehoshaphat, Valley of

Picture for Jehoshaphat

(fpy/hyæm [eSept. Koιλlc, 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 (Joel 3:2 [4:2]), and would there sit to judge them for their misdeeds to Israel (Joel 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 (Joel 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 (Joel 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 $\chi \acute{\omega} \rho \alpha \kappa \rho \acute{\iota} \sigma \epsilon \omega \varsigma$, 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* (qm,[); 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* (| j n), 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 (**Joel 2:32; 3:1, 6, 16, 17, 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 (***Zechariah 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 (*12316*2 Kings 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 (4200-2 Chronicles 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 "Genesis 14:17, and of Samuel 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.

Jehosh'eba

(Heb. Yehoshe'ba, [bi/hy] Jehovah swearing; Septuag. Ἰωσαβεέ, Josephus Ἰωσαβέδη), 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 (ΔΙΙΙΟΣ Kings 11:2). In the parallel passage (ΔΙΙΟΣ Chronicles 22:11) the name is written

JEHOSHABEATH († [b]//hy] Yehoshabath'; Sept. Ἰωσαβέδ). 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 (**Exodus 6:23), and ELISABETH, the wife of Zechariah (Luke 1:7). As she is called (Kings 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, Οχοζία 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" (1201-2 Chronicles 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 (Kings 11:2, 3; Chronicles 22:11), where he was brought up probably with her sons (42312 Chronicles 23:11), who assisted at his coronation. One of these was Zechariah, who succeeded her husband in his office, and was afterwards murdered (Chronicles 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 421082 Kings 11:3, and is accepted by Ewald (Geschichte, 3, 575) as perfectly authentic. SEE JEHOIADA.

Jehosh'ua

(AUSIGN Numbers 13:16), or Jehosh'uah (AUSIGN Chronicles 7:27). SEE JOSHUA.

Jeho'vah

(h/hy] Yehovah', Sept. usually ὁ Κῷριος, Auth. Vers. usually "the LORD"), the name by which God was pleased to make himself known, under the covenant, to the ancient Hebrews (**DE*Exodus 6:2, 3), although it was doubtless in use among the patriarchs, as it occurs even in the history of the creation (***Genesis 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 h/hy](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 ynda} 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 (**ELEVITICUS 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 ynda} "Adonay," Lord, in its stead; and hence, when the Masoretic text came to be supplied with the vowels, the four letters hwhy were pointed with the vowels of this word, the initial y 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 ynda, and likewise from the varied pointing when following ynda in which case it is written h/buf and pronounced \(\muyhbuf\), "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 h/hy]by ὁ Κύριος, like ynda and even the Samaritans observed the same custom, for they used to pronounce hwhy by the word amyvaShima, 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, $IA\Omega$ (a few $Iev\omega$, $I\alpha ov$), 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, $in\ Psalm\ 8;$ Theodoret, $Quoest.\ 15$ in Exodus; Epiphanius, $Hoer.\ 20$). The Gnostics classed $I\alpha\omega$, 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 ($I\alpha\omega$) 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 h/hy] Yahvoh', corresponding to the Greek Ιαώ. But this view, as well as that which maintains the correctness of the common pointing hwhy (Michaelis, Supplem. p. 524; Meyer, Blätter für höhere Wahrheit, 11, p. 306), is opposed to the fact that verbs, of the class (h81) from which this word appears to be derived do not admit such a pointing (Cholem) with their second radical. Moreover, the simple letters in hwhy would naturally be pronounced Jao by a Greek without any special pointing. Those, therefore, appear to have the best reason who prefer the pointing hwhy; Yahveh' (not hwhyi Yahaveh', for the first h being a mappik-he [as seen in the form Hy; 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 (y=t, w=o as a "mater lectionis," and h being silent; thus leaving a as the representative of the first vowel). From this, too, the apocapated forms Why; and Hy; 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, Exodus 3:14: "And God said to Moses, I shall be what I shall be (hyhk hyhk rva); 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 hyha by o $\mathring{\omega}v$, the Venetian Greek barbarously $\mathring{\eta}$ οντώτης, 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. Malachi 3:6, "I am Jehovah; change not;" Hosea 12:6, "Jehovah is his memento." The same attribute is referred to in the description of the divine Redeemer in the Apocalypse Revelation 1:4, 8, ὁ ὧν 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 (Εγώ εἰμι τὸ γεγονὸς καὶ ὃν καὶ εσόμενον, 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, $\Delta \iota \acute{o}\varsigma$, 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 hwhyi as= hwh); and this as the actual fut. Kal of the verb hwh;= hyh; 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 hypyæ Yihyeh', as frequently occurs. It is rather a denominative, i.e. noun or adj., formed by the prepositive y prefixed to the verb root, and pointed like

hnbyiand 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 and 3; "Exodus 9:30, etc. Far more frequent is the compounded form when followed by a genitive, as "Jehovah God of Israel" ("TIDE Deuteronomy 1:21; 6:3); "Jehovah God, thy God" ("TIDE Deuteronomy 1:31; 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 (**PSAIM** 102:25-27; ****** Hebrews 1:10-12; 13:8; ****** Revelation 1:4, 8). See LOGOS. JAH (Hy; *Yah*, Sept. Kópioς, Auth. Vers. "Lord," except in ***** Psalm 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 ***** Psalm 89:9; 94:7,12; ****** Isaiah 38:11; ***** Exodus 15:2; ****** Psalm 118:4; ****** Isaiah 12:2; ****** Psalm 68:5; ****** Isaiah 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 ynda]and Κύριος by the same word; it is rendered "Jehovah" only in "Exodus 6:3; Psalm 83:18; "Isaiah 12:2; 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 hwhy (Wittenb. 1755); Rafael ben-David, t/mWl [Ti(Venice, 1662); Reineccius, De hwhy (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 hwhy (Erlangen, 1867); Kurtz, Hist. of the Old Covenant, 1, 18 sq.; 2, 98, 215. SEE ELOHIM.

Jeho'vah-ji'reh

(Hebrew Yehovah' Yireh', hwhy]har yælehovah 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 (**Genesis 22:14*), evidently with allusion to his own reply to Isaac's inquiry (**Genesis 22:8*). SEE MORIAH.

Jeho'vah-nis'si

(Hebrew Yehovah' Nissi h/hy]ySapeJehovah 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 (**PTIS**Exodus 17:15). SEE REPHIDIM. The phraseology in the original is peculiar: "For [the] hand [is] on [the] throne (SKe? read Sne

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 'PSalm 60:4; 'Salio Isaiah 11:10. *SEE BANNER*.

Jeho'vah-sha'lom

(Hebrew Yehovah' Shalom', μ/l v; h/hy] 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 ("The Judges 6:24). (See Critici Sacri, 2, 949; Balthasar, De Altari Gideonis, Gryph. 1746.) SEE GIDEON.

Jeho'vah-sham'mah

(Heb. Yehovah' Sham'mah, hMy; h/hy] 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 (ΔΕΕΣΕΚΙΕΙ 48:35); under a figure evidently of like import with the description of the new Jerusalem in the Apocalypse (ΔΕΣΕΚΙΕΙ 31:3; 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. ΔΕΣΙΟ Jeremiah 33:16).

Jeho'vah-tsid'kenu

Dominus justus noster Auth. Vers. "The Lord our righteousness"), an epithet applied by the prophet to the Messiah (** Jeremiah 23:6), and likewise to Jerusalem (Jeremiah 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 Jeremiah 33:16, where the same name is given to the city of Jerusalem, and where it can only receive such an explanation.

Jehoz'abad

(Heb. Yehozabad', dbz/hy] Jehovah given; Sept. Ἰωζαβάδ, but Ἰωζαβέδ 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 (**100-1) Chronicles 26:4). B.C. 1014.
- **2.** The last named of Jehoshaphat's generals (Josephus Οχόβατος, *Ant*. 8:15, 2) in command of (?) 180,000 troops (Δ4778-2 Chronicles 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 (***2121; ***4206**2 Chronicles 24:26). B.C. 837.

Jehoz'adak

(Heb. Yehotsadak', qdx/hy] Jehovah justified; Sept. Ἰωσεδέκ; Auth. Vers. "Josedech" in Haggai and Zechariah), also in the contracted form JOZADAK (qdx/y, Yotsadak', in Ezra and Nehemiah; Sept. Ἰωσεδέκ), the son of the high priest Seraiah at the time of the Babylonian captivity (Chronicles 6:14, 15). Although he succeeded to the high priesthood after the slaughter of his father at Riblah (Lines 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 (***1015**1 Chronicles 6:15), and evidently died in exile, as, on the return from the captivity, his son Joshua was the first high priest who officiated (***1015**Haggai 1:1, 12, 14; 2:2, 4; ****102**Dechariah 6:11; ****102**Ezra 3:2, 8; 5:2; 10:18; ***102**Nehemiah 12:26). B.C. 588. *SEE HIGH PRIEST*.

Je'hu

(Heb. Yehu', a\hyeaccording to Gesenius for a\hyheal i.q. a\hyheal i.q. a\hyheal i.q. a\hyheal hyheal i.q. a\hyhe

- **1.** Son of Obed and father of Azariah, of the tribe of Judah (Chronicles 2:38). B.C. post. 1612.
- **2.** An Antothite, one of the Benjamite slingers that joined David's band at Ziklag (Chronicles 12:3). B.C. 1055.
- 3. The son of Hanani, a prophet (Josephus Iηοῦς, 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 (ΔΙΚΟΣ Chronicles 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 (ΔΙΚΟΣ IKings 16:1, 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 (ΔΙΚΟΣ Chronicles 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 (ΔΙΚΟΣ Chronicles 20:34). B.C. 928-886.
- **4.** The eleventh king of the separate throne of Israel (Josephus Ἰηοῦς, Ant. 8, 13, 7), and founder of its fourth dynasty; he reigned twenty-eight years, B.C. 883-855 (ЧЭЭЭ Kings 9:10; ЧЭЭЭ Chronicles 22:7-9). His history was told in the lost "Chronicles of the Kings of Israel" (ЧЭЭЭ Kings 10:34). His father's name was Jehoshaphat (ЧЭЭЭ Kings 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 (1995) 2 Kings 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 (1996) 1 Kings 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 (Kings 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 Ramothgilead 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 (Kings 8:28, 29). B.C. 883. According to Ephraem Syrus (who omits the words "saith the Lord" in Kings 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 (Kings 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 (42952 Kings 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 (Kings 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 (Kings 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 (4007)2 Kings 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 (Kings 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 bloodstained corpse in the road and was trodden under foot by the horses. SEE JEZEBEL. Jehu then went in and took possession of the palace (400%) Kings 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 (40082 Chronicles 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 (12004) Kings 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 (*2005) 2 Kings 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 (41162)1 Kings 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 (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 (Kings 10:29-33). He died in quiet, and was buried in Samaria, leaving the throne to his son Jehoahaz (Kings 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 (TRIP) (TR

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 (*** 1 Chronicles 4:35). B.C. cir. 711.

Jehub'bah

(Heb. *Yechubbah*', hBhy] for which the margin has hBj w] *ve-Chubbah*', i.e. *and Hubbah*, as if the proper form were hBj μ*Chubbah*', i.e. *hidden*; Sept. Oβά v.r. Ἰαβά,, Vulg. *Haba*), one of the sons of Shamer, or Shomer, of the tribe of Asher (ΔΙΙΙΙΑ) Chronicles 7:34). B.C. perhaps cir. 1618.

Jehu'cal

(Heb. *Yehukal*', | kwhy] *able*; Sept. Ἰωάχαλ), 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 (ΔΕΚΙΙ) Jeremiah 37:3). In ΔΕΚΙΙ Jeremiah 38:1 his name is written in the contracted form JUCAL (| kwy, *Yukal*', Sept. Ἰωάχαλ), and in verse 4 he is styled one of "the princes." B.C. 589.

Je'hud

(Heb. Yehud', chyl apocopated from Judah, as in Daniel 2:25, etc.; Sept. Ἰούδ v.r. Ἰούθ and Αζώρ), a town on the border of Dan, named between Baalah and Bene-barak (Tobs Joshua 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).

Jehudah (Ha-Levi) De Modena.

SEE MODENA.

Jehudah Ben-Balaam.

SEE IBN-BALAAM.

Jehudah Ben-David.

SEE CHAJUG.

Jehudah Ben-Koreish.

SEE IBN-KOREISH.

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 (yrzwk), 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 I yI dI a ^ydI a rxn yp I yI dI aw h8 8gj I a batk (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 Chronicles 1:5, 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 rps yrzwkh (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 (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 hdwhy]yl ha;(The Tents of Judah) (Jesnitz, 1719, 4to), consisting of two parts; the first part, µl /[µv@the everlasting name), confines itself mainly to proper names; the second part, µv dy;(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 hollhyeql j (The Portion of Judah); of this work, the introduction only, Çdwqh `wçl dwsy (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 hdwhy] [z6,(The Stem of Judah), which only goes as far as the root anx (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-Kodesh,

etc. SEE JUDAH, etc.

Jehu'di

(Hebrew Yehudi', yclimy] a Jew, as often; (Sept. Ἰουδείν v.r. Ἰουδίν, Ἰουδί, Ἰουδεί) 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 (and Jeremiah 36:14, 21). B.C. 605.

Jehudi'jah

(Heb. Yehudiyah', hYclibay] [with the art., the], Jewess, as in the Engl. margin; Sept. Ἰδία v. Αδία, Vulg. Judaja), a female named as the second wife, apparently of Mered, and mother of several founders of cities in Judah (বার্ণার)? Chronicles 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.

Je'hush (Chronicles 8:39). SEE JEUSH.

Jeï'el (Heb. Yeiel', | ap[pasnatched away by God),

the name of several men. SEE JEHIEL; SEE JEUEL.

- 1. (Text | am[] i.e. Jeuel], Sept. Ἰειήλ v.r. Ἰεήλ, 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 (43355) 1 Chronicles 9:35; comp. 8:29). B.C. prob. cir. 1618.
- 2. (Text | ae[yafi.e. Jeuel], Sept. Ἰειήλ or Ἰειήλ, Vulg. Jediel, Auth. Vers. "Jehiel.") An Aroerite, son of Hothan, and brother of Shama, one of David's supplementary heroes (<31146). B.C. 1046.
- 3. (Sept. Ἰεἰήλ, Vulg. *Jehiel*, but *Jahiel* in the first occurrence in ⁴³⁶⁶1 Chronicles 16:5.) One of the Levites appointed by David to celebrate the divine praises before the ark on its removal to Jerusalem (⁴³⁶⁶1 Chronicles 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 (⁴³⁵⁸1 Chronicles 15:18, 21), or as one of the sacred musicians "with harps on the Sheminith to excel" (⁴³⁵²1 Chronicles 15:21). B.C. 1043. *SEE JEHIEL*, 1.
- **4.** (Sept. Ελεήλ v.r. Ελείήλ, Ελειήλ, also Ἰειήλ, 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 (Chronicles 20:14). B.C. considerably ante 890.

- 5. (Text I are [ye] i.e. Jeuel], Sept. Ἰειήλ, Vulg. Jehiel.) A scribe charged, in connection with others, with keeping the account of Uzziah's troops (ΔΙΙΙ) Chronicles 26:11). B.C. 803.
- **6.** (Sept. $\frac{1}{100}$, 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 (**1370**) Chronicles 5:7). B.C. 782.
- 7. (Text | and i.e. Jeuel], Sept. Ἰετήλ, Vulg. Jahiel.) A Levite of the "sons" of Elizaphan, one of those who assisted in expurgating the Temple in the reign of Hezekiah (4003) 2 Chronicles 29:13). B.C. 726.
- **8.** (Sept. Ἰετήλ, Vulg. *Jehiel*.) One of the chief Levites who made an offering for the restoration of the Passover by Josiah (ΔΕΙΙ) 2 Chronicles 35:9). B.C. 623.
- 9. (Text I an [Mi.e. Jeuel], Sept. Ἰεήλ v.r. Εἰήλ, Vulg. Jehiel.) One of the "last sons" of Adonikam, a leading Israelite, who, with seventy males, returned from Babylon with Ezra (**Ezra 8:13). B.C. 459.
- **10.** (Sept. Ἰεεήλ v.r. Ἰαήλ, Vulg. *Jehiel*.) An Israelite, one of the "sons" of Nebo, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Exile (**SOB*Ezra 10:43). B.C. 459.

Jeins.

SEE JAINS.

Jeish.

SEE JEUSH.

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.

SEE FASTING.

Jekab'zeël

(Heb. Yekabtseël', I a βρή gathered by God; Sept. Καβσεήλ, Vulg. Cabseel), the name of a place in the tribe of Judah (solution Nehemiah 11:25); elsewhere (solution Joshua 15:21) called by the equivalent but shorter name KABZEEL SEE KABZEEL (q.v.).

Jekame'äm

(Heb. Yekamam', μ[m]ty] gatherer of the people; Sept. Ἰεκεμίας), the fourth in rank of the "sons" of Hebron in the Levitical arrangement established by David (1238) 1 Chronicles 23:19; 24:23). B.C. 1014.

Jekami'ah

(Heb. Yekamryah', hymqij] gathered by Jehovah), the name of two men.

- 1. (Sept. Ἰεκεμίας v.r. Ἰεχεμίας, Vulg. *Icamia*.) Son of Shallum, and father of Elishama, of the descendants of Sheshan of Judah (TDE) Chronicles 2:41). B.C. prob. cir. 588.
- **2.** (Sept. Ἰεκενία v.r. Ἰεκεμία, Vulg. *Jecemia*, Auth. Version "Jecamiah.") The fifth named of the sons of king Jeconiah (ΔΙΙΙΝ) Chronicles 3:18), born to him during the Babylonian exile, and, according to tradition, by Susanna. *SEE JEHOIACHIN*. B.C. post 598.

Jeku'thiël

(Heb. Yekuthiël', Ι apt (γ) reverence of God; Sept. Ἰεκθηήλ v.r. ὁ Χετιήλ), "father" of Zanoah and one of the sons apparently of Mered by his second wife Hodiah, or Jehudijah (1948-1 Chronicles 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.

SEE LUZATTO.

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 znkça `wçl b Bnt (*The four-and-twenty Books translated into German*), with (twyl [wt znkça `wçl b g8bl rh) Ralbag's twyl [wt, 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.

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 ryam µyny [Rödelheim, 1818-21]) and the book of Esther (also published by Heidenheim in his uyrwph ymy rds [Rödelheim, 1825]), with the vowels and accents, for the preparation of which he consulted six old Spanish codices, which he denominates a8t, q8a, j 8a, s8ma,z8a, f8a, and which Heidenheim explains to mean any dj a, 'wqyt, 'wmdq, bwch, twyrwsm, 'qt, bwf, the prefix a denoting Spain (comp. arwqh 'y[on Numbers 34:28). The results of his critical labors he further embodied in a work entitled aryq \hat{y} (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 dwgnh ykrd dwgnh yl | k (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.

Jemi'ma

(Heb. Yenzinzah', hmymædove, from the Arab.; Sept. Hμέρα, Vulg. Dies, both mistaking the derivation as if from μ/y, day), the name of the first of Job's three daughters born after his trial (**Planta 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.

Jem'naan

(Ἰεμναάν, Vulg. omits), a place mentioned in the Apocrypha (Judith 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.).

Jemu'ël

(Heb. Yenmuël', I almy] day-light of God, Sept. Ἰεμονήλ, Vulg. Jamuel), the first named of the sons of Simeon (Genesis 46:10; Sept. Exodus 6:15); elsewhere (Mumbers 26:12) called Nemuel (I almn] Nemuël'; Sept. Nαμονήλ, Vulg. Namuel), apparently by an error of copyists, and his descendants Nemuelites (Hebrew Nemuëli, yl almn] Sept. Nαμονηλί, Vulg. Namuelitoe, Mumbers 26:12). B.C. 1856.

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,

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.

SEE JENKYN.

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,

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,

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.

SEE JENKIN.

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,

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,

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, 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.)

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.)

Jephthaë

(**Hebrews 11:32). SEE JEPHTHAH.

Jeph'thah

(Heb. *Yiphtach*', j TpJ@pened or opener), the name of a man and also of a place. *SEE JIPHTHAH-EL*.

1. (Sept. Ἰεφθά v.r. Ἰεφθαέ and Ἰεφθάε, Josephus Ἰεφθής, Vulg. *Jephte*, N.T. Ἰεφθάε, "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 (OTHOLE Judges 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 (401014-Judges 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 (**Pab**Judges 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 (Judges 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" (**TIT**)Judges 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" (Judges 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 (Ouoestiones 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 wellknown 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 Kings 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 Judges 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 (verses 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 (**Genesis 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 Luke 3:37; Corinthians 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 (**Deuteronomy 18:9-14); and the Israelites were expressly forbidden to act like them in sacrificing their sons and daughters by fire (Deuteronomy 12:29-31). Again, for the redemption of any person devoted to God (Exodus 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 (Leviticus 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 (**Deuteronomy 16:2, 6, 11, 16, compare with **Deviticus 1:2-13; 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 Judges 11:29-36; comp. Leviticus 20:1-5); and his whole conduct is commended by an inspired apostle (**Hebrews 11:32: comp. **ODID1 Samuel 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 (Judges 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 4076-1 Corinthians 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 rdn, ne'der, a consecration, and not µri e 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 (ver. 39). The word rendered "lament" in verse 40 is not the common one (hkb) translated "bewail" in verse 37, 38, but the rare expression (hnt) 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 Judges 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.

Jephun'ne ('Ιεφοννῆ), a Graecized form (Ecclus. 46, 7) for the Hebrew name JEPHUNNEH SEE JEPHUNNEH (q.v.).

Jephun'neh

(Heb. Yephunneh', hBpy nimble), the name of two men.

- 1. (Sept. Ἰεφοννή, also Ἰεφονή and Ἰεφοννή.) The father of Caleb (q.v.), the faithful fellow explorer of Canaan with Joshua, in which paternal connection alone his name occurs (**Numbers 13:6; 14:6, 30, 38; 26:65; 32:12; 34:19; **Deuteronomy 1:36; **Joshua 14:6, 13, 14; 15:13; 21:12; **TOTION LESS 4:15; 6:56). B.C. 1698.
- 2. (Sept. Ἰεφινά.) One of the sons of Jether or Ithran, of the descendants of Asher (ΔΙΙΙΆΝ) Chronicles 7:38). B.C. prob. ante 1017.

Je'rah

(Heb. Ye'rach, j rj, in pause j ri* y, Ya'rach, the moon, as often; Sept. **Ἰ**αράχ, but omits in ^{₹3000} 1 Chronicles 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 Genesis 10:26), the general location of all the Joktanidae being given in verse 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" a, 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.

Jerah' meël (Heb. Yerachmeël', lam] [ry] loving God or beloved by God), the name of three men.

- 1. (Sept. Ἰραμεήλ and Ἰερεμεήλ v.r. Ἰεραμεήλ.) First born of Hezron, brother of Caleb, and father of Ram (not Aram), of the tribe of Judah (Chronicles 2:9, 25, 26. 27, 33, 42). B.C. ante 1658. His descendants were called JERAHMLEELITES (Hebrew Yeracnheëli', yl am] ['y] Sept. Ἰεριμιήλ and Ἱεριμιήλ v.r. Ἱερεμεήλ, (DZTO) I Samuel 27:10; 30:29).
- **2.** (Sept. Ἰραμαήλ v.r. ʿ Ιεραμεήλ.) Son of Kish, a Levite whose relationship is undefined otherwise (ΔΕΕΣ Chronicles 24:29). B.C. apparently 1014.
- **3.** (Sept. Γερεμιήλ v.r. Τερεμεήλα.) Son of Hammelech (q.v.), one of the two persons commanded by Jehoiakim to apprehend Jeremiah and Baruch, who providentially escaped (Δεπο-Jeremiah 36:26). B.C. 605.

Jerah'meëlite (Samuel 27:10; 30:29). SEE JERAHMEEL, 1.

Jer'echus (Ἰέρεχος), a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 5, 22) of the name of the city of JERICHO (q.v.).

Je'red (a, 4000-1 Chronicles 1:2; b, 4000-1 Chronicles 4:18). SEE JARED.

Jer'emai (Hebrew Yeremay', ymir dwelling in heights; Sept. Ἰερεμί v.r. ʿΙεραμί),), one of the "sons" of Hashum, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (STEE Ezra 10:33). B.C. 459.

Jeremi'ah (Heb. Yirmeyah', hym] yæften in the paragogic form Whym] yæYirmeya'hu, especially in the book of Jeremiah; raised up [i.e. appointed] by Jehovah; Sept. and N.T. Ἰερεμίας; "Jeremias," ΔΙΟΙΑ Ματτhew 16:14; "Jeremy," ΔΙΟΙΑ Ματτhew 2:17; 27:9; but in this last passage it probably occurs only by error of copyists; see ΔΙΙΙΑ Zechariah 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 (<320)1 Chronicles 12:10). B.C. 1061.
- **2.** The tenth of the same band of adventurers (Chronicles 12:13). B.C. 1061.
- **3.** One of the Benjamite bowmen and slingers who repaired to David while at Ziklag (SIZ) Chronicles 12:4). B.C. 1053.
- **4.** A chief of the tribe of Manasseh east, apparently about the time of the deportation by the Assyrians (The 1 Chronicles 5:24). B.C. 782.
- **5.** A native of Libnah, the father of Hamutal, wife of Josiah, and mother of Jehoahaz and Zedekiah (2 Kings 23; 31; 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 (******Jeremiah 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 (**DID** Jeremiah 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 (**DE*2 Kings 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," **DIOT** Jeremiah 1:1); again, the name Hilkiah was common among the Jews (see **DIST** 2 Kings 18:13; **TOT** 1 Chronicles 6:45; 26:11; **TOT** Nehemiah 8:4; **DIST** 29:3); and, lastly, his residence at Anathoth is evidence that he belonged to the line of Abiathar (**TOT** 1 Kings 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 (2006 Jeremiah 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 (Jeremiah 11:21), and even of his own family (Jeremiah 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 (Kings 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 (**** 2 Chronicles 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 (application) 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 (** Jeremiah 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" (""Jeremiah 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 Jeremiah 13:18; comp. Zings 24:12, and Jeremiah 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 (Jeremiah 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 (** Jeremiah 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 (2500 Jeremiah 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 (25702) Jeremiah 37:12-38:13). 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 (Jeremiah 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, Nebuzaradan, not only to provide for him, but to follow his advice (2002) Jeremiah 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 Jeremiah 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, 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 Jeremiah 1:10 the commission with which he was intrusted (Ecclus. 49:7). In 2 Macc. 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, ίεροφάντης, and calls a passage which he quotes from Jeremiah 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 τῆ ἐν ἑνι), Jerome, and the Talmud (Eichhorn, Einleitung, 3, 184). In the New Testament Jeremiah is referred to by name in Matthew 2:17, where a passage is quoted from Jeremiah 31:15, and in Matthew 16:14; in Mehrews 8:8-12, a passage is quoted from Jeremiah 31:31-34. There is one other place in which the name of Jeremiah occurs — Matthew 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 Zechariah 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 demoderated Inc. 1-16, and Jeremiah 30, 31, and 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 Zechariah 8:7-8) quotes from Jeremiah 31:7, 8, 33, and in verse 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 ver. 7 and 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 (Jeremiah 10:1-16), are the work of Jeremiah. It seems, however, not improbable that the Chaldee of verse 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 and 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 42482 Kings 24:18; 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:

Picture for Jeremiah

(b.) Various passages which exist in the Hebrew are not found in the Greek copies (e.g. Deremiah 27:19-22; 33:14-26; 39:4-14; 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" (24702 Jeremiah 7:2; 11:1; 18:1; 21:1; 25:1; 30:1; 32:1; 34:1, 8; 35:1; 40:1; 44:1), or by the very similar expression, "The word of the Lord which came to Jeremiah" Jeremiah 14:1; 46:1; 47:1; 49:34). The notices of time distinctly mark some other divisions which are more or less historical (Jeremiah 26:1; 27:1; 36:1; 37:1). Two other portions are in themselves sufficiently distinct without such indication (Jeremiah 29:1; 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, ²⁰⁰⁰ 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;
 - **3.** Jeremiah 7-10;
 - 4. Jeremiah 11-13;
 - **5.** Jeremiah 14-17, 18;
 - 6. ²⁴⁷⁷⁹ Jeremiah 17:19-20:
 - **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; and
- 3. Jeremiah 28, 29.
- **IV.** Two sections picturing the hopes of brighter times:
 - 1. Jeremiah 30, 31; and
 - 2. Jeremiah 32, 33;

to which, as in the last book, is added a historical appendix in three sections

- **1.** 2800 Jeremiah 34:1-7;
- 2. 2508 Jeremiah 34:8-22;
- 3. Jeremiah 35.

V. The conclusion, in two sections; 1. Jeremiah 36; 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, and 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 Deremiah 23:1-8; 30:31-40; 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, Lyrta, 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, Commentary (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,

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 Ἱερεμίου (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 (verse 1-7), and it exposes in a rhetorical declamation the folly of idolatry (verse 8-72), 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 (Βαρούχ ὅλοςώβὲλισται 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 2 Macc. 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.

SEE LAMENTATIONS OF JEREMIAH

- **8.** A priest who accompanied Zerubbabel from Babylon to Jerusalem (**Nehemiah 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 (Nehemiah 12:34); apparently the same with one of the priests who subscribed the sacred covenant along with Nehemiah (Nehemiah 10:2). B.C. 446 cir. 410. He was possibly identical with No. 8.

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,

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.

Jeremi'as

(Ἰερεμίας), a Graecized form of the name of two men.

- **1.** JEREMIAH *SEE JEREMIAH* (q.v.) the prophet (Ecclus. 49:6; 2 Macc. 15:14; *Matthew 16:14).
- **2.** (1 Esdr. 9:34.) *SEE JEREIAI*.

Jer'emoth

- (Heb. *Yereymoth*', t/myrg] or *Yeremoth*', t/mrg] *heights*), the name of several men. *SEE JERINIORH*.
- 1. (Sept. Ἰαριμώθ)) The last named of the three sons of Mushi, grandson of Levi (ΔΕΕΙΝΟΤΗ in ΔΕΕΙΝΟΤΗ in ΔΕΕΙΝΟΤΗ
- 3. (Sept. Ἰεριμώθ)) A Levite, chief of the fifteenth division of Temple musicians as arranged by David (ΔΕΣ) Chronicles 25:22); probably the same called JERIMOTH in ver. 4. B.C. 1014.
- **4.** (Sept. Ἰαριμώθ v.r. ἀριμώθ.) One of the "sons" of Beriah, a Benjamite (ΔΙΚΕ) Chronicles 8:14). B.C. appar. cir. 588. Probably the same with JEROHAM in ver. 27.
- 5. (Sept. Ἰεριμώθ v.r. Ἰαριμώθ) An Israelite, one of the "sons" (? inhabitants) of Elam, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (**Ezra 10:26). B.C. 459.
- **6.** (Ἰαρμώθ v.r. ἀρμώθ,, a Vulg. *Jerimuth*.) Another Israelite, one of the "sons" (? inhabitants) of Zattu, who likewise divorced his Gentile wife after the captivity (**SOZ*Ezra 10:27). B.C. 459.
- 7. (**Ezra 10:29, "and Ramoth.") SEE RAMOTH.

Jer'emy

a familiar form (1 Esdr. 1:28, 32, 47, 57; 2:1; 2 Esdr. 2:18; Baruch 6:title; 2 Macc. 2:1, 5, 7; Matthew 2:17; 27:9) of the name of the prophet JEREMIAH *SEE JEREMIAH* (q.v.).

Jeremy, Epistle Of.

SEE JEREMIAH, EPISTLE OF.

Jeri'ah

(Heb. Yeriyah', hΥγφ founded by Jehovah, otherwise fearer of Jehovah,

1 Chronicles 26:31; Sept. Ἰωρίας v.r. Ἰουρίας, Vulg. Jeria, A. Vers.

"Jerijah;" also in the paragogic form Yeriya'hu, WhΥγφ Sept. ἱεριά in

1 Chronicles 23:19, but Ἰεδιοῦ in 1221 Chronicles 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.

Jer'ibai

(Heb. Yeribay', ybyr pecontentious; Sept. Ἰαριβαί v.r. Ἰαριβί, a son of Elnaam and (together with his brother Joshaviah) one of David's famous bodyguard (Chronicles 11:46). B.C. 1046.

Jer'icho

(Heb. Yericho', /j yr place of fragrance, prob. from balsamous herbs growing there; Olivious 2:1, 2, 3; 3:16; 4:13, 19; 5:10, 13; 6:1, 2, 25, 26; 7:2; 8:2; 9:3; 10:1, 28, 30; 12:9; 13:32; 16:1, 7; 18:12, 21; 20:8; 24:11; ² Kings 2:4,15, 18; also written /j rg Yerecho', ²⁰⁰ Numbers 22:1; 26:3, 63; 31:12; 33:48, 50; 34:15; 35:1; 36:13; Deuteronomy 32:49; Chronicles 28. 15; Ezra 2:34; Nehemiah 3:2; 7:36; Deremiah 39:5; 52, 8; once hj yr **Yerichoh', *** Kings 16:34; Sept. and N.T. Ιεριγώ, Josephus Ιεριγοῦς [Genesis οῦντος]; Strabo, 16, 2, 41, Ιερικοῦς; Ptolem. 5, 16, 7; Ἱερεικοῦς; 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 (**Joshua**) 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" Numbers 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 (**Numbers 34:15; 31:12; 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 (***Joshua 4:19). That it had a king is a very secondary consideration, for almost every small town had one (Joshua 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 (Joshua 2:15), and its gates were shut, as throughout the East still, "when it was dark" (Joshua 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 (4017)2 Chronicles 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 thenexisting commerce between Jericho and the far East (Joshua 6:24; 7:21). In fact, its situation alone — in so noble a plain and contiguous to so prolific a river — would be peak 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 (Joshua 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 Hebrews 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 (Joshua 18:.21; it lay also on the border of Ephraim Joshua 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 (4005) Samuel 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 (Kings 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" ("Judges 1:16, and 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 Deuteronomy 34:3, and Chronicles 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" (Kings 2:1-22). In its plains Zedekiah fell into the hands of the Chaldaeans (4275) Kings 25:5; Apple Jeremiah 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 (**TRE* Ezra 3:34; **TRE* Nehemiah 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 (**TRE* Nehemiah 3:2). It was eventually fortified by the Syrian general Bacchides (1 Macc. 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 "elhenna"), 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" (Ecclus. 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 (1 Macc. 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 [Matthew 20:30; Mark 10:46]: this was in leaving Jericho; Luke says "as he was come nigh unto Jericho," etc. [Luke 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.

Jeri'ël

(Heb. Yeriël', I appropresent of God, or i.q. Jeruel; Sept. Lepiń λ), 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 (**370-1 Chronicles 7:2). B.C. post 1856.

Jeri'jah

(Chronicles 26:31). SEE JERIAH.

Jer'imoth

(Heb. *Yerimoth*', t/myr heights, i.q. Jeremoth), the name of several men. *SEE JEREMOTH*.

- 1. (Sept. Ἰεριμούθ) One of the five sons of Bela, son of Benjamin, a valiant chief of his tribe (ΔΙΙΙΙ) Chronicles 7:7). B.C. post 1856.
- 2. (Sept. Ἰεριμώθ) The last named of the three sons of Mushi, grandson of Levi (ΔΩΣΕ) 1 Chronicles 24:30); elsewhere (ΔΩΣΕ) 1 Chronicles 23:23) called JEREMOTH (q.v.).
- **3.** (Sept. Ἰαριμούθ v.r. ἀριμώθ)) One of the famous Benjamite archers and slingers that joined David's band at Ziklag (ΔΙΙΙΑ) Chronicles 12:5). B.C. 1055.
- **4.** (Sept. Ἰεριμούθ v.r. Ἰεριμώθ)) One of the fourteen sons of Heman, and appointed a Levitical musician under his father in the arrangement of the sacred services by David (^{ΔΣΟΔ}1 Chronicles 25:4); probably the same elsewhere (^{ΔΣΣΔ}1 Chronicles 25:22) called JEREMOTH.
- 5. (Sept. Ἰεριμούθ v.r. Ἰεριμώθ)) Son of Azriel, and "captain" of Naphtali under David and Solomon (*** Chronicles 27:19). B.C. 1014.
- 6. (Sept. Ερμούθ v.r. Ἰεριμώθ.) A son of David, whose daughter Mahalath was Rehoboam's first wife (ΔΙΙΙΙΒ 2 Chronicles 11:18). B.C. ante 973. He appears to have been different from any of David's sons elsewhere enumerated (ΔΙΙΙΙ 2 Samuel 3:2-5; ΔΙΙΙΙ 1 Chronicles 14:4-7), having, perhaps, been born of a concubine (compare ΔΙΙΙΙ 2 Samuel 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 ΔΙΙΙΙΙ 2 Chronicles 11:18 is not quite clear, since the word 'daughter' is a correction of the Keri: the original text had b, i.e. 'son.'"
- 7. (Sept. Ἰεριμώθ.) A Levite, one of the overseers of the Temple offerings in the time of Hezekiah (ΔΕΙΙΒ) 2 Chronicles 31:13). B.C. 726.

Je'rioth

(Heb. Yerioth', t/[yrytimidity, otherwise curtains; Ἰεριώθ), 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 (ΔΥΙΝΝ-1 Chronicles 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 ΔΥΙΝΝ-1 Chronicles 2:19; or perhaps we should render the connective by even, thus making Jerioth but another name for Azubah.

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.)

Jerobo'äm

(Heb. Yarobam', μ[b]* y, increase of the people; Sept. Ἰεροβοάμ, Josephus Ἱεροβόαμος), 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 (41126-1 Kings 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 (411126-1 Kings 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 (411129-40).

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" (

Kings 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 (411226-1 Kings 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 Annual Chronicles 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 (41101)1 Kings 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 (Kings 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" (**IHO)*1 Kings 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 (**IHO)*1 Kings 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 Ruth 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 Kings 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 (**DEC**2**2**Kings 14:23). He followed the example of the first Jeroboam in keeping up the idolatry of the golden calves (**DEC**2** Kings 14:24). Nevertheless, the Lord had pity upon Israel (**DEC**2** Kings 14:26), the time of its ruin had not yet come, and this reign was long and flourishing, being contemporary with those of Amaziah (**DEC**2** Kings 14:23) and Uzziah (**DEC**2** Kings 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. **DEC**2** Kings 13:4; 14:26, 27). He even took their chief cities of Damascus (**DEC**2** Kings 14:28; Amos 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 (**DEC**2** Kings 14:25; **Amos 6:14**). Ammon and Moab were

reconquered (***Mos 1:13; 2:1-3); the Transjordanic tribes were restored to their territory (Kings 13:5; Chronicles 5:17-22). But it was merely an outward restoration. The sanctuary at Beth-el was kept up in royal state (Amos 7:13), while drunkenness, licentiousness, and oppression prevailed in the country (*****Amos 2:6-8; 4:1; 6:6; *****Hosea 4:12-14; 1:2), and idolatry was united with the worship of Jehovah (AND Hosea 4:13; 13:6). During this reign lived the prophets Hosea (Mobile Hosea 1:1), Joel (comp. Mobile 3:16 with Mobile Amos 1:12), Amos (***Mos 1:1), and Jonah (***2 Kings 14:25). In ***Mos 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 (Kings 14:29), although the interregnum of eleven years which intervened before the accession of his son Zechariah (Kings 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 4233 2 Kings 13:13; 14:16, 23, 27, 28, 29; 15:1, 8; 4355 1 Chronicles 5:17; Hosea 1:1; Amos 1:1; 7:9, 10, 11; in all others the former Jeroboam is intended. SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

Jero'ham (Heb. *Yerocham*', µj ry] *cherished*), the name of several men.

- 2. (Sept. Ἰεροάμ v.r. Ἰροάμ) An inhabitant of Gedor, and father of Joelah and Zebadiah, two of the Benjamite archers who joined David's band at Ziklag (ΔΙΙΙ) Chronicles 12:7). B.C. ante 1055.
- **3.** (Sept. Ἰωράμ v.r. Ἰρωάβ) The father of Azareel, which latter was "captain" of the tribe of Dan under David and Solomon (*** 1 Chronicles 27:22). B.C. ante 1017.

- **4.** (Sept. Ἰωράμ.) 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 (ΔΕΠ) Chronicles 23:1). B.C. ante 876.
- **5.** (Sept. Ἰεροάμ v.r. Ἰροάμ.) The father of several Benjamite chiefs resident at Jerusalem (I Chronicles 7:27). B.C. appar. ante 588. See No. 6; also JEREMOTH, 4.
- 6. (Sept. Ἰεροάμ ν.r. Ἰεροβοάμ) The father of Ibneiah, which latter was one of the Benjamite chiefs resident at Jerusalem (*** 1 Chronicles 9:8). B.C. apparently ante 536. Possibly identical with the preceding.
- **8.** (Sept. Leροάμ) The son of Pelaliah, and father of Adaiah, which last was one of the chief priests resident at Jerusalem after the Exile (MILE) Nehemiah 11:12). B.C. ante 440. Perhaps, however, this Jeroham was the same with No. 7.

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,

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.

Jerubb'aal

(Heb. Yerubba'al, | [Biry] contender with Baal; comp. ISHBAAL; Sept. Ἰεροβάαλ), a surname of GIDEON SEE GIDEON (q.v.), the judge of Israel, given him in consequence of his overthrow of the idol (ΔΙΕΡΟΣ) Judges 6:32; 7:1; 8:29, 35; 9:1, 2, 5, 16, 19, 24, 28, 57; Samuel 12:11). "The name Jerubbaal appears in the Graecized form of Hierombal (Ἰερόμβαλος) 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, Ἰαρίβολος 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.

Jerub'besheth

(Heb. Yerubbe'sheth, tvBryl countender with the shame, i.e. idol; compare Ishbosheth; Sept. Ἰεροβάαλ), a surname (probably to avoid mentioning the name of a false god, Exodus 23:13) of GIDEON SEE GIDEON (q.v.), the Israelitish judge, acquired on account of his contest with the idolatry of Baal (**OIII) 2 Samuel 11:21). SEE JERUBBAAL.

Jeru'el

(Heb. Yeruel', | altryafounded by God, otherwise fear of God; SEE JERIEL; Sept. Ἰεριήλ), a desert (rBdm, 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 (Chronicles 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 (ver. 20), in the direction of Engedi (**ver. 2), near a certain watchtower overlooking the pass (ver. 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," ver. 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 (ver. 26).

Jeru'salem

(Heb. µl ivWry] *Yerushala'im*, fully [in Thronicles 3:5; Chronicles 25:1; Esther 2:6; Lermiah 26:18] µyl ivWry]

Yerushala'yim [with final h directive, hml ₩ry] I Kings 10:2; fully hmy] ivWry] 42 Chronicles 32:9]; Chald. µl @Vry]or µl vVry] Yerushelem'; Syr. Urishlem; Gr. Ἰερουσαλήμ (τὰ) [Sepoσόλυμα [Gen. ύμων]; Latin *Hierosolymna*), poetically also SALEM (μ); *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" (Nehemiah 11:1, 16: Matthew 4:5), as in the modern Arab. name el-Khuds, the Holy (comp. ἱερόπολις, Philo, Opp. 2:524); once (ΔΣΣ) Chronicles 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. µl ♥A∨Wry∉rather than µl ♥; Wry] 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 (**OHAS**Genesis 14:18). B.C. cir. 2080. Such was the opinion of the Jews themselves; for Josephus, who calls Melchizedek king of Solyma ($\Sigma \acute{o} \lambda \upsilon \mu \alpha$), 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 (**PSD**Psalm 76:2), "In Salem is his tabernacle, and his dwelling place in Zion." *SEE SALEM*.

The mountain of the land of Moriah, which Abraham (Genesis 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 (Chronicles 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 Joshua 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. Joshua 12:10). B.C. 1618. *SEE JOSHUA*.

In drawing the northern border of Judah, we find Jerusalem again mentioned (**GETS**Joshua 15:8; compare **GETS**Joshua 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 (**GETS**Joshua 18:28) "Jebus, which is Jerusalem" (comp. **GETS**Judges 19:10; **GETS**Judges 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**.

Picture for Jerusalem 1

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 (Judges 1:1-8), B.C. cir. 1590. After that, the

Judahites and the Benjamites dwelt with the Jebusites at Jerusalem; for it is recorded (Joshua 15:63) that the children of Judah could not drive out the Jebusites inhabiting Jerusalem; and we are farther informed (Judges 1:21) that the children of Benjamin did not expel them from Jerusalem (comp. Tudges 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 (*** Samuel 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 (*** Samuel 5:5-9; *** Chronicles 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 (**124:15-25*). 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 (**127:13*) 2 Samuel 7:13; 4 Kings 5:3-5). Still the Lord announced to him, through the prophet Nathan. (**1070-2*) 2 Samuel 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 (Kings 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, Deuteronomy 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; Psalm 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 (**DIR**Psalm 2:6; 1, 2; 37; 102:16-22; 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 (*11235-1 Kings 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 (4239) 2 Chronicles 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 (*D43) Kings 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 (400) 2 Chronicles 26:9), B.C. cir. 807. His son, Jotham (q.v.), built the high gate of the Temple, and reared up many other structures (Chronicles 27:3, 4), B.C. cir. 755. Hezekiah (q.v.) added to the other honors of his reign that of an improver of Jerusalem (Chronicles 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 (Kings 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 (Chronicles 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 (Chronicles 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 Chronicles 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 (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 (Kings 23:33-35), B.C. 609, and Babylonians (42244), B. C. 606, and again (Kings 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 (Leviticus 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 SEE NEBUCHADNEZZAR.

Picture for Jerusalem 2

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 (**Deuteronomy 30:1-5; comp. **UNION** 1 Kings 8:46-53; **ONN** Nehemiah 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 (***IS**Isaiah 44:28; comp. **PIP** Jeremiah 3:2, 7, 8; 23:3; 31:10; 32:36, 37). Among the remarkably precise indications should be mentioned that in which ***ISAIA** Jeremiah 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 (**Daniel 9:16, 19), that the streets and the walls of Jerusalem should be built again, even in troublous times (**TUES*ver. 25). *SEE SEVENTY WEEKS*.

4. Daniel lived to see the reign of Cyrus, king of Persia (Daniel 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" Ezra 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 (**Ezra 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" (**TETTER 3:2, 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 (**DETTER 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 (**Ezra 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 (45065) Ezra 6:15, 16, 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 (Nehemiah 1, 2:4, 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 (**Nehemiah 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 (Nehemiah 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 Malachi 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 (2 Macc. 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 (1 Macc. 6:48-65). 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 (1 Macc. 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 (1 Macc. 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 Macc. 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 (1 Macc. 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 (**ITO**Mark 13:1; **ITO**John 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 (**ITO**Mark 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 (ADZE) Matthew 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. Hoowever, 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.

Picture for Jerusalem 3

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*.

Picture for Jerusalem 4

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 eightyeight 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.

Picture for Jerusalem 5

(**A.**) *Hills.* —

- (1.) Mount Zion, frequently mentioned in the Old Testament, only once in the New (**Revelation 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 details 2 Chronicles 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 Mehemiah 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*.

Picture for Jerusalem 6

- (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 (**SMT*)John 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 ²⁸³³Jeremiah 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*.

Picture for Jerusalem 7

(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 (** 2 Samuel 15:23; ** John 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 Joshua 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" (**Nehemiah 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 **Silon** Silon** Sil

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 Saiah 7:3; Chronicles 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 Nehemiah 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 Saiah 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 (**TIN*) 2 Kings 20:20; **PE* 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 (

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 ⁴⁰⁰⁰ 2 Chronicles 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*.

Picture for Jerusalem 8

- (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* (*** Nehemiah 3:13; compare *** Chronicles 26:9; 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 Nehemiah 2:13, and 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 Nehemiah 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 (**PD*Jeremiah 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 (***Nehemiah 2:14; 12:37), and adjoining the Pool of Siloah (***Nehemiah 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 (1029) Nehemiah 12:39; 3:1, 32; 17. John 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 (**GBI5*verse 15) lay a portion extending opposite the "sepulchres of David" (verse 16). By these can only be meant the tomb of David, still extant on the crown of Zion, to which Peter alludes (**Acts 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 (**verses 14 and 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 (verse 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" (2001) Isaiah 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 Nehemiah 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 (***270**2 Kings 25:4, 5;

Jeremiah 29:4; 52:7). From Chronicles 27:3; and 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 (***OZ**Nehemiah 12:37; 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 (***Nehemiah 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 (**Nehemiah 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" (verses 25, 26, 27); that it contained three gates (the "Water gate," verse 26; the "Horse gate," verse 28; and the gate "Miphkad," verse 31); that it adjoined Ophel (verse 27); and that it completed the circuit of walls in this direction (verse 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 Nehemiah 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* (**\frac{12116}{2} Kings 11:16; *\frac{42215}{2} Chronicles 23:15; *\frac{40225}{2} Nehemiah 3:28; *\frac{40225}{2} Jeremiah 31:3840).
- (12.) Not far to the north of this must be placed "the *Tower lying out*" (**Nehemiah 3:25, 26, 27).
- (13.) On the north side of the space included by the parts of this wall we place the *Water gate* (**Nehemiah 3:26; 12:37; comp. *Nehemiah 8:1, 3, 16); probably the same with the *Middle gate* (**PDD**Jeremiah 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 (12.30-40); probably the same with the gate *Miphkad*, referred to by Nehemiah as lying between the Horse gate and the Sheep gate (16.30-chap. 3:28, 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 (**Nehemiah 3:8, 11, 13; 12:38; comp. **2 Chronicles 26:9); and
- (2.) on the western bank of this entrance of the Tyropoeon would be situated the *Corner gate* (compare ²⁶¹³⁸ Jeremiah 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 Nehemiah 3:8; 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 (1834) Chronicles 33:14); and having been broken down in Hezekiah's time, it was rebuilt by him as a defense against the Assyrians (1835), and again broken down by the rival Jehoash, on his capture of the city (1843).

(3.) On the eastern slope of this depression, we think, must be placed the *Ephraim gate* (4000 Nehemiah 3:38, 39; 4243 2 Kings 14:13; comp 4000 Nehemiah 8:16), corresponding to the modern "Damascus gate," and probably identical with the *Benjamin gate* (4000 Jeremiah 37:12, 13; comp. 38:7; see 400 Zechariah 14:10), but different from the "*High* gate of Benjamin, that was by the house of the Lord" (4000 Jeremiah 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, 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 (**Nehemiah 3:1, 3, 6; 12:39; comp. **Chronicles 33:14; **Chronicles 34:14; **Chronicles 34:14; **Chronicles 34:14; *
- (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
- (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 (*** Nehemiah 3:1, 3; 12:39), and at the most northeastern point of the city (*** Jeremiah 31:38, compared with *** Zechariah 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 <u>SEE TEMPLE</u>.

(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 (sostyled) 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.

Picture for Jerusalem 9

(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.

Picture for Jerusalem 10

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 Nehemiah 3:26; 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:

Picture for Jerusalem 11

- (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 (*** 2 Samuel 5:9; *** 1 Kings 9:15, 24; 11:27; *** 2 Kings 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.

Picture for Jerusalem 12

- (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 (***S**John 18:28, 33; 19:9; ***ISIG**Mark 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 ***ISIG**Matthew 27:19) in front (i.e. at the eastern entrance) of it (namely, on the "*Pavement*" of ****ISIG**John 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 (**1020**1 Kings 2:10) Nehemiah mentions it as surviving the first overthrow of the city (**1020**Nehemiah 3:16): Peter refers to it as extant at Jerusalem in his time (**1020**Acts 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 Nehemiah 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 "Nehemiah 8:1, 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 ²⁸⁷² Jeremiah 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 (**Nehemiah 3:24, 25; **PJeremiah 32:2; 38:6), must have been situated in the northwest corner of the inclosure which we have designated as "Millo," near the "Prison gate" (**PNehemiah 12:39), and Peter's "iron gate" (**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 (John 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 (Saiah 26:2; Saiah 26:17), 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 (*** Isaiah 7:3; 36:2; *** Kings 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).

Picture for Jerusalem 13

(5.) There is no good ground to dispute the traditionary site of *Aceldama* or the *Potter's Field* (**Matthew 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* (***SNehemiah 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* (***SH40*Zechariah 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 (*** 2 Samuel 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.

Picture for Jerusalem 14

"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' (**Psalm 33:14): its kings were 'higher than the kings of the earth' (Psalm 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 (2 Macc. 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 (<i>Kasr Jalud</i>) 2610
Mount Zion (Coenaculum) 2537
Mount Moliah (Haram esh-Sherif) 2429
Bridge over the Kedron, near Gethsemane2281
Pool of Siloam2114
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" (Kings 1:33, 38); from Kings 1:33, 38); Chronicles 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 (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" (****Micah 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 Saiah 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.

Picture for Jerusalem 15

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).

Picture for Jerusalem 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).

Picture for Jerusalem 17

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.

Picture for Jerusalem 18

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 11,500, 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 esSultan, 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, 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 $\alpha \sigma \pi \iota \zeta$ $\delta \rho \theta o \delta \delta \zeta (\alpha \zeta) \tilde{\eta} \tilde{\alpha} \pi o \lambda \delta \gamma (\alpha)$. 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 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, 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, 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,

the symbolic name of the Christian Church; also called "the Bride, the Lamb's wife" (**Revelation 21:2-21; 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" Ephesians 5:23-30; Galatians 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 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.

SEE NEW-JERUSALEM CHURCH.

Jerusalem, Patriarchate Of.

SEE PATRIARCHATE OF JERUSALEM.

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.)

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, Betrachtungen 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.)

Jeru'sha

(Heb. Yerusha', avwry] possession; Sept. Ἰερουσά), the daughter of Zadok, and mother of king Jothan, consequently wife of Uzziah, whom she appears to have survived (ΔΣΞΞΕ Kings 15:33); written JERUSHAH (hvwry] Yerushah', id.; Sept. Ἱερουσά) in the parallel passage (ΔΣΞΕ Chronicles 27:1). B.C. 806.

Jeru'shah

(4470) 2 Chronicles 27:1). SEE JERUSHA.

Jesai'ah

[many Jesai'ah] (a, 46107 Nehemiah 11:7, b, 4382 1 Chronicles 3:21). SEE JESHAIAH.

Jeshai'ah

[many Jeshai'ah] (Hebrew Yeshayah', hy[]yi] deliverance of Jehovah;'

Chronicles 3:21; **Ezra 8:7,19; **Nehemiah 11:7; elsewhere in the paragogic form \[\frac{1}{2}y \] Yeshaya'hu), the name of several men.

- 1. (Sept: Ωσαίας v.r. Ἰωσίας, Vulg. *Iasajas*, Author. Ver. "Jeshaiah.") Son of Rehabiah, and father of Joram, of the Levitical family of Eliezer (*** 1 Chronicles 26:25). B.C. considerably ante 1014.
- 2. (Sept. Ἰεεία v.r. Ἰσαές; Ἰσίας v.r. Ἰωσιά; Vulg. *Jesejas*, Auth. Vers. "Jeshaiah.") One of the sons of Jeduthun, appointed under him among the sacred harpers (ΔΙΣΙΙΝ Chronicles 25:3), at the head of the eighth division of Levitical musicians (ΔΙΣΙΙΝ Vers. 15). B.C. 1014.

3. SEE ISAIAH.

- **4.** (Septuag. Ἰεσσεία v.r. Ἰεσίας, Vulg. *Isaja*, Auth. Vers. "Jesaiah.") Father of Ithiel, a Benjamite, whose descendant Sallu resided in Jerusalem after the exile (*** Nehemiah 9:7). B.C. long ante 539.
- 5. (Septuagint Ἰεσεία v.r. Ἰεσίας, Vulgate *Jesejas*, Auth. Vers. "Jesaiah.") The second of the three sons of Hananiah, son of Zerubbabel (Thronicles 3:21; see Strong's *Harmony and Expos. of the Gosp.* p. 17). B.C. post 536.
- **6.** (Septuag. Hoαία v.r. Ἰσαίας, Vulg. *Isajas*, Auth. Vers. "Jeshaiah.") Son of Athaliah, of the "sons" of Elam, who returned with 70 male relatives from Babylon (ΔΝΝΈΖΙΤΑ 8:7). B.C. 459.
- 7. (Sept. Ἰσαία, 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 (***Ezra 8:19). B.C. 459.

Jesha'nah

[many *Jesh'anah*] (Heb. *Yeshanah'*, hnvy] *old*, q.d. Παλαιόπολις; Sept. **Ἰεσυνά** v.r. ἀνά), a city of the kingdom of Israel, taken with its suburbs from Jeroboam by Abijah, and mentioned as situated near Bethel and Ephraim (Δ4339)2 Chronicles 13:19). It appears to be the "village *Isanas*" (Ἰσάνας), mentioned by Josephus as the scene of Herod's encounter with Pappus, the general of Antigonus, in Samaria (*Ant.* 14, 15, 12; compare Ἰσανά, 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).

Jeshar'elah

[some Jeshare'lah] (Heb. Yeshare'lah, hl ae yi] upright towards God; some copies read, hl ae yi] Yesare'lah; Septuag. Ἰσρεηλά v.r. Ἰσεριήλ; Vulg. Isreela), the head of the seventh division of Levitical musicians (Chronicles 25:14); elsewhere called by the equivalent name ASARELAH (CARR) ver. 2). B.C. 1014.

Jesheb'eab

(Heb. Yeshebab', bably, seat of his father; Sept. Ἰσβαάλ v.r. Ἰεσβαάλ, Vulg. Ishbaab), the head of the fourteenth division of priests as arranged by David (Chronicles 24:13). B.C. 1014.

Je'sher

(Heb. *Ye'sher*, rvyeupright; Sept. Ἰωασάρ v.r. Ιασάρ), the first named of the three sons of Caleb (son of Hezron) by his first wife Azubah (TDS) Chronicles 2:18). B.C. ante 1658. *SEE JERIOTH*.

Jesh'imon

is the rendering in the Auth. Version (**OPT) Numbers 21:20; 23:28; *OPT | Samuel 23:1, 9, 24; 26:1, 3) of **Imply denotes a wilderness, as in the margin (so the Sept.), and elsewhere in the text (**OPT | Deuteronomy 22:10; *OPT | Psalm 68:7; "desert;" *OPT | Psalm 78:40; 107:14; *OPT | Psalm 107:4). SEE DESERT.

Jeshimoth

SEE BETH-JESHIMOTH.

Jesh'ishai

[many *Jeshish'ai'*, some *Jeshisha'I*] (Heb. *Yeshishay'*, yvyvægrayish, perh. q.d. born of an *old* man, Sept. Ἰεσσαί v.r. Ἰεσσαί), the son of Jahdo and father of Michael, of the ancestry of Abihail, a Gadite chief in Bashan (ΔΙΣΙΑ) Chronicles 5:14). B.C. long ante 782.

Jestohai'ah

(Heb. *Jeshochayah*', hyj /vy] worshipper of Jehovah; Sept. Ἰασονία), a chief Simeonite, apparently one of those who migrated to the valley of Gedon (1 Chronicles 4:36). B.C. prob. cir. 711.

Jesh'ua

(Heb. *Yeshu'a*, [ℕνy] a contracted form of JOSHUA, i.q. JESUS; Sept. Ἰησοῦς), the name of several men, also of a place.

- 1. (See Joshua. 17.) SEE Joshua.
- **2.** The head of the ninth sacerdotal "class" as arranged by David (Chronicles 24:11, where the name is Anglicized "Jeshuah"). B.C. 1014. He is thought by some to be the Jeshua of Ezra 2:36. But see No. 6.
- **3.** One of the Levites appointed by Hezekiah to distribute the sacred offerings in the sacerdotal cities (***S2** Chronicles 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 (4006) Ezra 2:6; 4000 Nehemiah 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 (*Ezra 2:40; *Nehemiah 7:43). B.C. ante 536. See Nos. 9 and 10.
- 6. Jeshua (or JOSHUA as he is called in Haggai 1:1,12; 2:2, 4; Zechariah 3:1, 3, 6, 8, 9), the "son" of Jozadak or Jozedech, and high priest of the Jews when they returned, under Zerubbabel, from the Babylonian exile (Nehemiah 7:7; 12:1, 7, 10, 26; Ezra 2:2; 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 (STRE) Ezra 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 (**Ezra 3:2,8,9). Jeshua joined with Zerubbabel in opposing the machinations of the Samaritans (**Ezra 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 (**Ezra 5:2; **MPHaggai 1:12). Several of the prophet Haggai's utterances are addressed to Jeshua (**MPHaggai 1:1; 2:2), and his name occurs in two of the symbolical prophecies of Zechariah (3:1-10; 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 **Ezra 2:36; **MPHEST** Nehemiah 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 (*Ezra 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 (**Nehemiah 3:19). B.C. ante 446.
- **9.** A Levite, son of Azaniah (****Nehemiah 10:9), who actively cooperated in the reformation instituted by Nehemiah (****Nehemiah 8:7; 9:4, 5; 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 (**Nehemiah 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 (**Nehemiah 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.

Jesh'uah

(Chronicles 24:11). SEE JESHUA, 2.

Jesh'urun

(Heb. Yeshurun', `Wrvy), a poetical appellation of the people of Israel, used in token of affection and tenderness, occurring four times Composition (Sept. 1) Deuteronomy 32:15, Sept. 1 (March 1) Deuteronomy 32:15, Sept. 1 (March 2) Deuteronomy 32:15 (March 2) De 33:5, 26, and Sup Isaiah 44:2 [A. Vers. in this latter passage "Jesurun"]: Sept. ἡγαπημένος, 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 rlvy;i.q. rvy;(compare µW ∨; and µ W), q.d. rectulus, a 'rightling," i.e. the dear upright people. Aguila, 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 `wrcy (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 rvyhi "that which was right" in the eyes of Jehovah, i.e. what God approved (Kings 11:34, etc.).

Jesi'ah

(a, (3326) 1 Chronicles 12:6; b, (2331) 1 Chronicles 23:20). *SEE ISHIAH*, 2, 4.

Jesim'iel

(Heb. Yesimiel', Laympe pappointed of God; Sept. Ἰσμαήλ), apparently one of the chief Simeonites who migrated to the valley of Gedor in search of pasture (1986). Chronicles 4:36). B.C. cir. 711.

Jessaeans.

According to Epiphanius, the first distinctive appellation of Christians was Isogoto, 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 $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ Ieogotow, which is now extant under the title of $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ Biou $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \eta \tau i \kappa o i$ (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.

Jes'se

(Heb. Yishay', yvypperhaps firm, otherwise living; once yvipperhaps', either by prosthesis, or *manly*, dept. 1 Chronicles 2:13; Sept. and N.T. <u>leσσαί</u>; Josephus <u>leσσαίος</u>, Ant. 6, 8, 1), a son (or descendant) of Obed, the son of Boaz and Ruth (**Ruth 4:17, 22; **Matthew 1:5, 6; **Luke 3:32; (Chronicles 2:12). He was the father of eight sons (()) Samuel 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 (Samuel 20:27, 30, 31; 22:7, 8; 25:10; COND 2 Samuel 20:1; COND 1 Kings 12:16; COND 2 Chronicles 10:16). "Stem of Jesse" is used poetically for the family of David (Sin Isaiah 11:1), and "Root [i.e. root-shoot, or sprout from the stump, i.g. scion of "Jesse" for the Messiah (2011) Isaiah 11:10; Revelation 5:5; comp. 22:16). He seems to have been a person of some note and substance at Bethlehem, his property being chiefly in sheep (4000)1 Samuel 16:1, 11; 17:20; comp. Psalm 78:71). It would seem from 60001 Samuel 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 Samuel 17:12). The last historical mention of Jesse is in relation to the asylum which David procured for him with the king of Moab (Samuel 22:3). B.C. cir. 1068-1061. SEE DAVID.

"According to an ancient Jewish tradition, recorded in the Targum on Samuel 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 (**TDG**1 Chronicles 2:16), yet Abigail is said to have been the daughter of Nahash (**TDG**2 Samuel 17:25). Of this, two explanations have been proposed.

- (1.) The Jewish: that Nahash was another name for Jesse (Jerome, *Quoest. Hebr.* on OZE Samuel 17:25, and the Targum on Ruth 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,

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.

Jes'sue

(Ἰεσσονέ v.r. Ἰησονέ and Ἰησονς, 1 Esdr. 5:26), or Je'su (Ἰησονς, 1 Esdr. 8:63), corrupt forms (see Ezra 2:40; 8:33) of the name of JESHUA SEE JESHUA (q.v.).

Jesu

is likewise used in modern poetry for the name of JESUS, our Savior, especially as a vocative or genitive.

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.

Jes'ui, Jes'uite

(Numbers 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, twentyfour 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 Mohiley, 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	Province	Members	Priests
District			

1. Italy	1. Rome	483	245
-	2. Naoles (scattered)	352	194
	3. Sicily (scattered)	222	141
	4. Turin (scattered)	292	173
	5. Venice (scattered)	223	128
2. Germany	1. Austria	443	160
	2. Belgium	602	260
	3. Gallicia	185	70
	4. Germany	653	260
	5. Holland	263	95
3. France	1. Champagne	566	224
	2. Paris	650	306
	3. Lyons	702	316
	4. Toulouse	546	271
4. Spain	1. Aragon (scattered)	492	144
	2. Castile (scattered)	708	183
	3. Mexico (scattered)	18	10
5. England	1. England	312	151
	2. Ireland	167	77
	3. Maryland	238	80
	4. Missouri	204	75

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.)

Jes'urun

(SEE JESHURUN.

Je'sus

(Ἰησοῦς, Gen., Dat., and Voc. οῦ, Acc. οῦν; from the Heb. WivyeYeshu'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 (2 Esdr. 7:37; Ecclesiastes 46:1; 1 Macc. 2:55; **Acts 7:45; **BHebrews 4:8; so also Josephus, passim).
- **2.** JOSHUA, or JESHUA *SEE JESHUA* (q.v.) the priest, the son of Jehozadak (1 Esdr. 5:5, 8, 24, 48, 56, 68, 70; 6:2; 9:19; Ecclesiastes 49:12; so also Josephus, *Ant.* 11, 3, 10 sq.).
- **3.** JESHUA *SEE JESHUA* (q.v.) the Levite (1 Esdr. 5:58; 9:48).

4. JESUS, THE SON OF SIRACH (Ἰησοῦς υίὸς 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 (Ecclus. 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 (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 (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 (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 (3, 1-16; 7, 27, 28); humility (3, 17-19; 10, 7-18, 28); kindness to domestics (4, 30; 7, 20, 21; 33, 30, 31); to relieve the poor (4, 1-9); to act as a father to the fatherless, and a husband to the widow (4, 10); to visit the sick (7, 35); to weep with them that weep (7, 34); not to rejoice over the death of even the greatest enemy (7, 7), and to forgive sins as we would be forgiven (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 Christ

(Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Ἰηοῦς 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 (ΚΙΚΙΣ) John 18:7, etc., strictly Jesus the Nazarene, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος), and Jesus the son of Joseph (ΚΙΚΙΣ) John 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 (**Exodus 24:13), and the high priest who, along with Zerubbabel (**Exodus 24:13), 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* (**Missing Numbers 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 (**Testament Sept.**).

The original name of Joshua was *Hoshea* ([veh, saving), as appears in Numbers 13:8, 16, which was changed by Moses into Jehoshua ([wthy] Jehovah is his salvation), as appears in Numbers 12:16; Chronicles 7:27, being elsewhere Anglicized "Joshua." After the exile he is called by the abridged form of this name, Jeshua ([Wvyeid.), whence the Greek name Ἰησοῦς, by which this is always represented in the Sept. This last Heb. form differs little from the abstract noun from the same root. h[\vy] yeshuah', deliverance, and seems to have been understood as equivalent in import (see 4022 Matthew 1:22 comp. Ecclesiastes 46:1). The "name of Jesus" (**Philippians 2:10) is not the name Jesus, but "the name above every name" ("ver. 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 εν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ 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 (**DL**Luke 1:31; 2:21), as indicative of his saving function (**DL**Matthew 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 **DL**Romans 1:3, 4; 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 Matthew 1:1 sq.; Luke 3:23 sq.; comp. John 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 (**Matthew 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 (**Luke 1:26) in Nazareth (q.v.), in Lower Galilee (**Matthew 2:23; comp. **Luke 4:16; **Dohn 1:46, etc.), where the youthful Jesus so rapidly matured (**Luke 2:40, 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 (**Luke 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 (**Matthew 3:13 sq.; **Mark 1:9 sq.; **Luke 3:21 sq.; John 1:32 sq.). He now began, after a forty-days' fast (comp. 41908-1 Kings 19:8) spent in the wilderness of Judea (***Matthew 4:1-11; ***Mark 1:12 sq.; Luke 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 (****John 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. Luke 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 (υίὸς 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 (***John 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 John 7:49; and even from the despicable publicans, Matthew 9:9 sq. Luke 5:27 sq.); for the eminent and learned were repelled by the severe reproofs which he uttered against their corrupt maxims (**Mark 12:38 sq.), their sanctimonious (**Luke 12:1; 18:9 sq.) and hypocritical punctiliousness (Luke 11:39 sq.; 18:9 sq.), and against their prejudices, as being subversive of all true religion (John 8:33; 9:16), as well as by the slight regard which (in comparison with their statutes) he paid to the Sabbath (John 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 (Mark 11:18; John 7:30, 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 ($\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\lambda\eta\tau\sigma\varsigma$), 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. Eccl.* 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* ([Wvy]t/dl]T, 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 criticochronological 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 (Matthew 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 Luke 3:1, 23; Matthew 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 Matthew 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 Luke 2:1 sq.; 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, **Luke 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. 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 (**Luke 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 ($\alpha \pi \sigma \gamma \rho \alpha \phi \dot{\eta}$), which made traveling necessary (**TLuke 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 (**Luke 1:5, 8), who belonged to the eighth division (Chronicles 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 (*Chronolog. 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 Luke 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 abovementioned 15th year of Tiberius, in which John the Baptist began his career Luke 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 (**John 1:19; comp. 29:35; 2:1), and comes in just before the Passover (John 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 405) John 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. 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 Luke 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 (ADSS Matthew 27:45; ADSS Mark 15:33; ADSS Luke 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 (Matthew 1:12 sq.; Luke 3:27), but also Matthew carries back Joseph's lineage to David's son Solomon (ver. 6 sq.), while Luke refers it to another son Nathan ver. 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 καταλλαγής, 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 Luke 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 Ἡλί), since we must understand all the following genitives to refer to the actual *fathers* and not to the fathers-in-law (the appeal to Ruth 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 Matthew 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. Numbers 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 (Deuteronomy 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 (**UIS*ver. 16) "begat" ($\ref{equ:together}$) in a manner quite calculated to mislead. Moreover, this hypothesis of Hug rests upon an interpretation of **ITS*1 Chronicles 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 (Luke 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 (**Romans 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 (**Luke 1:26 sq.; **Matthew 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 (2014 Isaiah 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, "The John 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' (Κυβος Romans 1:3; Κυβος Τίποτην 2:8); once (Κυβος Galatians 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 (κυρος Galatians 4:4) as that of the older theologians upon hml [i(κυρος Isaiah 7:14).
- (c) "Mary calls Joseph, without qualification, the father of Jesus (**Luke 2:48), and also among the Jews Jesus was generally called Joseph's son (**Matthew 13:55; **Mark 6:3; **Luke 3:23; 4:22; **John 1:46; 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 (**Dohn 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, "Luke 1:29, 34), and that this had drawn nourishment from a vision in a dream, as the angelic annunciation ("Luke 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. Micah 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 John 1:46. That Jesus was born in Bethlehem is stated in two of the evangelical accounts (Matthew 2:1; Matthew 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 (Matthew 2:22, 23; Matthew 1:26; 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 (***S**John 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 (***OII**)*Acts 1:13) and Joses (*****John 19:25)*Matthew 27:56; ****ISO** Mark 15:40). *SEE MARY*.
- (b) *Elizabeth*, who is called the relative (συγγενής, "cousin") of Mary (συγγενής). 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 Luke 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 (*****Luke 1:57 sq.). *SEE ELIZABETH*.

(c) Brethren of Jesus (ἀδελφοί, Δελφοί, Matthew 12:46, and parallel passages; John 2:12; 7:3, 5, 10; Δατε 1:14; ἀδελφοί τοῦ Κυρίου, Δυσίου Corinthians 9:5), by the name of James, Joses (q.v.), Simon, and Judas (Matthew 13:55, and the parallel passage, Mark 6:3). (On these see Clemen. in the Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol. 3; 329 sq.; A. H. Bloom, De Toîc άδελφοῖς 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 propinguor. Servatoris persecutione, Lips. 1782.) In the passages Matthew 12:46; 13:55; Tohn 2:12; Acts 1:14, are unquestionably to be understood proper brothers, as they are all together named conjointly with the mother of Jesus (and with Joseph, Matthew 13:55); the same is the natural inference from the statement (**John 7:5) that the brethren $(\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\circ\iota)$ of Jesus had not believed in him as the Messiah. On "James, the brother of the Lord" (Ιάκωβος ὁ αδελφὸς Κυρίου, «ΠΕΘ Galatians 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 (Matthew 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. Eccl. 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 Matthew 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" (Matthew 1:25; Luke 2:7), which is further corroborated by the statement of abstinence from matrimonial intercourse until the birth of Jesus (Matthew 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 [Δικε 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.

John 19:26, contains no valid counter argument: the brothers of Jesus may have become convinced by his resurrection (Matthew 28:10), and, even had they been so at his death, yet perhaps the older and more spirituallykindred 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 (**Acts 1:14; 1 Corinthians 9:5). SEE BROTHERS.

(d) Sisters of Jesus are mentioned in Matthew 13:56; Mark 6:3 (in Mark 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 (***Mark 15:40; 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 (**John 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. Mark 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 (John 5:45; 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 (**Luke 8:2; Mark 15:41). He had a common traveling purse with the apostles John 12:6; 13:29), from which the stock of provisions for the journey was provided (**Luke 9:13; **Matthew 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 Matthew 8:20 (see Lunze, De Christi divitiis. et pautpertate, Lips. 1784), nor yet from ⁴⁸⁸⁹2 Corinthians 8:9 (see *Beitrage* z. vernunftigen Denk. 4, 160 sq.), and John 19:23, rather shows the contrary (comp. Bar-Hebraeus, Chron. p. 251); yet his parents were by no means in opulent circumstances (see Luke 2:24; comp. Leviticus 12:8), and he himself possessed (***Matthew 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 (Matthew 4:13), and only on one or two occasions (***Luke 4:16; ***Mark 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 (**TD*John 2:1 sq.; **Luke 7:31 sq.; **Matthew 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 **Matthew 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, Luke 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, Matthew 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 (**Matthew 4:13; 8:5; 17:24; ***Mark 1:21; 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 (Matthew 8:23 sq.; 13:1 sq.; 14:13; Luke 8:22), also on the other side in Peraea Matthew 8:28; Luke 8:26; Mark 7:31). Once he went as far as within the Phoenician boundaries (**Matthew 15:21; **Mark 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 **Luke 4:19; comp. Saiah 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, Luke 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, John 4:4; compare his return, Luke 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 (**John 2:13), is a Passover; the second (**Tohn 5:1) is called indefinitely "a feast of the Jews" (ξορτή τῶν Ἰουδαίων); the third was the Festival of Tabernacles John 7:2); the fourth the Feast of Dedication (John 10:22); and, lastly, the fifth (John 12, 13) again a Passover: mention is also made John 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 "John 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 John 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 (**POTE**Luke 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 (***OHING***Numbers 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 Matthew 13:54; Luke 4:22, etc.), sometimes in public places, and even in the open field, sometimes in the Temple court, were suggested on the occasion (John 4:32 sq.; 7:37 sq.), either by some transaction or natural phenomenon, or else by some recital (**Luke 13:1), or expression of others (Matthew 8:10). He loved especially to clothe his sentiments in comparisons (see Greiling, p. 201 sq.), parables (Matthew 13:11 sq., 34 sq.) (for these are preeminently distinguished for simplicity, conciseness, natural beauty, intelligibleness, and dignity; see especially Unger, De parabolar. Jesu natura, interretatione, usu, Leipz. 1828), allegories John 6:32 sq.; 10; 15), and apothegms (Matthew 5), sometimes also paradoxes (John 2:19; 6:53; 8:58), which exactly suited the comprehension of his audience (Mark 4:33; Luke 13:15 sq.; 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 (***Matthew 12:25). When they proposed to him captious questions, he brought, them, not unfrequently by similar questions, mostly in the form of a dilemma (Matthew 21:24; 22:20; Luke 10:29 sq.; 20:3 sq.), or by appeal to the explicit written law or to their sacred history (**Matthew 9:13; 12:3 sq.; 19:4 sq.; Luke 6:2 sq.; 10:26 sq.; 20:28 sq.), or by analogies from

ordinary life (Matthew 12:10 sq.), to maintain silence, or put them to embarrassment with all their sagacity and legal zeal (Matthew 22:42 sq. John 8:3 sq.); sometimes he disarmed them by the exercise of his miraculous power (**Luke 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 (John 13:1 sq., 20, 22; comp. Luke 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 John 7:46; 18:6; Matthew 7:28 sq.). The tuition which Jesus imparted to the apostles (comp. Greiling, p. 213 sq.), was apparently private (Matthew 13:11 sq.; see Colln, Bibl. Theol. 2, 14). SEE APOSTLE. Finally, Jesus commonly spoke Syro-Chaldee (comp. e.g. Mark 3:17; 5:41; 7:34; Matthew 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 ($yBzi \dot{\rho}\alpha\beta\beta\dot{\iota}$), in the sense of the Jewish schools, as having been thus styled not only by the populace (***Mark 10:51; John 20:16), or his disciples (John 1:39, 50; 4:31; 9:2; 11:8; Matthew 26:25, etc.), but also by Nicodemus (****John 3:2), and even his enemies (John 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 (*****John 7:15). SEE RABBI. (Additional literature may be seen in Volbeding, p. 25.) SEE PROPHET.

11. The Jews expected miracles of the Messiah (John 7:31; 4 Esdr. 13:50; comp. Matthew 8:17; John 20:30 sq.; see Bertholdt, Christologia Judoeor. p. 168 sq.), such as Jesus performed (τέρατα, σημεία, δυνάμεις). These all had a moral tendency, and aimed at beneficent results (on Matthew 8:28 sq., see Paulus, ad loc.; Bretschneider, Handb. d. Dogm. 1, 307 sq.; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 134; on Matthew 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 (**Mark 6:56) of such maladies as had baffled all scientific remedies (insanity, epilepsy, palsy, leprosy blindness, etc.). He asked no reward (comp. **Matthew 10:8), and performed no miracles to gratify curiosity (Matthew 16:1 sq.; Mark 8:11 sq.), or to excite the astonishment of a sensuous populace; rather he repeatedly forbade the public report of his extraordinary deeds Matthew 9:30; Mark 1:44; 7:36; 8:26; Luke 5:14; 8:56; Plitt, in

the Hess. Heboper, 1850, p. 890 sq., takes an erroneous view of Mark 5:19, for in verse 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 (***John 5:13), only suffering these miracles to be acknowledged to the honor of God Luke 8:39 sq.; 17:16 sq.). In effecting cures he sometimes made use of some means (Mark 7:33; 8:23; John 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 Matthew 8:1 sq.;

John 5:8, etc.), even at a distance

Matthew 8:5 sq.; ***Luke 7:6 sq.; ***John 4:50), or merely a touch of the invalid Matthew 8:3, 15) or the afflicted member (blind eyes, Matthew 9:29; 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 (Matthew 9:20 sq.; 14:36), but in such a case always on the presumption of a firm faith (***Matthew 9:28; compare John 5:6), so that when this failed the miraculous power was not exercised (***Matthew 13:58; ***Mark 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. Luke 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 Matthew 12:27; Luke 11:19; Mark 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 (Matthew 16:1; Dhn 2:18) which sprung from sensuous curiosity or from pure malevolence Matthew 12:39; 16:4; Mark 8:11 sq.), or else had a thankless regard merely to their own advantage (***John 4:48; 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 (John 11:42; comp. Matthew 11:4 sq.; Luke 7:21 sq.), and hence

often lamented their ineffectualness (**Matthew 11:20 sq.; **Luke 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 (**Matthew 26:65 sq.; Mark 14:64; compare John 19:7), for which the Law prescribed capital punishment (**Leviticus 24:16); but he would have been guilty of this crime if he had falsely claimed (Matthew 26:63 sq.; Luke 22:67

sq.) to be the Messiah (Son of God), and the fact of this profession was substantiated indirectly by witnesses (Matthew 26:60 sq.; Mark 14:57 sq.), and directly by Jesus' own declaration (**Matthew 26:63 sq.; Mark 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 (Matthew 26:60), and Jesus had really uttered John 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) (Matthew 27:11; Mark 15:2; Luke 23:2; John 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 (***John 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 (***John 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 (***Mark 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. Tohn 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 αΐμα 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 Mark 15:37; Luke 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 (Matthew 28:9. Mark 16:9; John 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 (**Luke 24:13 sq., 36 sq.; ***DDDOnn 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 (Luke 24:37; John 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 (**Luke 24:51; **Acts 1:9. Mark 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 Matthew 28:16). The apostles, in the doctrinal expositions, occasionally allude to this ascension (ἀνάληψις) of Jesus (ΔΕΕΑ 3:21; Timothy 3:16; Revelation 12:5), and often speak (ALES Acts 2:33; 5:31; 7:55, 56; **Romans 8:34; **Dephesians 1:20; **Colossians 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, Genesis 5:24; Kings 2:11, and serving as a basis of the expectation of his visible return from heaven, Acts 1:11; for, that the Jews of that day believed in an ascension of the Messiah to heaven [comp. ***John 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 (***Matthew 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 (**John 20:15), and the two disciples on the way to Emmaus Luke 24:16), as well as the apostles at his last appearance by the Sea of Gennesareth (John 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 (John 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 (**Luke 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 (Luke 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 Matthew 13:54 sq.; John 7:15), although the Jewish fables (Toledoth Jesu, p. 5) assign him a youthful teacher named Elhanan (nj 1 a), 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 (***John 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 (**DZ*John 4:22; **Matthew 15:24; compare Matthew 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 (John 4:23; 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 (Matthew 15:24), whereas his disciples, led by the Holy Spirit, should eventually traverse the world as heralds of the truth (Matthew 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, Luke 20:1 sq., and forbade the spread of this report, Matthew 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 Matthew 12:8), partly by explicit statements (Matthew 13:16 sq.; Luke 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 John 4:26; 9:36 sq.), and also to the high priest at the conclusion of his career (Matthew 26:64). The disciples required it merely for the confirmation of the faith they had already attained (Matthew 16:13 sq.; Luke 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 (Luke 18:19), and ardent love towards men in view of the determined sacrifice (4808) John 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 John 2:16 sq.; 8:44 sq.; Matthew 16:23; 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 (Matthew 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 (John 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 (Luke 7:13; Matthew 9:36: 14:14; 30:34). He was both (compare Romans 12:15) tearful among the tearful (John 11:35), and cheerful among 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. Matthew 12:46 sq.; 15:21 sq.; John 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. Luke 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 (**PD**Luke 10:21); oftener did it experience dejection of spirit (**PD**John 12:27), at times to the depths of mental anguish (**PD**Mark 14:34). **SEE AGONY**. It was this interior pressure that so frequently burst forth in sighs and tears (**PD**John 11:33; **DON**Luke 19:41), and made Jesus the ready sympathizer with human affliction (**PD**John 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*" (**Matthew 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. Luke 5:8) and consternation (see Luke 8:37). It was the selfrestraint 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 Daniel 9:25), was now close at hand (see Luke 2:26, 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 Luke 2:1), that an incident occurred which, although apparently personal and inconsiderable, broke like a new oracle the silence of ages (comp. Peter 3:4), and proved the dawn of the long looked for day of Israel's glory (see Luke 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 (**Luke 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 (Luke 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 (**Luke 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 (**Matthew 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 (**Luke 2:1-7), in fulfilment of an express prediction of Scripture (***Micah 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 (**Luke 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 Matthew 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 (**Matthew 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 (**D*Luke 2:40, 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 (ΔΩΣΕ) Luke 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).

Picture for Jesus Christ 1

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 (Matthew 3:13-17; Luke 3:1-18, 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 (***Matthew 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 (**TID-John 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 (**TID-John 2:1-11; prob. March, A.D. 26).

Picture for Jesus Christ 2

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 John 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 (John 2:23-25; 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 John 3:22-36); but the imprisonment of John not long afterwards by order of Herod (*Matthew 14:3 sq.; *Mark 6:17 sq.; *Luke 3:19) rendered it expedient (**Matthew 4:12; **Mark 1:14), in connection with the odium excited by the hierarchy (John 4:1-3), that Jesus should retire into Galilee (**Luke 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 (4001) John 4:4-42; prob. December, A.D. 26). On his arrival in Galilee he was received with great respect (***John 4:43-45), and his public announcements of the advent of the Messianic age (Matthew 4:17: Mark 1:14, 15) in all the synagogues of that country spread his fame still more widely (**Luke 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 (John 4:46-54). Arriving at Nazareth, he was invited by his townsmen to read the Scripture lesson (2601 Isaiah 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 (**Luke 4:16-30). Thenceforward he fixed upon Capernaum (q.v.) as his general place of residence (Matthew 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 (**Luke 5:1-10; **Matthew 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 (4002) Mark 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 (Mark 1:29-34; Matthew 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 (***Mark 1:35-38; ***Matthew 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 (****Mark 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 (***Luke 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 (***PIS**Mark 2:13,14, and parallels; probably April, A.D. 27). SEE MATTHEW.

Picture for Jesus Christ 3

Picture for Jesus Christ 4

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 thirtyeight 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 (John 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 (Deuteronomy 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 (*** Samuel 21:1-6), the practice of the priests themselves (Numbers 28:9-19), and the tenor of Scripture (Hosea 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 (Matthew 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 (Mark 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 (**Mark 3:7-12; Matthew 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 Luke 6:12-16, and parallels). SEE APOSTLE. Then, descending to a partial plain, he cured the diseased among the assembled multitude Luke 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 (**Matthew 5:1-12; Luke 6:24-26; Matthew 5:17-24, 27-30, 33-48; 6:1-8, 16-18; 7:1-5, 12, 15-18, 20, 21, 24-27; 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 (**Luke 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 (**Luke 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 Isaiah 61:1; 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 (***Luke 7:18-35; ***Matthew 11:20, 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 (**Luke 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 (**Luke 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 Mark 3:19-21; Matthew 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 (**Luke 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 (Matthew 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 (**Luke

11:37-42, 44-46, 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 Luke 12:1, 6, 7, 13-31, 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 Luke 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 (Matthew 13:1-9, 24-30; Mark 4:26-29; Matthew 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 (***Matthew 13:10, 11, 13-23; 5, 14-16; 6:22, 23; 10:26, 27; 13:12, 36-43, 47-50, 44-46, 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 (4088) Matthew 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 (Matthew 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 (***Mark 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 Matthew 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 (Matthew 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 (Mark 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 (Matthew 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 (***Mark 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 (**Matthew 9:35-38; 10:1, 5-14, 40-42; 11:1; Mark 6:12, 13; and parallels). Upon their return, Jesus, being apprized of the execution of John the Baptist by Herod Mark 6:21-29; probably March, A.D. 28), and of the tetrarch's views of himself (**Mark 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 (and Mark 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 (**John 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 Matthew 14:22-36, and parallels), the populace whom he had left on the eastern shore meanwhile missing him, returned by boats to Capernaum (402) John 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 (**D) John 6:25-71; prob. Saturday, March 27, A.D. 28).

Picture for Jesus Christ 5

Picture for Jesus Christ 6

4. Third more public Year. — Avoiding the malicious plots of the hierarchy at Jerusalem by remaining at Capernaum during the Passover (John 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 (**Mark 7:1-16; **Matthew 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 (Matthew 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 (***Mark 7:31-37; ***Matthew 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 (Matthew 16:1-3; 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* (**Matthew 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 (4002)Mark 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 (Matthew 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 Malachi 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 Matthew 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 (***Mark 9:14-28, and parallels), which would have rendered them competent to any requisite miracle Luke 17:5, 6, and parallel) if coupled with devout humility (Mark 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 (Mark 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 (**Matthew 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 (***Mark 9:33-40, 42, 49, 50; ***Matthew 18:10, 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 (**Luke 10:1-3; **Matthew 7:6; 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 (***John 7:2-10), experiencing on the way the inhospitality of the Samaritans with a patience that rebuked the indignation of one of his disciples (***Luke 9:51-56), and receiving the grateful acknowledgments of a single Samaritan among ten lepers whom he cured (***Luke 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 (**Matthew 11:28-30), but deterred by the specious objections of the hierarchy (John 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 (***John 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 (John 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 (**Luke 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 Control Deuteronomy 6:5; CERUS Leviticus 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 (***Luke 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 (**Luke 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 (**Luke 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; 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 (***John 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 (John 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 (***John 11:47-53). Withdrawing in consequence to the city of Ephron (John 11:54), and afterwards to Perea, Jesus continued his teaching and miracles to crowds that gathered about him (Mark 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 (**Luke 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 (**Luke 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 (**Luke 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 Luke 14:1-15; Matthew 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 (Luke 15:25, 26, and parallel), under various figures (Luke 14:28-33); while he corrected the jealousy of the Jewish sectaries at his intercourse with the lower classes (**Luke 15:1, 2), 19:10, and parallel), under the parables of stray sheep (**Luke 15:3-7, and parallel), the lost piece of money, and the prodigal son (**Luke 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 (*Luke 16:1-12), showing the incompatibility of worldliness with devotion (Luke 16:13, and parallel); and the self sufficiency of the Pharisees he rebuked in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (*Luke 16:14, 15, 19-31), declaring to them that the kingdom of the Messiah had already come unobserved (Luke 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 selfrighteous Pharisee (**Luke 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 (4008 Matthew 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 (4003) Mark 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 (4007 Mark 10:17-29; 4008 Matthew 19:28, 29; 4270 Luke 17:710; 4000 Matthew 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 (Mark 10:32-34); but they so little understood him (Luke 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 (Matthew 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 (**Mark 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 (**Luke 19:2-9), who took occasion to illustrate the duty of fidelity in improving religious privileges by the parable of the "talents" or "pounds" (***Luke 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 (**II55*John 11:55-57; 12:1-11; and parallels).

Picture for Jesus Christ 7

Picture for Jesus Christ 8

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 (***Matthew 21:19; ***John 12:16, 17, 19; ****Luke 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 (Matthew 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 (Matthew 21:18, 19; Luke 21:37,38; 19:47,48; Matthew 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 Matthew 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 (**Matthew 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 (Matthew 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 (Mark 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 ex, 1) he could still be David's Lord? which so embarrassed his enemies that they desisted from this mode of attack (Matthew 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 (Matthew 23:1-12, 14-21, 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 (**Mark 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 (**Dohn 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 (Matthew 24:1-8; 10:17-20, 34-36; 24:9, 10; 10:28; 24:13-37; Luke 21:34-36; Matthew 24:3, 44; Luke 12:41, 42; Mark 13:31, 34; Matthew 24:45-51; Matthew 24:47, 48; Matthew 24:42; 25:1-12; Luke 12:35-38; Matthew 25:13, 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 (Matthew 26:1-5,14-16, and parallels).

Picture for Jesus Christ 9

Picture for Jesus Christ 10

The same day Jesus sent two of his disciples into the city, with directions where to prepare the Passover meal (Luke 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 (**Luke 22:14-17, 24; **TO) John 13:1-15; **Luke 22:25-30; John 13:17-19, 21, 22; Matthew 26:22-24; John 13:23-26; Matthew 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 (***John 13:27-33, 36-38; Matthew 26:31-33; Luke 22:31-38; and parallels); then, closing the meal by instituting the Eucharist (q.v.) (Matthew 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 (John 14:1-15, 17; 13:34, 35; 15:18-17, 26), he retired with them to the Mount of Olives (**BND*John 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 (Matthew 26:36-50; John 18:4-9; Luke 22:49; Matthew 26:51-56; Mark 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 (John 18:13-16, 18, 17, 25, 19-23, 26, 27; Luke 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 John 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 (**Matthew 26:57, 59-63; Luke 22:67-71, 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 (4888) John 18:28-38; 41712 Matthew 27:12-14; 4270 Luke 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 (**Euke 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 (**Luke 23:13-16; Matthew 15:17-19, 16, 20-30; John 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 (Matthew 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 Psalm 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 (Matthew 27:31, 32; Luke 23:27-31; Mark 15:22, 23, 25, 27, 28; Luke 23:34; John 19: 19-24; Matthew 27:36, 39-43; Luke 23:36, 37, 39. 43; John 19:25-27; Matthew 27:45-47, 49; 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 (John 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 (Mark 15:42-44; John 19:38-42; Luke 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 (Matthew 27:62-66). The women, meanwhile, prepared additional embalming materials in the evening for the body of Jesus (**Mark 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 (Matthew 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 (Mark 21:2-4; *****John 20:2; *****Luke 24:3-8; *****Matthew 28:7-10; *****Luke 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 (Matthew 33:11-15). 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 (John 20:11-18; Mark 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 (Luke 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 (**Luke 24:36-49; **TDD John 20:21; **IDD Mark 16:15-18; **John 10:4, 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 (John 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 (Matthew 28:16; John 21:1-23). Soon afterwards (probably Thursday. March 31, A.D. 29) he appeared to some five hundred of his disciples (4056) 1 Corinthians 15:6) at an appointed meeting on a mountain in Galilee, where he commissioned his apostles afresh to their work Matthew 28:16-20). Next he appeared to James (Corinthians 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 (***Acts 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. 1861), 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 (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' 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.

SEE JESUITS.

Je'ther

(Heb. *Ye'ther*, rty, *surplus*), the name of six men, and perhaps also of a place.

- 1. (Sept. Ἰεθέρ) A son of Jada and great-grandson of Jerahmeel, of the family of Judah; he had a brother Jonathan, but no children (TEP) Chronicles 2:32). B.C. considerably post 1856.
- **2.** (Sept. Ἰοθόρ, Vulg. *Jethro*, Auth. Vers. "Jethro.") The father-in-law of Moses (**DHS*Exodus 4:18, first clause), elsewhere (last clause of the same verse) called JETHRO *SEE JETHRO* (q.v.).
- 3. (Sept. Ἰεθέρ) 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 (συτ) Chronicles 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. Ἰεθερ) 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 (στα) Judges 8:20). B.C. 1362. According to στα Judges 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. Τέθερ, Τεθέρ) The father of Amasa, David's general (ΔΙΩΣ) Kings 2:5, 32; Thronicles 2:17); elsewhere (Thronicles 2:17); elsewhere (Thronicles 2:17) ITHRA SEE ITHRA (q.v.). He is described in Chronicles 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 Thronicles 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, hakr[b (= yd tyb) 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 Ἰεθάρσης (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. Ἰεθέρ v.r. Ἰεθήρ) An Asherite (head of a warrior family numbering 26,000) whose three sons are named in ⁴⁰⁰⁸ 1 Chronicles 7:38; possibly the same with ITHRAN of the preceding verse.
- 7. Whether the *Ithrites* (yrty, Sept. Εθιραῖος, Ἰεθρί, Ἰεθερί, Τεθρίτης, Vulg. *Jethrites, Jethroeus*, etc.) Ira and Gareb, mentioned in 23:38, etc., were natives of an otherwise unknown place called Jether, or of Jathir, ryty, one of David's places of refuge (30:27), or descendants of one Jether the least probable suggestion cannot now be determined. *SEE ITHRITE*.

Je'theth

(Heb. Yetheth', ttp] prob. a peg, or fig. a prince; Sept. Ἰεθέθ and Ἰεθέρ, the last apparently from falsely reading rty; Vulg. Jetheth), the third named of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO**Genesis 36:40; **OBEO**CENTION** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** Genesis 36:40; **OBEO** CENTION** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** Genesis 36:40; **OBEO** CENTION** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** Genesis 36:40; **OBEO** CENTION** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** Genesis 36:40; **OBEO** CENTION** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** Genesis 36:40; **OBEO** CENTION** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** Genesis 36:40; **OBEO** Genesis 36:40; **OBEO** CENTION** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** Genesis 36:40; **OBEO** CENTION** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** Genesis 36:40; **OBEO** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** Genesis 36:40; **OBEO** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** Genesis 36:40; **OBEO** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** Genesis 36:40; **OBEO** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** Genesis 36:40; **OBEO** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** Genesis 36:40; **OBEO** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** The control of the petty Edomitish sheiks in Mount Seir (**OBEO** The control of

Jeth'lah

(Heb. Yithlah', hl tyzuspended, i.e. lofty; Sept. Ἰεθλά v.r. Σιλαθά, Vulg. Jethela), a city on the borders of the tribe of Dan, mentioned between Ajalon and Elon (Δ692) Joshua 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.

Jeith'ro

(Heb. Yithro', /rtyæ.q. ^/rtyæxcellence or gain, as often in Eccles.; occurs in ^(MRI)Exodus 3:1; 4:18; 18:1, 2, 5, 6, 9,10, 12; Sept. Ἰοθόρ) or JETHER (rty, abundance, as often; occurs with reference to this person, ^(MRI)Exodus 4:18, where it is Anglicized "Jethro" in the Auth. Vers., though

in the Heb.-Samuel text and Samuel version the reading is wrty, 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. Ἰοθόρ), a "priest or prince (for the word ˆh៥ carries 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 (**PSID**Exodus 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 `t] owhich, in Exodus 3:1; Numbers 10:29; Unders 4:11, is translated father-inlaw, and in Genesis 19:14, son-in-law, is a term of indeterminate signification, denoting simply relationship by marriage; and besides, the transaction which in one place (*Exodus 18:27) is related of Jethro, seems to be in another related of Hobab (**Numbers 10:28). Hence some have concluded that, as forty years had elapsed since Moses' connection with this family was formed, his father-in-law (**Exodus 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 Numbers 10:29; Tudges 4:11; Jethro in Exodus 3:1; and in Judges 1:16, Keni (ynge) ewhich there, as well as in 4:11, is rendered 'the Kenite')" (Kitto). Against this explanation, however, there lies this serious objection, that in Numbers 10:29 Hobab is expressly called the son of Raguel (or Reuel), who in Exodus 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" Exodus 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 b wrty, "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-inlaw (referring $\hat{t} \dot{e} \dot{o}$ n Numbers 10:29 to Raguel, and in Judges 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 (Ιοθόρ, i.e. Jethro) for a surname" (Ιεθεγλαίος ην ἐπίκλημα τῷ Pαγοοήλ). "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 (rytwh) good deeds, or because 'he added a Parasha to the Torah;' Cheber (rbj), because he was a friend of the Lord; Chobeb (bbj), because he was beloved by the Lord, or because 'he loved the Torah;' Reuel, because he was a companion ([r) to the Lord; Petuel, because he freed himself (rfp) 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 (w) 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 (**Exodus 4:24-26*): indeed, it is even possible that Zipporah had afterwards been subjected to a kind of divorce (**Exodus 18:2, hyj **Lv**) con 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 (Exodus 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 Numbers 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 Judges 1:16: 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 (Genesis 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 Exodus 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)"

Je'tur

(Heb. Yeturm', rWfy] prob. i.q. rWf, an *inclosure*, i.e. nomadic camp; Sept. Ἰετούρ, Ἰεττούρ, but Ἰτουραῖοι in ⁽¹⁵⁰⁾1 Chronicles 5:19), one of the twelve sons of Ishmael (⁽¹²⁵⁾Genesis 25:15; ⁽¹³³⁾1 Chronicles 1:31). B.C. post 2063. His name stands also for his descendants, the *Ituroeans* (⁽¹⁵⁰⁾1 Chronicles 5:19), a people living east of the northern Jordan (⁽¹⁶⁰⁾Luke 3:1), where he appears to have settled. *SEE ITURAEA*.

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*.

Jeu'el

(Heb. Yeuel', la [y]] snatched away by God, i.e. protected; Sept. Ἰεήλ, Vutg. Jehuel), a descendant of Zerah, who, with his kindred to the number of 690, resided in Jerusalem after the captivity (1896). Chronicles 9:6). B.C. 536. This name is also everywhere written in the text for lapper SEE JEIEL. In the Apocrypha (1 Esdr. 8:39) it stands for the Heb. Jeuel (1898) Ezra 8:13) as the name of one of the Bene-Adonikam who returned to Jerusalem after the captivity.

Je'ush

(Hebrew Yeush', VW[y] assembler; written Vy[y] Yeish', in the text of Genesis 36:5, 14; (3070) 1 Chronicles 7:10), the name of several men.

- 1. (Sept. Ἰεούς, but Ἰεούλ, in ΔΙΙΙΕ΄ Chronicles 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 (ΔΙΙΙΕ΄ Genesis 36:5, 14, 18; I Chronicles 1:35). B.C. post 1964.
- **2.** (Sept. Ἰεώς v.r. Ἰαούς, Vulg. *Jehus*.) The first named of the sons of Bilhan, grandson of Benjamin (****) Chronicles 7:10). B.C. considerably post 1856.
- 3. (Sept. $1\omega\alpha\zeta$, 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 (1230-1 Chronicles 23:10, 11). B.C. 1014.
- **4.** (Sept. Ἰεούς, Vulg. *Jehus*.) One of the three sons of Rehoboam, apparently by Abihail, his second wife (વાક 2 Chronicles 11:19). B.C. post 973.

5. (Sept. Ἰδιάς v.r. Ἰάς, Vulg. *Jehus*, A. Vers. "Jehush.") The second son of Eshek, brother of Azel, of the descendants of Saul (****) 1 Chronicles 8:39). B.C. cir. 588.

Je'uz

(Heb. Yeuts', /W[y] counsellor, q.d. εὔβουλος; Sept. Ἰεούς v.r. Ἰεβούς, Vulg. Jehus), a chief Benjamite, one of the sons apparently of Shaharaim, born of his wife Hodesh or Baara in the land of Mloab (⁴™¹ Chronicles 8:10). B.C. perh. cir. 1618.

Jew

(*Heb. Yehudi*, yollay]plur. µyollay, sometimes µyYollay] The Esther 4:7; 8:1, 7,13; 9:15, 18 text; femn. hydbey] (1088) 1 Chronicles 4:18; Chald. in plur. emphat. yYelWhy] TREDaniel 3:8; Ezra 4:12; 5:1, 5; adv. tyclWhy, Judaici, in the Jews' language, Kings 18:26; Nehemiah 13:24; Sept. and N.T. Ἰουδαῖος, hence verb Ἰουδαΐζω, to Judaize, Galatians 2:14; adj. Ἰουδαικός, Jewish; Titus 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 (** Kings 16:6; 25:5; ** Jeremiah 32:12; 38:19; 40:11; 41:3; 44:1; 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 Esther 3:6, 9; Daniel 3:8, 12); and this loose application of the name was preserved after the restoration to Palestine (**Haggai 1:14; 2:2; Ezra 4:12; 5:1, 5; Mehemiah 1:2; 2:16; 5:1, 8, 17), when it came to denote not only every descendant of Abraham in the largest possible sense (2 Macc. 9:17; *** John 4:9; *** Acts 18:2, 24, etc.), especially in opposition to foreigners ("Jews and Greeks," Acts 14:1; 18:4; 19:10; 1 Corinthians 1:23, 24), but even proselytes who had no blood-relation to the Hebrews (Acts 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 (**John 1:19; 5, 15, 16; 7:1, 11, 13; 9:22; 18:12,14, etc.; comp. **Acts 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 (**Genesis 11:15; **Exodus 2:7; 3:18; 5:3; 7:16; 9:13; Jonah 1:9; comp. 4 Macc. 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, Genesis 39:14; 41:12; Exodus 1:16; the Philistines, ⁴⁹⁰⁰ 1 Samuel 4:6, 9; 13:19; 29:3; the Assyrians, Judith 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 Macc. 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. Acts 9:29; Eusebius 3, 24), in distinction from the Hellenists (**Acts 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 (**D2 Corinthians 11:22; **Philippians 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 µ/qm; I kB]µyr Ball Mhi VaσSherira 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. Benhithrabba), 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 guit 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 — "vielding 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
Austria1,124,000	Sweden 1000
Great Britain 40,000	Greece 500
France 80,000	European Turkey 70,000
European Russia2,277,000	Asiatic Turkey and
Italy 2,200	Syria 52,000
Portugal3,000	Morocco and North
Switzerland4,2001	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.

While the tradition obtained in the Christian Church that the "disciple whom Jesus loved" should not die (**DD**John 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

is the representative in the A.V. of the following terms in the original: UZN, (ne'zem,, a ring), a nose-ring (Proverbs 11:22; Reaiah 3:21; Ezekiel 16:12; everywhere else rendered "earring," Genesis 24:22, 30, 47; see Jerome on Ezekiel ad loc.; Hartmann's Hebraerin, 2, 166; 3, 205), or an earring (Genesis 35:4; Exodus 32:2, 3); elsewhere without specifying the part of the person on which it was worn (Judges 8:24-26; Exodus 35:32; Job 42, 51; Proverbs 25:12; Hosea 2:15). yl (chali', so called as being polished), a necklace or trinket Song of Solomon 7:1; "ornament," Proverbs 25:12), and hyll, (chelyah', fern. of precedo), a necklace or female ornament (***Hosea 2:13). yl ke(keli', an implement or vessel of any kind), an article of silver ware or other precious material (**Genesis 1:24:53; **Exodus 3:22; 11:2; 12:35; Onn Numbers 26:50, 51; Onn 1 Samuel 6:8, 15; Onn 28:17; Proverbs 20:15), or ally elegant *trappings* or piece of finery in dress (Isaiah. 61:10; Ezekiel 16:7, 39; 23:16), elsewhere rendered "vessel," etc., hLgs & egullah', property), wealth or treasure (Malachi 3:17; elsewhere usually "peculiar treasure," Exodus 19:5; Psalm 135:4. etc.). SEE DRESS: SEE PRECIOUS STONE: etc.

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

(Ἰουδαία), a woman of Hebrew birth, without distinction of tribe (Δετε 16:1; 24:24). It is applied in the former passage to Eunice, the mother of Timothy, who was unquestionably of Hebrew origin (comp. Timothy

3:15), and in the latter to Drusilla, the wife of Felix and daughter of Herod Agrippa I. — Smith. *SEE JEW*.

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.

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

(Ἰουδαϊκός), of or belonging to Jews: an epithet applied to the Rabbinical legends against which the apostle Paul warns his younger brother (6014 Titus 1:14). SEE JEW.

Jewish Christians.

SEE JUDAIZERS.

Jew'ry

(dWhy] Yehud', Chald., ΔΙΒΙ Daniel 5:13, last clause; "Judaea" in ΔΙΒΙ Ezra 5:8; elsewhere "Judah;" Ἰουδαῖα, ΔΙΒΙ Luke 23:5; ΔΙΒΙ John 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 (1 Esdr. 1:32; 2:4; 4:49; 5, 7, 8, 57; 6:1; 8:81; 9:3; Bel 33; 2 Macc. 10:24).

Jews.

SEE JEW.

Jezani'ah

(24108-Jeremiah 40:8; 42:1). SEE JAAZANIAH, 4.

Jez'ebel

(Hebrew *lze'bel*, | bzaaaot-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. Ἰεζάβελ; N.T. Ἰεζαβήλ, «Σ Revelation 2:20; Joseph. Ιαζεβέλις, 9: Ant. 9, 6, 4; Vul. Jezabel), the consort of Ahab, king of Israel (Kings 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 (Kings 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 (Kings 16:31; 18:4, 13, 19; 21:5-25; Tkings 9:7, 22, 30-37). B.C. 883.

The name of Jezebel appears anciently (as in modern times) to have become proverbial for a wicked termagant (comp. Kings 9:22), and in this sense it is probably used in Revelation 2:20, where, instead of "that

woman Jezebel" (τὴν γυναίκα Ἰεζαβήλ), many editors prefer the reading "thy wife Jezebel" (τὴν γυναῖκὰ σου Ἰεζάβελ), 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*.

Jeze'lus

(Ἰέζηλος), 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" (1 Esdr. 8:32); evidently the JAHAZIEL of **Ezra 8:5.
- **2.** (Vulg. *Jehelus*.) The father of Abadias, of "the sons of Joab" (1 Esdr. 8:35); evidently the JEHIEL of Ezra 8:9.

Je'zer

(Heb. Ye'tser, Γχy formation; Sept. Ἰσσάαρ, Ἰέσερ, but in Chronicles Σααρ v.r. Åσήρ), the third named of the four sons of Naphtali (Genesis 46:24; Numbers 26:49; Thronicles 7:13), and progenitor of the family of JEZERITES (Heb. Yitsri', yr Legal eptuag. Ἰεσερί, Numbers 26:49; SEE IZRI). B.C. 1856.

Je'zerite

Numbers 26:49). SEE JEZER.

Jezi'ah

(Heb. Yizziyah', hYzyæfor HyAyzyæprinkled by Jehovah; or perhaps to be written hyzyæYizyah', for HyAyzyæassembled by Jehovah, SEE JEZIEL; Sept. Åζία, Vulgate Jezia), an Israelite, one of the "sons" of Parosh, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (**SE*Ezra 10:25). B.C. 459.

Je'ziël

[some $Jezi'\ddot{e}l$] (Heb. Yeziul', I ayzzy as in the margin, assembled by God; Sept. $A\zeta\iota\dot{\eta}\lambda$ v.r. $I\omega\dot{\eta}\lambda$, etc.; Vulg. Jaziel), a. "son" of Azmaveth, who, with his brother, was one of the Benjamite archers that reinforced David at Ziklag (***IR**) Chronicles 12:3). B.C. 1055.

Jezirah

(hryxperpseSepher 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 (hmk] ; t/bytak or, in plainer terms, of the thirty-two attributes of the divine mind (1 kc) 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 (t/ryp& 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 c8ma), 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 t8rpkdgb), 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*.

Jezli'ah

(Heb. Yizliah', hayl zpeperh. drawn out, i.e. preserved; Sept. Ἰεζλία v.r. Ἰεζλίας, Vulg. Jezlia), one of the "sons" of Elpaal, and apparently a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (*** 1 Chronicles 8:18). B.C. prob. cir. 588.

Jezo'är

[some Jez'oär] (Chronicles 4:7). SEE ZOAR.

Jezrahi'ah

Nehemiah 12:42). SEE IZRAHIAH, 2.

Jez'reël

(Heb. Yizreel, I a [τ]] once I a [τ] ε Κίης 9:10; sown by God; Sept. Ἰεζραήλ, but sometimes Ἰεζρεήλ, Ἰεζριήλ, Ἰεζράελ, or Ἰεζραέλ; Josephus Ἰεσράηλα, Ant. 8, 13, 6; Ἰεσράελα, Ant. 9, 6, 4), the name of two places and of several men.

1. A town in the tribe of Issachar (Joshua 19:18), where the kings of Israel had a palace (Samuel 2:8 sq.), and where the court often resided (Kings 18:45; 21:1; Kings 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 (*** Kings 16:33; *** Kings 10:11). The palace of Ahab (<1200-1 Kings 21:1; 18:46), probably containing his 'ivory house' (Kings 22:39), was on the eastern side of the city, forming part of the city wall (comp. | Kings 21:1; | Kings 9:25, 30, 33). The seraglio, in which Jezebel lived, was on the city wall, and had a high window facing eastward (Kings 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 (Kings 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 (** 2 Kings 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 (Samuel 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 (** 2 Kings 9:25). SEE JEZEBEL. A little further east, but adjacent to the royal domain (Kings 21:1), was a smooth tract of land cleared out of the uneven valley (Kings 9:25), which belonged to Naboth, a citizen of Jezreel (Kings 9:25), by a hereditary right (Kings 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 (Kings 21:2). Here Elijah met Ahab (Kings 21:17)" (Smith). Here was the vineyard of Naboth, which Ahab coveted to enlarge the palace grounds (*** Kings 18:45, 46; *** 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 2 Kings 9:14-37; 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 (**Hosea 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 (Kings 9:17) to Beisan (Bethshean), and on the west quite across the great plain to the mountains of Carmel (Kings 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*', yl ae[ety] Kings 21:1, 4, 6, 7, 15, 16; Lings 2:21, 25).

Jezerel, Blood Of

(µymæ, i.e. *bloodshed*), put for the murders perpetrated by Ahab and Jehu at this place (****Hosea 1:4). See below.

Jezreel, Day Of

(μ /y, i.e. *period*), put for the predicted time of the execution of vengeance for the atrocities there committed (***Hosea 1:5). See 3, below.

Jezreel, Ditch Of

(I j eSeptuag. πρλτείχισμα), was simply the fortification or entrenchments surrounding the city, outside of which Naboth was executed (ΔΙΣΣΣΣΑ Kings 21:23; comp. ver. 13). SEE TRENCH.

Jezreel, Fountain Of

('y always a perennial natural spring), a place where Saul encamped before the fatal battle of Gilboa (Samuel 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 (Judges 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 ("Judges 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 bloodstained water (Sept.). But the natural inference from the present text of

1 Kings 22:38 makes the scene of these events to be the pool of Samaria. *SEE NABOTH*.

Jezreel, Portion Of

(ql j); 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 (ΔΣΘΟ 2 Kings 9:10, 21, 36, 37; comp. ver. 25, 26). Naboth was stoned to death outside the city of Jezreel (ΔΣΘΟ 1 Kings 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 (ΔΣΘΟ 1 Kings 22:35, 38); hence Schwarz (*Palest*. p. 165, note) proposes to render the expression μ/qmβæ τναβ' in the place where" (occurring in the sentence of retaliation, ΔΣΘΟ 1 Kings 21:19), as signifying "in punishment for that;" but this construction is not in accordance with the Heb. idiom (see Gesenius' *Lex.* s.v. μ/qm), and the other incidents furnish a sufficiently exact fulfilment of the prediction (see Clarke's *Comment*. ad loc.).

Jezreel, Tower Of

(I DgmaSept. $\pi \dot{\nu} \rho \gamma o \zeta$), was one of the turrets or bastions guarding the entrance to the city, and sentinelled as usual by a watchman (**28772 Kings 9:17). See above.

Jezreel, Valley Of

(qm[e⁻⁶⁶⁷⁶Joshua 17:16; Judges 6, 33; Auto-Hosea 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" (-6676) Joshua 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 (-6678) Joshua 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 (Grand Judges 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" (Samuel 29:1-11). The Israelites were defeated, and Saul and Jonathan, with the flower of their troops, fell on the heights of Gilboa (Samuel 31:1-6). *SEE SAUL*.

Picture for Jezreel

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, 1 Macc. 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 Ἐσδρηλώμ, Judith 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* (4822) Chronicles 35:22; Zechariah 12:11), and the *Armageddon* of the Apocalypse (***Revelation 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 (Deuteronomy 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 (Kings 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 (22) Kings 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 (Judith 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 (**Joshua 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 (**** 1 Samuel 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 (tyl according to the associated names)
- 3. A descendant of Judah (Chronicles 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 (Per Ver. 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" (μfy[eybachLay] 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 (**Hosea 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 (2:2). He is afterwards made, together with his brother Lo-ammi and his sister Lo-ruhama (2006-1:6, 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 Hosea 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 ver. 21), shall yield anew her produce to (the tillers of) Jezreel. The prophet then (ver. 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 Isaiah 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' Zechariah 10:9). 'Ye shall be tilled and *sown*, and I will multiply men upon you' (Ezekiel 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' Jeremiah 31:27). Hence the consecration of the image of 'sowing,' as it appears in the N.T. (Matthew 12:2)"

Jez'reëlite

(41201) 1 Kings 21:1, 4, 6, 7, 15, 16; 41392) 2 Kings 9:21, 25), an inhabitant of JEZREEL *SEE JEZREEL* (q.v.), in Issachar.

Jez'reëlitess

(Samuel 27:3; 30:5; Samuel 2:2; Chronicles 3:1), a woman of JEZREEL SEE JEZREEL (q.v.), in Judah.

Jib'sam

(Hebrew Yibsamn', μCb) pleasant; Sept. Ἰεβασάμ v.r. Ἰεμασάν), one of the "sons" of Tola, the son of Issachar, a valiant chief, apparently of the time of David ("TOP) Chronicles 7:2). B.C. cir. 1017.

Jid'laph

(Hebrew *Yidlaph*', ãl clyæearful; Sept. Ἰελδάφ), the seventh named of the eight sons of Nahor (Abraham's brother) by Micah (¹²⁷²Genesis 22:22). B.C. cir. 2040.

```
Jim'na

(***Numbers 26:44),

Jim'nah

(****Genesis 46:17),

Jim'nite

(***Numbers 16:44). SEE IMNA.

Jiph'tah
```

(Heb. *Yiphtach*', **j** Tp) at he same name as *Jephthah*; Sept. Te $\phi\delta\alpha$), a town in the "lowland" district of Judah, mentioned between Ashan and Ashmah ("Dish Joshua 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).

Jiph'thah-el

(Heb. Yiphtach'-el, | aaj Τρ ϕ pening of God; Sept. [Γαί] Ἰεφθαήλ), a valley at the intersection of the line between Asher and Naphtali with the northern boundary of Zebulon (**Joshua 19:14, 27). Dr. Robinson, with great probability, suggests (new ed. of Researches, 3, 106, 107) that the name is represented by that of *Jotapata* (Ἰωτάπατα), 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* (attpwg) 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 Joshua 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 (Chronicles 6:77). The title (ay) ravine, and not | j | iii | 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 (**Toshua 19:14), "And the *outgoings* thereof are in the valley of Jiphthah-el" (comp. **Deuteronomy 33:18, "And of Zebulon he said, Rejoice, Zebulon, in thy *goings out*").

Jireh.

SEE JEHOVAH-JIREH.

Jizchaki.

SEE RASHI; SEE SAKTAR.

Jo'äb

(Heb. *Yoäb*', ba/y, *Jehovah* is his *father*; Sept. Ἰωάβ, but Ἰωβάβ in Thronicles 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 (*** 1 Chronicles 4:14). B.C. post. 1567.
- **2.** One of the three sons of Zeruiah, the sister of David (4086 2 Samuel 8:16; 20:13), and "captain of the host" (generalissimo of the army) during nearly the whole of David's reign (4083 2 Samuel 2:13; 10:7; 11:1; 4083 1 Kings 11:15; 4083 2 Samuel 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 (1 1 $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \beta \sigma \zeta$), indeed, gives (1 2, 1,3) the father's name as 1 3 Sarouiah (1 2 $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha}$). 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 (4022 2 Samuel 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 (Samuel 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 (4002) Samuel 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 (Samuel 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 (Samuel 3:26, 27); and that Joab placed his murderous act on the footing of vengeance for his brother's blood is plainly stated in 2 Samuel 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" 2 Samuel 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 (2 Samuel 5, 6-10). He had a chief armor bearer of his own, Naharai, a Beerothite (2 Samuel 23:37; Chronicles 11:39), and ten attendants to carry his equipment and baggage (1085 2 Samuel 18:15). He had the charge, formerly belonging to the king or judge, of giving the signal by trumpet for advance or retreat (Samuel 18:16). He was called by the almost regal title of "lord" (Samuel 11:11), "the prince of the king's army" (

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 (12:02) Samuel 14:30), in the "wilderness" (12:02) Kings 2:34), probably on the northeast of Jerusalem (compare 13:18) Samuel 13:18; 13:18 Joshua 8:15, 20), near an ancient sanctuary, called from its nomadic village "Baalhazor" (12:02) Samuel 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* (12:03) Chronicles 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 ("Valley of salt," and celebrated by a triumphal monument ("Valley of salt," and 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 ("IIII5") Kings 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 (ib. 11:21, 22).
- (c) The third was against the Ammonites. They were again left to Joab (2. Samuel 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 (2 Samuel 11:1, 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 (2025-2 Samuel 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 (**OIII*2 Samuel 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 (Samuel 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 (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 (1993) Samuel 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 (Samuel 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 (4026) Samuel 23:6, 7), and now he recalled to Solomon's recollection the two murders of Abner and Amasa (Kings 2:5; 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 (Kings 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 mostaccomplished warriors and unscrupulous men that Israel ever produced. His corpse was removed to his domain in the wilderness of Judah, and buried there (Kings 2:5, 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 (Samuel 3:39) and of Solomon (Kings 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 (1 Esdr. 8:35), whose descendants, together with those of Jeshua, returned from the exile to the number of 2812 or 2818 (**Ezra 2:6; *Nehemiah 7:11), besides 218 males subsequently under the leadership of one Obadiah (**Ezra 8:9). B.C. ante 536.

Jo'ächaz

(Ἰωάχαζ v.r. Ἰώχαζ and Ἰεχονίας), a Graecized form (I Esdr. 1, 34) of the name of king JEHOHAZ *SEE JEHOHAZ* (q.v.).

Jo'ächim

(Ἰωακείμ), 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*.

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).

Joachim I And II.

SEE REFORMATION (GERMAN).

Joachimites.

SEE JOACHIM OF FLORIS.

Jo'äcim (Ἰωακίμ), 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 (1 Esdr. 1:43).
- **3.** A son of Zerubbabel, who returned to Jerusalem after the exile (1 Esdr. 5: 5), apparently a mistake for Zerubbabel himself.
- 4. "The high priest which was in Jerusalem" (Judith 4:6, 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 Ἰσραήλ, 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 Chronicles 6 (compare Josephus, Ant. 10, 8, 6); and it is a mere arbitrary conjecture to suppose that Eliakim, mentioned in Still less can be said for the identification of Joacim with Hilkiah (Σίια Κίας). 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.

Joida'nus

(Ἰωαδάνος, Vulg. Joadeus), one of the priests, "sons of Jesus, the son of Josedec, and his brethren," who had married foreign wives after the exile (1 Esdr. 9:19); apparently the same as GEDALIAH in the corresponding Hebrew text (**Ezra 10:18) by a corruption (see Burrington, Genealogies, 1, 167).

Jo'äh

(Heb. Yoäch', j a/y, Jehovah is his brother, i.e. helper), the name of four men.

- 1. (Sept. Ἰωαά v.r. ʿ Ἰωάθ, Vulg. *Joaha*.) The third son of Obed-edom (q.v.), appointed with his brethren to take charge of the sacred furniture (ব্যાપ) Chronicles 26:4). B.C. 1014.
- 2. (Sept. Ἰωάχ v.r. Ἰωάβ, Ἰωάς, Ἰωαά; but in ΔΟΟ 2 Chronicles first occurrence Ἰωά v.r. Ἰωδαάδ, second Ἰωαχά; Vulg. Joah.) A Levite of the family of Gershom, the son of Zimmah and father of Iddo (ΔΟΟ) 1 Chronicles 6:21); apparently the same elsewhere called ETHAN, and father of Adaiah (ver. 42). He is probably the same as the person who, with his son Eden, aided Hezekiah in his efforts at a religious reformation (ΔΟΟ) 2 Chronicles 29:12). B.C. 726.
- 3. (Sept. Ἰωάς, in Isaiah Ἰωάχ, Vulg. *Joahe*.) Son of Asaph and historiographer of king Hezekiah, who was one of the messengers that received the insulting message of Rabshakeh (**288*2 Kings 18:18, 26, 37; **2308*Isaiah 36:3, 11, 22). B.C. 712.
- **4.** (Sept. Ἰουάχ v.r. Ἰωάς, Vulg. *Joha*; Josephus Ἰωατής, *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 (4808) 2 Chronicles 34:8). B.C. 623.

Jo'ähaz

(Heb. *Yodaichaz*', zj a/y, a contracted form of the name JEHOAHAZ, for which it occurs in speaking of others of the same name; Sept. Ἰωάχαζ, Vulg. *Joachaz*), the father of Joah, which latter was historiographer in the reign of Josiah (**PORTION 2018). B.C. ante 623.

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 D'albret.

SEE HUGUENOTS; FRANCE.

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),

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.

Joai'nan

(Ἰωανάν v.r. Ἰωνάν), a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 9:1) of the name of JOHANAN *SEE JOHANAN* (q.v.), the son of Eliashib (**Ezra 10:6).

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.

Joän'na,

the name of a man (prop. *Joannas*) and also of a woman in the New Testament.

- 1. (Ἰωαννᾶς, probably. i.q. Ἰωάννης, JOHN.) The (great) grandson of Zerubbabel, in the lineage of Christ (ΔΙΕΡΣ Luke 3:27); probably the same called ARNAN in the Old Testament (ΔΙΕΡΣ Chronicles 3:21. See Strong's Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 16, 17). B.C. considerably post 536. SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.
- **2.** (Ἰωάννα, prob. femin. of Ἰωάννης, *John*.) The wife of Chuza, the steward of Herod Antipas, tetrarch of Galilee (ΔΝΒ Luke 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 (ΔΩΙΟ Luke 24:10). A.D. 27-29.

Joän'nan

(Ιωαννάν ν.r. Ιωάννης),

the eldest brother of Judas Maccabaeus (1 Macc. 2:2); elsewhere called JOHN *SEE JOHN* (q.v.).

Joannes.

SEE JOHN.

Jo'ärib

(Ἰωαρίβ v.r. Ἰωαρείμ), a Graecized form (1 Macc. 2:1) of the name of the priest JEHOIARIB (ΔΕΙΙ) (ΔΕΙΙ) (ΔΕΙΙ).

Jo'äsh

(Heb. *Yoäsh*', the name of several persons, written in two forms in the original.

- 1. (Va/y, a contracted form of JEHOASH; Septuag. Ἰωάς) The father of Gideon, buried in Ophrah where he had lived (ΦΠΟΙ) Judges 6:11, 29; 7:14; 8:13, 29, 32). Although himself probably an idolater, he ingeniously screened his son from the popular indignation in overthrowing the altar of Baal (ΦΠΟΙ) Judges 6:30, 31). B.C. 1362. SEE GIDEON.
- **2.** (Same form as preceding; Sept. Ἰωράς v.r. Ἰωάς) 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 (SIZIB-1 Chronicles 12:3). B.C. 1055.
- 3. (Same form as preceding; Sept. $I\omega\alpha\zeta$) One of the descendants of Shelah, son of Judah, mentioned among those who were in some way distinguished among the Moabites in early times ($^{\text{TOP}}$) Chronicles 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 (\mathbb{W}) 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. Ἰωάς) An eminent officer of king Ahab, to whose close custody the prophet Micaiah was remanded for denouncing the allied expedition against Ramoth-Gilead (ΔΙΖΣΣΕ) 1 Kings 22:26; ΔΙΚΣΣΕ Chronicles 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 ΔΙΣΣΕ Chronicles 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. 100 (3) King of Judah (3) Kings 11:2; 12:19, 20; 13:1, 10; 14:1, 3, 17, 23; (3) Chronicles 3:11; (4) Chronicles 22:11; 24:1 [(2) (2) (2) (2) (3) (
- **6.** (Same form as preceding; Sept. 100 King of Israel (*270) 2 Kings 13:9, 12, 13, 14, 25; 14:1, 23, 27; *42577 2 Chronicles 25:17, 18, 21, 23; *42577 4 Hosea 1:1; *40000 Amos 1:1). *SEE JEHOASH*, 2.

- 7. (V[/y, to whom *Jehovah hastens*, i.e. for aid; Sept. Ἰωάς.) One of the "sons" of Becher, son of Benjamin, a chieftain of his family (**** 1 Chronicles 7:8). B.C. prob. cir. 1017.
- **8.** (Same form as last; Septuag. Ἰωάς.) The person having charge of the royal stores of oil under David and Solomon (ΔΣΣΣ) Chronicles 27:28). B.C. 1014.

Jo'ätham

Matthew 1:19). SEE JOTHAM.

Joäzab'dus

(Ἰωάζαβδος v.r. Ἰώζαβδος), a Graecized form (1 Esdr. 9:48) of the name of JOZABAD *SEE JOZABAD* (q.v.), the Levite (ΔΙΚΙΣ Nehemiah 8:7).

Joäzar

(Ἰωάζαρος, Ἰώζαρος, 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*.

Job

the name of two persons, of different form in the original.

1. (b/Ya) yob', persecuted; Sept. and N.T. 1ώβ.) An Arabian patriarch and hero of the book that bears his name; mentioned elsewhere only in Ezek. 14:14, 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 (**No** Job 1:1-2, 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 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 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 (2, 11-31, 40). — 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 Pob 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. 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 (***MB**Job 4:6, 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 (ARBIT-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. 4 with ch. 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. 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" (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, 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 (SSSS) Job 13:18-28). Admitting his liability to such sins as are common to man, being unclean by birth (Job 13:26; 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 (verse 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 (verse 14), nor will he allow that the possible restoration or prosperity of his descendants at all meets the exigencies of his case (ver. 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 (verse 3-16), and by his rebellious struggles (ver. 25-27) against God deserves every calamity which can befall him (ver. 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 (ver. 5-14), and his losses to his former gains (ver. 15-19), and thus not only accounts for Job's present calamities, but menaces him with still greater evils (ver. 20-29).

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; 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 (yræBinawithout my flesh). should survive in spirit to witness this posthumous vindication, a pledge of which had already often been given him (₩ar; yniy [) 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 (ver. 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 (ver. 14, 19-22) — warns him, teaches him self-knowledge and humility (ver. 16, 17) — and prepares him (ver. 23) by the mediation of a spiritual interpreter (the angel Jehovah of Genesis) to implore and to obtain pardon (ver. 24), renewal of life (ver. 25), perfect access and restoration (ver. 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 (verse 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 (verse 9), when evil seems to get the upper hand, is owing merely to the fact that man prays in a proud and insolent spirit (ver. 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 (ver. 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 Store 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. Matthew 22:32); and this thought, in fact, constitutes the afflicted patriarch's ground of consolation and trust, especially in that sublime passage (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 (Psalm 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 (Matthew 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 (Luke 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 (**Dohn 5:14; **Dohn 5:20, 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 **Dohn 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 (***D**Job 1:22; 2:10; comp. 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 (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; 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 Psalm 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 (**Hebrews 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 (**Ezekiel 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 (***James 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 Genesis 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 byia; 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 4:19, and 33:6, to Moses' account of the creation of man in 5:14, to Deuteronomy 32:32; in 24:1, to Deuteronomy 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 3:14, which may also be said of the assertion that 4898 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, 9:26; the Nile grass, 8:12, the Nile horse (Behemoth) and the crocodile (Leviathan), 11:15; 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 Saiah 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 (***Ezekiel 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. **Planta Lamenta S:16, comp. **SIGN Job 16:13; **CHILD Lamenta Lamenta Lamenta S:7, 9, comp. **SIGN Job 19:8; **SIGN Job 16:13. **SIGN Lamenta S:19, comp. **SIGN Job 16:13. **
- **(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 Psalm 39:13, with Job 7:19; 14:6; 10:20, 21; 7:8, 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 "BDD Job 28 and the numerous similar didactic strains found in the writings of Solomon (comp. especially Proverbs 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 4897 19:17 and the statement that all Job's children had perished rests upon a misinterpretation of the words ynate and "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 ver. 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 ver. 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. 4838) 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), √₩rP€Ferrara, 1477, 4to; with various supercomments, Naples, 1486, 4to; and in Bomberg's Rabbinic Bibles), Arama, ryame 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), v₩rP@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.), ull r ti etc. (modern Greek in Heb. characters, Constantinople, 1576, 4to), Ibn-Jaish (Bar. ben-Is.), EWrB; r/qm; [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), fPylnæhéa (Venice, 1590,4to; also in Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible); Farissol (Abr.b.-Mard.), √₩rP€in the Rabbinic Bibles); Mord. b.-Jacob (of Cracow), v₩rP@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, qq@mltqi] (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, fPivinæde, (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, yDivitair vain 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, vaebqoyi tyBeF. 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, rbD; rvP (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, µYGr Ti(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, ulling Ti 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, ulign Teetc. (Offenb. 1807 [?], 8vo); Pareau, De immortalitate, etc. (Davent. 1807, 8vo); Polozk (Pinch. ben-Jeh.), t[blashn\Pa\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, Lyr la Batemberg, 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, uWGr Ti 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, ull rti 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); *Noves, *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's 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 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 (SELET-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 (**7:5); in the offensive breath, which drove away the kindness of attendants (19:17), in the restless nights, which were either sleepless or scared with frightful dreams (Job 7:13, 14; 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 `yhæ (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.

Job (2)

(bwy, Yob; if genuine, perh. returning, from bWy = bWa; Sept. Ἰασούβ. Vulg. Job.) The third-named of the four sons of Issachar (⁰⁴⁴³Genesis 46:13). elsewhere called JASHUB (⁰⁰²⁴Numbers 26:24; ⁰⁰⁰⁰1 Chronicles 7:1), for which this is probably an erroneous transcription.

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, col. 2.

Jo'bab

(Heb. *Yobab*', bb/y, probably dweller in the *desert*, from the Arabic; Sept. Ἰωβάβ, but in τον Ἰωβαβ, but in τον Γον Εὐῦ καὶ τὸν Ωράμ, v.r. simply Ἰωάβ), the name of several men.

- 1. The last-named of the sons of Joktan, and founder of a tribe in Arabia (^{ODD} Genesis 10:29; ^{ODD} 1 Chronicles 1:23), B.C. post 2414. Bochart compares (*Phaleg*, 2, 29) the *Jobaritoe* (**Iωβαρῖται**) 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 (**Genesis 36:33, 34; **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 (***ID**Joshua 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 (Chronicles 8:9), B.C. cir. 1612.
- **5.** One of the "sons" of Elpaal, a chief of Benjamin, at Jerusalem (Chronicles 8:18), B.C. probably cir. 588.

Joceline,

bishop OF BATH AND WELLS.

SEE JOHN (KING OF ENGLAND).

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*.

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,

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,

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.

SEE JOHN OF GISCHALA.

Joch'ebed

(Heb. Yoke'bed, dbk/y, Jehovah is her glory; Sept. Ιωχαβέδ or Ἰωχάβεδ, the wife of Amram, and mother of Miriam, Aaron, and Moses (ΔΙΕΝΟΝ Νυμβες 26:59). B.C. 1738. In ΔΙΕΝΟΝ 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 (ΔΙΕΝΟΣ Leviticus 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 Numbers 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 (***Exodus 6:16, 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 (***Exodus 2:1-10) are alluded to with commendation by the apostle (****Exodus 2:1-10) 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**.

Jo'da

(Ἰωδά), a corrupt form (1 Esdr. 5, 58) of the name of JUDAH SEE JUDAH (q. v), the Levite ($^{\text{CRID}}$ Ezra 3:9).

Jo'ëd

(Heb. *Yoed*', $d[\not ey]$, *Jehovah* is his *witness*; Sept. $I\omega\dot{\alpha}\delta$), son of Pedaiah, father of Meshullam, and grandfather of Sallu, which last was one of the Benjamites who resided in Jerusalem after the captivity (*Nehemiah 11:7). B.C. considerably ante 538.

Jo'ëd

(Heb. Yoël', $\mid a \not e y$, Jehovah is his God; Sept. and N.T. $\overleftarrow{lon}\lambda$), 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 (*** 1 Samuel 8:2). *SEE SAMUEL*. In *** 1 Chronicles 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 (*** 1 Chronicles 6:33; 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 (Chronicles 5:4, 8). B.C. considerably ante 1092.

- **3.** Brother of Nathan of Zobah, and one of David's famous warriors (Chronicles 11:38); called IGAL *SEE IGAL* (q.v.) in the parallel passage (Samuel 23:36);
- **4.** The third named of the four sons of Izrahiah, a chieftain of the tribe of Issachar (Chronicles 7:3). B.C. prob. cir. 1017.
- **5.** A chief Levite of the family of Gershom, at the head of 130 Temple servitors (Chronicles 15:7, 11); probably the same with the third of the "sons" of Laadan (Chronicles 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" (Chronicles 26:22). B.C. 1042.
- **6.** Son of Pedaiah, and prince of the half tribe of Manasseh west (Chronicles 27:20). B.C. 1014.
- 7. Son of Pethuel, and second of the twelve minor prophets (***Joel 1:1). His history is only known from the contents of the book that bears his name.

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 (*** Peter 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 (2000 Joel 1:1-2, 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 (**Deuteronomy 28:38, 39), and by Solomon in his prayer at the dedication of the Temple (Kings 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 hr/MhAta, as 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 (**Deuteronomy 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 (***Doel 2:12-17). He foretells the restoration of the land to its former fertility, and declares that Jehovah would still be their God (***Joel 2:18-26; comp. Müller, *Anmerk. ib.* 2, 16, in *Brenz. and Verd. Biblioth.* 2, 161).
- 3. The 'kgrighted' 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 $\alpha \pi \alpha \rho \gamma \eta$, 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 Acts 2:39 proves that he extended his reference to the end of the dispensation. The expression "all flesh" (***PT-Acts 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. 472 Joel 2:32 with **Si012**Romans 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 (1 Macc. 3:41; Ezekiel 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 "Isaiah 2:2-4; "Micah 4:1-3, are direct imitations of him. Parts of the New Test. also ("Revelation 9:2 sq.; 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, hr/hf]hj nm [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 (Chronicles 5:12). B.C. cir. 782.
- 9. A Levite, son of Uzziah or Azariah, and father of Elkanah, of the family of Kohath (*** 1 Chronicles 6:36), and one of those who cooperated with Hezekiah in his restoration of the Temple services (*** 2 Chronicles 29:12). B.C. 726. In *** 1 Chronicles 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 (***) Chronicles 4:35). B.C. cir. 712.
- **11.** Son of Zichri, and prefect of the Benjamites resident at Jerusalem after the captivity (Nehemiah 11:9). B.C. 536.
- **12.** One of the "sons" of Nebo, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (**SDB*Ezra 10:43). B.C. 459.

Joë'lah

(Heb. Yoëlah', hl a [ε), derivation uncertain; Sept. Ἰωηλά v.r. Ἰελία, 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 (ΔΙΙΙ) Chronicles 12:7). B.C. 1055.

Joë'zer

(Heb. *Yoë'zer*, rz[/y, *Jehovah* is his *help*; Sept. Ἰοζαάρ v.r. Ἰωζαρά), one of the Korhites who reinforced David while at Ziklag, and remained among his famous bodyguard (ΔΙΙΙΙ) Chronicles 12:6). B.C. 1055.

Joga.

SEE HINDUISM; SEE VISHNU.

Jog'behah

(Heb. Yogbah', HBij); only with h paragogic, hhBjj); lofty; Sept. Ἰεγεβαά, 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 (**Numbers 32:35). It lay on the route of Gideon when pursuing the nomadic Midianites, near Nobah, beyond Penuel, in the direction of Karkor (***OND**Judges 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.

SEE YOGEE.

Jog'li

(Heb. Yogli', yl ; exiled; Sept. Ἰεκλί), the father of Bukki, which latter was the Danite commissioner for partitioning the land of Canaan (MRD) Numbers 34:22). B.C. ante 1618.

Jogues, Or Yugs,

is a name among the Hindus for periods of extraordinary length spoken of in their mythological chronology.

Jo'ha

(Heb. *Yocha*', aj /y, probably contracted for h\'j i'y, whom *Jehovah revives*), the name of two men.

- 1. (Sept. Ἰωαζαέ v.r. Ἰωζαέ) A person mentioned as a Tizite, along with his brother Jediael, the son of Shimri, among David's famous bodyguard (ΔΙΙΝΕ-1 Chronicles 11:45). B.C. 1046.
- **2.** (Sept. $1\omega\alpha\chi\dot{\alpha}$ v.r. $1\omega\delta\dot{\alpha}$) The last named among the Benjamite chiefs, descendants of Beriah, resident at Jerusalem (***1816*)1 Chronicles 8:16). B.C. apparently 588 or 536.

Joha'nan

(Heb. *Yochanan*', nj /y, a contracted form of the name JEHOHANAN; comp. also JOHN), the name of several men. *SEE JEHOHANAN*, 3, 4, 6.

- **1.** (Sept. Ἰωνάν ν.r. Ἰωανάν.) The eighth of the Gadite braves who joined David's band in the fastness of the desert of Judah (ΔΙΖΖ) Chronicles 12:12). B.C. cir. 1061.
- **2.** (*Sept.* Ἰωανάν.) One apparently of the Benjamite slingers and archers who joined David at Ziklag (ΔΙΙΙΝΕ) Chronicles 12:4). B.C. 1055.
- **4.** (Sept. Ἰωανάν.) The oldest son of king Josiah (ΔΝΒΕ)1 Chronicles 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. Ἰωνά, in Jeremiah Ἰωάναν and Ἰωάνναν; Josephus Graecizes the name as John, Ἰωάννης, 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 (Kings 25:23; Lie Jeremiah 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 (Jeremiah 40:13, 16). After Gedaliah's assassination, Johanan pursued the murderer, and rescued the people taken away by him as captives to the Ammonites (Jeremiah 41:8, 13, 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 Jeremiah 42:1, 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 (Jeremiah 43:2, 4, 5), where, doubtless, they were seized by the Chaldeans. B.C. 587.
- **6.** (Sept. Ἰωάναν.) Son of Katan (Hakkatan), of the "sons" of Azgad, who returned with 110 males from Babylon with Ezra (ΔΕΣΤΑ 8:12). B.C. 459.

- 7. (Sept. Ἰωάναν.) A son of Tobiah, who named Meshullam's daughter (κίσιος Nehemiah 6:18). B.C. 446.
- **8.** (*Sept.* Ἰωανάν.) A chief priest, son (? grandson) of Eliashib, named as last of those whose contemporaries the Levites were recorded in "the book of the Chronicles" (Δασσο Nehemiah 12:22, 23). He appears to be the same called JEHOHANAN (in the text, but "Johanan" in the Auth. Vers.) in Δασσο Ezra 10:6; also JONATHAN, the son of Joiada and father of Jaddua, in Δασσο Nehemiah 12:11; comp. 22. B.C. prob. 459.
- **9.** (Sept. Ἰωανάμ.) The fifth named of the seven sons of Elioenai, of the descendants of Zerubbabel (ΔΕΕΕ Chronicles 3:24). He is apparently the same with the NAHUM mentioned among the ancestry of Christ (ΔΕΕΕ Luke 3:25. See Strong's *Harm. and Expos. of the Gosp.* p. 16, 17). B.C. somewhat post 406. SEE GENEALOGY OF CHRIST.

Johan'nes

(Ἰωαννής, 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 (1 Esdr. 8:38); the JOHANAN of Ezra 8:12.
- **2.** A "son" of Bebai (1 Esdr. 9:29); the JEHOHANAN of SEZRA 10:28.

Johannites.

SEE KNIGHTS OF MALTA.

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 tdj oyçrç, 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 twba twdl wt (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 'yçl h ydwsy 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 µyl mr [(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.